CHRISTOPH SCHILLER

MOTION MOUNTAIN

CHRISTOPH SCHILLER

MOTION MOUNTAIN

Preface

> Primum movere, deinde docere.*
>
> Antiquity

The intense curiosity with which small children explore their environment suggests that there is a drive to grasp the way the world works, a 'physics instinct', built into each of us. What would happen if this drive, instead of being stifled during school education, as it usually is, were allowed to thrive in an environment without bounds, reaching from the atoms to the stars? Probably most adolescents would then know more about nature than most senior physics teachers today. And they would be well-prepared to shape their lives. This text tries to provide this possibility to the reader. It acts as a guide in an exploration, free of all limitations, of physics, the *science of motion*. The project is the result of a threefold aim I have pursued since 1990: to present the basics of motion in a way that is simple, up to date and vivid.

In order to be *simple*, the text focuses on concepts, while keeping mathematics to the necessary minimum. Understanding the concepts of physics is given precedence over using formulae in calculations. The whole text is within the reach of an undergraduate. It presents simple summaries of the main domains of physics.

There are three main stages in the physical description of motion. First, there is everyday physics, or classical continuum physics. It is based on the existence of the infinitely small and the infinitely large. In the second stage, each domain of physics is centred around a basic inequality for the main observable. Thus, statistical thermodynamics limits entropy by $S \geqslant k/2$; special relativity limits speeds by $v \leqslant c$; general relativity limits force by $F \leqslant c^4/4G$; quantum theory limits action by $L \geqslant \hbar/2$; and quantum electrodynamics limits change of charge by $\Delta q \geqslant e$. These results, though not so well known, are proved rigorously. It is shown that within each domain, the principal equations follow from the relevant limit. Basing the domains of physics on limit principles allows them to be introduced in a simple, rapid and intuitive way. The third and final stage is the unification of all these limits in a single description of motion. This unusual way of learning physics should reward the curiosity of every reader – whether student or professional.

In order to be *up to date*, the text includes introductions to quantum gravity, string theory and unification. Meanwhile, the standard topics – mechanics, electricity, light, quantum theory, particle physics and general relativity – are enriched by the many gems – both theoretical and empirical – that are scattered throughout the recent scientific literature.

In order to be *vivid*, a text must be challenging, questioning and daring. This text tries to startle the reader as much as possible. Reading a book on general physics should be like going to a magic show. We watch, we are astonished, we do not believe our eyes, we think, and finally – maybe – we understand the trick. When we look at nature, we often have the same experience. The text tries to intensify this by following a simple rule: on each page, there should be at least one surprise or provocation for the reader to think about. Numerous interesting challenges are proposed. Hints or answers to these are given in an appendix.

* 'First move, then teach.' In modern languages, the mentioned type of moving (the heart) is often called *motivating*; both terms go back to the same Latin root.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The strongest surprises are those that seem to contradict everyday experience. Most of the surprises in this text are taken from daily life: in particular, from the things one experiences when climbing a mountain. Observations about trees, stones, the Moon, the sky and people are used wherever possible; complex laboratory experiments are mentioned only where necessary. These surprises are organized so as to lead in a natural way to the most extreme conclusion of all, namely that *continuous space and time do not exist*. The concepts of space and time, useful as they may be in everyday life, are only approximations. Indeed, they turn out to be mental crutches that *hinder* the complete exploration of the world.

Giving full rein to one's curiosity and thought leads to the development of a strong and dependable character. The motto of the text, *die Menschen stärken, die Sachen klären*, a famous statement by Hartmut von Hentig on pedagogy, translates as: 'To clarify things, to fortify people.' Exploring any limit requires courage; and courage is also needed to abandon space and time as tools for the description of the world. Changing habits of thought produces fear, often hidden by anger; but we grow by overcoming our fears. Achieving a description of the world without the use of space and time may be the most beautiful of all adventures of the mind.

Eindhoven and other places, 8 January 2009

Advice for learners

In my experience as a teacher, there was one learning method that never failed to transform unsuccessful pupils into successful ones: if you read a book for study, summarize every section you read, *in your own words, aloud*. If you are unable to do so, read the section again. Repeat this until you can clearly summarize what you read in your own words, aloud. You can do this alone in a room, or with friends, or while walking. If you do this with everything you read, you will reduce your learning and reading time significantly. In addition, you will enjoy learning from good texts much more and hate bad texts much less. Masters of the method can use it even while listening to a lecture, in a low voice, thus avoiding to ever take notes.

Using this book

Text in green, as found in many marginal notes, is a link that can be clicked in a pdf reader. Green links can be bibliographic references, footnotes, cross references to other pages, challenge solutions or URLs of other websites.

Solutions and hints for *challenges* are given at the end of each part. Challenges are classified as research level (r), difficult (d), standard student level (s) and easy (e). Challenges of type r, d or s for which no solution has yet been included in the book are marked (ny).

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

A request

The text is and will remain free to download from the internet. In exchange, please send me a short email on the following issues:

— What was unclear?
— What story, topic, riddle, picture or movie did you miss?
Challenge 1 s — What should be improved or corrected?

Feedback on the specific points listed on the www.motionmountain.eu/help.html web page is most welcome of all. You can also add feedback directly to www.motionmountain.eu/wiki. On behalf of all other readers, thank you in advance for your input. For a particularly useful contribution you will be mentioned – if you want – in the acknowledgements, receive a reward, or both. But above all, enjoy the reading.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



AN APPETIZER

> Die Lösung des Rätsels des Lebens in Raum und Zeit liegt *außerhalb* von Raum und Zeit.*
> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 6.4312

What is the most daring and amazing journey we can make in a lifetime? We can travel to remote places, like adventurers, explorers or cosmonauts; we can look at even more distant places, like astronomers; we can visit the past, like historians, archaeologists, evolutionary biologists or geologists; or we can delve deeply into the human interior, like artists or psychologists. All these voyages lead either to other places or to other times. However, we can do better.

The most daring trip of all is not the one leading to the most inaccessible place, but the one leading to where there is no place at all. Such a journey implies leaving the prison of space and time and venturing beyond it, into a domain where there is no position, no present, no future and no past, where we are free of the restrictions imposed by space and time, but also of the mental reassurance that these concepts provide.** In this domain, many new discoveries and new adventures await us. Almost nobody has ever been there; humanity's journey there has so far taken at least 2500 years, and is still not complete.

To venture into this domain, we need to be curious about the essence of travel itself. The essence of travel is *motion*. By exploring motion we will be led to the most fascinating adventures in the universe.

The quest to understand motion can be pursued behind a desk, with a book, some paper and a pen. But to make the adventure more vivid, this text uses the metaphor of a mountain ascent. Every step towards the top corresponds to a step towards higher precision in the description of motion. In addition, with each step the scenery will become more delightful. At the top of the mountain we shall arrive in a domain where 'space' and 'time' are words that have lost all meaning and where the sight of the world's beauty is overwhelming and unforgettable.

Thinking without time or space is difficult but fascinating. In order to get a taste of the issues involved, try to respond to the following questions without referring to either space or time:

Challenge 2 s

— Can you *prove* that two points extremely close to each other always leave room for a third point in between?

* 'The solution of the riddle of life in space and time lies *outside* space and time.' This and other quotes of Ludwig Wittgenstein are from the equally short and famous *Tractatus logico-philosophicus*, written in 1918, first published in 1921; it has now been translated into many other languages.

** Some people might need a clarification: drugs do not provide such experiences.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

— Can you describe the shape of a knot over the telephone?
— Can you explain on the telephone what 'right' and 'left' mean, or what a mirror is?
— Can you make a telephone appointment with a friend without using any terms of time or position, such as 'clock', 'hour', 'place', 'where', 'when', 'at', 'near', 'before', 'after', 'upon', 'under', 'above', 'below'?
— Can you describe the fall of a stone without using the language of space or time?
— Do you know of *any observation at all* that you can describe without concepts from the domains of 'space', 'time' or 'object'?
— Can you explain what time is? And what clocks are?
— Can you imagine a finite history of the universe, but without a 'first instant of time'?
— Can you imagine a domain of nature where matter and vacuum are indistinguishable?
— Have you ever tried to understand why motion exists?

This book explains how to achieve these and other feats, bringing to completion an ancient dream of the human spirit, namely the quest to describe *every* possible aspect of motion.

Why do your shoelaces remain tied? They do so because space has three dimensions. Why not another number? The question has taxed researchers for thousands of years. The answer was only found by studying motion down to its smallest details, and by exploring its limits.

Why do the colours of objects differ? Why does the Sun shine? Why does the Moon not fall out of the sky? Why is the sky dark at night? Why is water liquid but fire not? Why is the universe so big? Why is it that birds can fly but men can't? Why is lightning not straight? Why are atoms neither square, nor the size of cherries? These questions seem to have little in common – but they are related. They are all about motion – about its details and its limitations. Indeed, they all appear, and are answered, in this text. Studying the limits of motion, we discover that when a mirror changes its speed it emits light. We also discover that gravity can be measured with a thermometer. We find that there are more cells in the brain than stars in the galaxy, giving substance to the idea that people have a whole universe in their head. Exploring any detail of motion is already an adventure in itself.

By exploring the properties of motion we will find that, despite appearance, motion never stops. We will find out why the floor cannot fall. We will understand why computers cannot be made arbitrarily fast. We will see that perfect memory cannot exist. We will understand that nothing can be perfectly black. We will learn that every clock has a certain probability of going backwards. We will discover that time does not exist. We will find that all objects in the world are connected. We will learn that matter cannot be distinguished precisely from empty space. We will learn that we are literally made of nothing. We will learn quite a few things about our destiny. And we will understand why the world is the way it is.

The quest to understand motion, together with all its details and all its limits, involves asking and answering three specific questions.

How do things move? Motion is usually defined as an object changing position over time. This seemingly mundane definition actually encompasses general relativity, one of the most amazing descriptions of nature ever imagined. We will find that there is a maximum speed in nature, that space is warped, that it can move, that light does not usually

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009


PHYSICS:
Describing motion with action.
(Unified) theory of motion
Adventures: understanding everything, intense fun with thinking, catching a glimpse of bliss
What are space, time and quantum particles?
General relativity
Adventures: the night sky, measuring curved space, exploring black holes and the universe, space and time
Quantum theory with gravity
Adventures: bouncing neutrons, understanding tree growth
Quantum field theory
Adventures: building accelerators, understanding quarks, stars, bombs and the basis of life, matter, radiation
How do small things move? What are things?
Classical gravity
Adventures: climbing, skiing, space travel, the wonders of astronomy and geology
How do everyday, fast and large things move?
Special relativity
Adventures: understanding time dilation, length contraction and $E=mc^2$
Quantum theory
Adventures: death, sexuality, biology, enjoying art, colours in nature, all high-tech business, medicine, chemistry, evolution
G
c
h, e, k
Galilean physics, electricity and heat
Adventures: sport, music, sailing, cooking, using electricity and computers, understanding the brain and people

FIGURE 1 A complete map of physics: the connections are defined by the speed of light c, the gravitational constant G, the Planck constant h, the Boltzmann constant k and the elementary charge e.

travel in a straight line, and that time is not the same for everybody. We will discover that there is a maximum force of gravity, and that gravity is not an interaction, but rather the change of time with position. We will see how the blackness of the sky at night proves that the universe has a finite age. We will also discover that there is a smallest entropy in nature, which prevents us from knowing everything about a physical system. In addition, we will discover the smallest electrical charge. These and other strange properties and phenomena of motion are summarized in the first three parts of this text, covering mechanics, heat, special relativity, general relativity and electrodynamics. These topics correspond to the four points in the southwest of Figure 1. The question on how things move leads directly to the next question.

What are things? Things are composites of quantons, or quantum particles. Not only

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

tangible things, but all interactions and forces – those of the muscles, those that make the Sun burn, those that make the Earth turn, those that determine the differences between attraction, repulsion, friction, creation and annihilation – are made of quantons as well. The growth of trees, the colours of the sky, the burning of fire, the warmth of a human body, the waves of the sea and the mood changes of people are all composed of quantons in motion. This story is told in more detail in the fourth and fifth part of the text, which deal with the foundations and the applications of quantum mechanics. They correspond to the three 'quantum' points of Figure 1. Here we will learn that there is a smallest change in nature. This minimum value of change, given by the quantum of action $\hbar/2$, forces everything in nature to keep changing. In particular, we will learn that it is impossible to completely fill a glass of wine, that eternal life is impossible, and that light can be transformed into matter. If you find this boring, you can read about the substantial dangers involved in buying a can of beans.

Page 1339

The first five parts of this text can be summarized with the help of a few limit principles:

Statistical thermodynamics limits entropy:	$S \geqslant k/2$
Special relativity limits speed:	$v \leqslant c$
General relativity limits force:	$F \leqslant c^4/4G$
Quantum theory limits action (or change):	$L \geqslant \hbar/2$
Quantum electrodynamics quantizes electric charge:	$Q = n\,e$
Quantum asthenodynamics quantizes weak charge.	
Quantum chromodynamics quantizes colour charge.	

In other words, each of the constants of nature $k/2$, c, $c^4/4G$, $\hbar/2$ and e that appear above is a *limit* value. We will discover in each case that the equation of the corresponding domain of physics follows from this limit property. After these results, the path is prepared for the final part of our mountain ascent.

What are space, time and quantons? The recent results of an age-long search are making it possible to start answering this question. One just needs to find a description that explains all limit principles at the same time. This sixth and last part, corresponding to the highest point of Figure 1, is not yet complete, because the necessary research results are not yet available. Nevertheless, some of the intermediate results are striking:

Page 1398

— It is known already that space and time are not continuous; that – to be precise – neither points nor particles exist; and that there is no way to distinguish space from time, nor vacuum from matter, nor matter from radiation.
— It is known already that nature is *not* simply made of particles and vacuum.
— It seems that position, time and particles are aspects of a complex, *extended* entity that is incessantly varying in shape.
— Among the mysteries that should be cleared up in the coming years are the origin of the three dimensions of space, the origin of time and the details of the big bang.
— Current research indicates that motion is an intrinsic property of matter and radiation and that, as soon as we introduce these two concepts in our description of nature,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

motion appears automatically. Indeed, it is impossible *not* to introduce these concepts, because they necessarily appear when we divide nature into parts, an act we cannot avoid because of the mechanisms of our senses and therefore of our thinking.

— Current research also indicates that the final, completely precise, description of nature does not use any form of infinity. We find, step by step, that all infinities appearing in the human description of nature – both the infinitely large and the infinitely small – result from approximations. 'Infinity' turns out to be merely a conceptual convenience that has no place in nature. However, we find that the precise description does not include any finite quantities either!

This sixth and final part of the text thus describes the present state of the search for a unified theory encompassing general relativity and quantum theory. To achieve such a description, the secrets of space, time, matter and forces have to be unravelled. It is a fascinating story, assembled piece by piece by thousands of researchers. At the end of the ascent, at the top of the mountain, the idea of motion will have undergone a complete transformation. Without space and time, the world will look magical, incredibly simple and fascinating: pure beauty.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



First Part

Fall, Flow and Heat

In our quest to learn how things move,
the experience of hiking and other motion
leads us to introduce the concepts of
velocity, time, length, mass and temperature,
and to use them to measure change.
We discover how to float in free space,
why we have legs instead of wheels,
why disorder can never be eliminated,
and why one of the most difficult open issues
in science is the flow of water through a tube.

Contents

22 1 Why should we care about motion?

Does motion exist? 23 • How should we talk about motion? 25 • What are the types of motion? 27 • Perception, permanence and change 31 • Does the world need states? 33 • Galilean physics in six interesting statements 34 • Curiosities and fun challenges about motion 35 • Summary on motion 38

39 2 From motion measurement to continuity

What is velocity? 40 • What is time? 45 • Clocks 48 • Why do clocks go clockwise? 49 • Does time flow? 51 • What is space? 52 • Are space and time absolute or relative? 56 • Size – why area exists, but volume does not 57 • What is straight? 61 • A hollow Earth? 61 • Curiosities and fun challenges about everyday space and time 62 • Summary about everyday space and time 72

73 3 How to describe motion – kinematics

Throwing, jumping and shooting 75 • Enjoying vectors 77 • What is rest? What is velocity? 78 • Acceleration 80 • Objects and point particles 83 • Legs and wheels 85 • Curiosities and fun challenges about kinematics 87 • Summary of kinematics 88

89 4 From objects and images to conservation

Motion and contact 90 • What is mass? 91 • Momentum and mass 93 • Is motion eternal? – Conservation of momentum 98 • More conservation – energy 99 • Rotation 102 • Rolling wheels 107 • How do we walk? 108 • Curiosities and fun challenges about conservation 109 • Summary on conservation 115

116 5 From the rotation of the earth to the relativity of motion

How does the Earth rotate? 123 • Does the Earth move? 126 • Is velocity absolute? – The theory of everyday relativity 132 • Is rotation relative? 133 • Curiosities and fun challenges about relativity 134 • Legs or wheels? – Again 139 • Summary on Galilean relativity 141

142 6 Motion due to gravitation

Properties of gravitation 146 • Dynamics – how do things move in various dimensions? 150 • Gravitation in the sky 151 • The Moon 153 • Orbits 155 • Tides 158 • Can light fall? 161 • What is mass? – Again 162 • Curiosities and fun challenges about gravitation 164 • Summary on gravitation 177

178 7 Classical mechanics and the predictability of motion

Should one use force? Power? 178 • Friction and motion 181 • Friction, sport, machines and predictability 181 • Complete states – initial conditions 185 • Do surprises exist? Is the future determined? 186 • Free will 188 • Summary on predictability 189 • Global descriptions of motion 190

194 8 Measuring change with action

The principle of least action 198 • Lagrangians and motion 200 • Why is motion so often bounded? 202 • Curiosities and fun challenges about Lagrangians 205 • Summary on action 208

209 9 Motion and symmetry

Why can we think and talk about the world? 209 • Viewpoints 211 • Symmetries and groups 212 • Representations 213 • Symmetries, motion and Galilean

physics 216 • Reproducibility, conservation and Noether's theorem 219 • Curiosities and fun challenges about symmetry 223 • Parity and time invariance 224 • Summary on symmetry 224

226 10 Simple motions of extended bodies – oscillations and waves
Waves and their motion 228 • Why can we talk to each other? – Huygens' principle 234 • Why is music so beautiful? 236 • Signals 238 • Solitary waves and solitons 240 • Curiosities and fun challenges about waves and extended bodies 243 • Summary on waves and oscillations 249

250 11 Do extended bodies exist? – Limits of continuity
Mountains and fractals 250 • Can a chocolate bar last forever? 250 • The case of Galileo Galilei 252 • How high can animals jump? 254 • Felling trees 254 • The sound of silence 256 • Little hard balls 256 • The motion of fluids 260 • Curiosities and fun challenges about fluids 263 • Curiosities and fun challenges about solids 271 • Summary on extension 276 • What can move in nature? – Flows 276

278 12 From heat to time-invariance
Temperature 278 • Thermal energy 281 • Entropy 282 • Flow of entropy 284 • Do isolated systems exist? 284 • Why do balloons take up space? – The end of continuity 285 • Brownian motion 287 • Entropy and particles 289 • The minimum entropy of nature – the quantum of information 290 • Why can't we remember the future? 291 • Is everything made of particles? 292 • Why stones can be neither smooth nor fractal, nor made of little hard balls 293 • Curiosities and fun challenges about heat and reversibility 294 • Summary on heat and time-invariance 301

302 13 Self-organization and chaos – the simplicity of complexity
Curiosities and fun challenges about self-organization 310 • Summary on self-organization and chaos 313

314 14 From the limitations of physics to the limits of motion
Research topics in classical dynamics 314 • What is contact? 314 • Precision and accuracy 315 • Can all of nature be described in a book? 316 • Something is wrong about our description of motion 317 • Why is measurement possible? 317 • Is motion unlimited? 318

319 A Notation and conventions
The Latin alphabet 319 • The Greek alphabet 321 • The Hebrew alphabet and other scripts 323 • Digits and numbers 323 • The symbols used in the text 324 • Calendars 326 • People Names 328 • Abbreviations and eponyms or concepts? 328

330 Bibliography

355 Challenge hints and solutions

391 Credits
Acknowledgements 391 • Film credits 392 • Image credits 392

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 1

WHY SHOULD WE CARE ABOUT MOTION?

> All motion is an illusion.
>
> Zeno of Elea*

Wham! The lightning striking the tree nearby violently disrupts our quiet forest alk and causes our hearts to suddenly beat faster. In the top of the tree e see the fire start and fade again. The gentle wind moving the leaves around us helps to restore the calmness of the place. Nearby, the water in a small river follows its complicated way down the valley, reflecting on its surface the ever-changing shapes of the clouds.

Motion is everywhere: friendly and threatening, terrible and beautiful. It is fundamental to our human existence. We need motion for growing, for learning, for thinking and for enjoying life. We use motion for walking through a forest, for listening to its noises and for talking about all this. Like all animals, we rely on motion to get food and to survive dangers. Like all living beings, we need motion to reproduce, to breathe and to digest. Like all objects, motion keeps us warm.

Motion is the most fundamental observation about nature at large. It turns out that *everything* that happens in the world is some type of motion. There are no exceptions. Motion is such a basic part of our observations that even the origin of the word is lost in the darkness of Indo-European linguistic history. The fascination of motion has always made it a favourite object of curiosity. By the fifth century BCE in ancient Greece, its study had been given a name: *physics*. Ref. 1

Motion is also important to the human condition. What can we know? Where does the world come from? Who are we? Where do we come from? What will we do? What should we do? What will the future bring? What is death? Where does life lead? All these questions are about motion. The study of motion provides answers that are both deep and surprising.

Motion is mysterious. Though found everywhere – in the stars, in the tides, in our eyelids – neither the ancient thinkers nor myriads of others in the 25 centuries since then have been able to shed light on the central mystery: *what is motion?* We shall discover that the standard reply, 'motion is the change of place in time', is inadequate. Just recently an answer has finally been found. This is the story of the way to find it. Ref. 2

Motion is a part of human experience. If we imagine human experience as an island, then destiny, symbolized by the waves of the sea, carried us to its shore. Near the centre of

* Zeno of Elea (*c.* 450 BCE), one of the main exponents of the Eleatic school of philosophy.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 2 Experience Island, with Motion Mountain and the trail to be followed

the island an especially high mountain stands out. From its top we can see over the whole landscape and get an impression of the relationships between all human experiences, in particular between the various examples of motion. This is a guide to the top of what I have called Motion Mountain (see Figure 2; a less artistic but more exact version is given in Figure 1). The hike is one of the most beautiful adventures of the human mind. The first question to ask is:

Does motion exist?

> *Das Rätsel* gibt es nicht. Wenn sich eine Frage überhaupt stellen läßt, so *kann* sie beantwortet werden.*
>
> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 6.5

To sharpen the mind for the issue of motion's existence, have a look at Figure 3 or at Ref. 3 Figure 4 and follow the instructions. In all cases the figures seem to rotate. One can experience similar effects if one walks over Italian cobblestone that is laid down in wave patterns or with the many motion illusions by Kitaoka Akiyoshi shown at www.ritsumei. Ref. 4 ac.jp/~akitaoka. How can we make sure that real motion is different from these or other Challenge 3 s similar illusions?

Many scholars simply argued that motion does not exist at all. Their arguments deeply Ref. 5 influenced the investigation of motion. For example, the Greek philosopher Parmenides

* '*The riddle* does not exist. If a question can be put at all, it *can* also be answered.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 3 Illusions of motion: look at the figure on the left and slightly move the page, or look at the white dot at the centre of the figure on the right and move your head back and forward

(born *c.* 515 BCE in Elea, a small town near Naples) argued that since nothing comes from nothing, change cannot exist. He underscored the *permanence* of nature and thus consistently maintained that all change and thus all motion is an illusion. Ref. 6

Heraclitus (*c.* 540 to *c.* 480 BCE) held the opposite view. He expressed it in his famous statement πάντα ῥεῖ 'panta rhei' or 'everything flows'.* He saw change as the essence of nature, in contrast to Parmenides. These two equally famous opinions induced many scholars to investigate in more detail whether in nature there are *conserved* quantities or whether *creation* is possible. We will uncover the answer later on; until then, you might ponder which option you prefer. Challenge 4 s

Parmenides' collaborator Zeno of Elea (born *c.* 500 BCE) argued so intensely against motion that some people still worry about it today. In one of his arguments he claims – in simple language – that it is impossible to slap somebody, since the hand first has to travel halfway to the face, then travel through half the distance that remains, then again so, and so on; the hand therefore should never reach the face. Zeno's argument focuses on the relation between *infinity* and its opposite, finitude, in the description of motion. In modern quantum theory, a similar issue troubles many scientists up to this day. Ref. 7

Zeno also maintained that by looking at a moving object at a *single* instant of time, one cannot maintain that it moves. Zeno argued that at a single instant of time, there is no difference between a moving and a resting body. He then deduced that if there is no difference at a single time, there cannot be a difference for longer times. Zeno therefore questioned whether motion can clearly be distinguished from its opposite, *rest*. Indeed, in the history of physics, thinkers switched back and forward between a positive and a negative answer. It was this very question that led Albert Einstein to the development of general relativity, one of the high points of our journey. In our adventure, we will explore all known differences between motion and rest. Eventually, we will dare to ask whether single instants of time do exist at all. Answering this question is essential for reaching the top of Motion Mountain.

When we explore quantum theory, we will discover that motion is indeed – to a certain extent – an illusion, as Parmenides claimed. More precisely, we will show that motion is observed only due to the limitations of the human condition. We will find that we experience motion only because we evolved on Earth, with a finite size, made of a large but

* Appendix A explains how to read Greek text.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 4 Zoom this image to large size or approach it closely in order to enjoy its apparent motion (© Michael Bach after the discovery of Kitaoka Akiyoshi)

finite number of atoms, with a finite but moderate temperature, electrically neutral, large compared with a black hole of our same mass, large compared with our quantum mechanical wavelength, small compared with the universe, with a limited memory, forced by our brain to approximate space and time as continuous entities, and forced by our brain to describe nature as made of different parts. If any one of these conditions were not fulfilled, we would not observe motion; motion, then, would not exist. Each of these results can be uncovered most efficiently if we start with the following question:

How should we talk about motion?

> Je hais le mouvement, qui déplace les lignes,
> Et jamais je ne pleure et jamais je ne ris.
> Charles Baudelaire, *La Beauté*.*

Like any science, the approach of physics is twofold: we advance with *precision* and with *curiosity*. Precision makes meaningful communication possible, and curiosity makes it worthwhile. Be it an eclipse, a beautiful piece of music, or a feat at the Olympic games: the world is full of fascinating examples of motion.**

If you ever find yourself talking about motion, whether to understand it more precisely or more deeply, you are taking steps up Motion Mountain. The examples of Figure 7 make the point. When you fill a bucket with a small amount of water, it does not hang vertically. (Why?) If you continue adding water, it starts to hang vertically at a certain moment. How much water is necessary? When you pull a thread from a reel in the way

Challenge 5 ny

* Charles Baudelaire (b. 1821 Paris, d. 1867 Paris) *Beauty*: 'I hate movement, which changes shapes, and never do I weep and never do I laugh.'

Ref. 8

Ref. 9 ** For a collection of interesting examples of motion in everyday life, see the excellent book by Walker.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 5 A time line of scientific and *political* personalities in antiquity (the last letter of the name is aligned with the year of death)



FIGURE 6 An example of how precision of observation can lead to the discovery of new effects: the deformation of a tennis ball during the *c.* 6 ms of a fast bounce (© International Tennis Federation)

shown, the reel will move either forwards or backwards, depending on the angle at which you pull. What is the limiting angle between the two possibilities?

High precision means going into fine details, and being attuned to details actually *increases* the pleasure of the adventure.* The higher we get on Motion Mountain, the further we can see and the more our curiosity is rewarded. The views offered are breath-taking, especially from the very top. The path we will follow – one of the many possible routes – starts from the side of biology and directly enters the forest that lies at the foot of the mountain. Ref. 10

Intense curiosity drives us to go straight to the limits: understanding motion requires exploration of the largest distances, the highest velocities, the smallest particles, the strongest forces and the strangest concepts. Let us begin.

Challenge 6 s * Distrust anybody who wants to talk you *out* of investigating details. He is trying to deceive you. Details are important. Be vigilant also during *this* walk.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 7 How much water is required to make a bucket hang vertically? At what angle does the pulled reel change direction of motion? (© Luca Gastaldi)

TABLE 1 Content of books about motion found in a public library

Motion topics	Motion topics
motion pictures	motion as therapy for cancer, diabetes, acne and depression
motion perception Ref. 11	motion sickness
motion for fitness and wellness	motion for meditation
motion control in sport	motion ability as health check
perpetual motion	motion in dance, music and other arts
motion as proof of various gods Ref. 12	motion of stars and angels Ref. 13
economic efficiency of motion	the connection between motional and emotional habits
motion as help to overcome trauma	motion in psychotherapy Ref. 14
locomotion of insects, horses and robots	commotion
motions in parliament	movements in art, sciences and politics
movements in watches	movements in the stock market
movement teaching and learning	movement development in children Ref. 15
musical movements	troop movements Ref. 16
religious movements	bowel movements
moves in chess	cheating moves in casinos Ref. 17
connection between gross national product and citizen mobility	

What are the types of motion?

> Every movement is born of a desire for change.
> Antiquity

A good place to obtain a general overview on the types of motion is a large library (see Table 1). The domains in which motion, movements and moves play a role are indeed

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 8 An example of transport, at the Etna (© Marco Fulle)

varied. Already in ancient Greece people had the suspicion that all types of motion, as well as many other types of change, are related. Three categories of change are commonly recognized:

1. Transport. The type of change we call motion in everyday life is material *transport*, such as a person walking, a leaf falling from a tree, or a musical instrument playing. Transport is the change of position or orientation of objects. To a large extent, the behaviour of people also falls into this category.
2. Transformation. Another category of change groups observations such as the dissolution of salt in water, the formation of ice by freezing, the rotting of wood, the cooking of food, the coagulation of blood, and the melting and alloying of metals. These changes of colour, brightness, hardness, temperature and other material properties are all *transformations*. Transformations are changes not visibly connected with transport. To this category, a few ancient thinkers added the emission and absorption of light. In the twentieth century, these two effects were proven to be special cases of transformations, as were the newly discovered appearance and disappearance of matter, as observed in the Sun and in radioactivity. *Mind change*, such as change of mood, of health, of education and of character, is also (mostly) a type of transformation.

Ref. 18

Ref. 19

3. Growth. The last and especially important category of change, *growth*, is observed for animals, plants, bacteria, crystals, mountains, planets, stars and even galaxies. In the nineteenth century, changes in the population of systems, *biological evolution*, and in the twentieth century, changes in the size of the universe, *cosmic evolution*, were added to this category. Traditionally, these phenomena were studied by separate sciences. Independently they all arrived at the conclusion that growth is a combination of transport and transformation. The difference is one of complexity and of time scale.

At the beginnings of modern science during the Renaissance, only the study of transport was seen as the topic of physics. Motion was equated to transport. The other two domains

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 9 Transport, growth and transformation (© Philip Plisson)

were neglected by physicists. Despite this restriction, the field of enquiry remains large, covering a large part of Experience Island. Early scholars differentiated types of transport by their origin. Movements such as those of the legs when walking were classified as *volitional*, because they are controlled by one's will, whereas movements of external objects, such as the fall of a snowflake, which cannot be influenced by will-power, were classified as *passive*. Children are able to make this distinction by about the age of six, and this marks a central step in the development of every human towards a precise description of the environment.* From this distinction stems the historical but now outdated definition of physics as the science of the motion of non-living things.

The advent of machines forced scholars to rethink the distinction between volitional and passive motion. Like living beings, machines are self-moving and thus mimic volitional motion. However, careful observation shows that every part in a machine is moved by another, so their motion is in fact passive. Are living beings also machines? Are human actions examples of passive motion as well? The accumulation of observations in the last 100 years made it clear that volitional movement** indeed has the same physical properties as passive motion in non-living systems. (Of course, from the emotional viewpoint, the differences are important; for example, *grace* can only be ascribed to volitional movements.) A distinction between the two types of motion is thus unnecessary. But since passive and volitional motion have the same properties, through the study of motion of non-living objects we can learn something about the human condition. This

Ref. 20

* Failure to pass this stage completely can result in a person having various strange beliefs, such as believing in the ability to influence roulette balls, as found in compulsive players, or in the ability to move other bodies by thought, as found in numerous otherwise healthy-looking people. An entertaining and informative account of all the deception and self-deception involved in creating and maintaining these beliefs is given by James Randi, *The Faith Healers*, Prometheus Books, 1989. A professional magician, he presents many similar topics in several of his other books. See also his www.randi.org website for more details.

** The word 'movement' is rather modern; it was imported into English from the old French and became popular only at the end of the eighteenth century. It is never used by Shakespeare.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 10 One of the most difficult volitional movements known, performed by Alexander Tsukanov, the first man able to do this: jumping from one ultimate wheel to another (© Moscow State Circus)

is most evident when touching the topics of determinism, causality, probability, infinity, time and sex, to name but a few of the themes we will encounter on the way.

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries other classically held beliefs about motion fell by the wayside. Extensive observations showed that all transformations and all growth phenomena, including behaviour change and evolution, are also examples of transport. In other words, over 2 000 years of studies have shown that the ancient classification of observations was useless: all change is transport.

In the middle of the twentieth century the study of motion culminated in the experimental confirmation of an even more specific idea, previously articulated in ancient Greece: *every type of change is due to the motion of particles.* It takes time and work to reach this conclusion, which appears only when one relentlessly pursues higher and higher precision in the description of nature. The first five parts of this adventure retrace the path to this result. (Do you agree with it?) Challenge 7 s

The last decade of the twentieth century again completely changed the description of motion: the particle idea turns out to be wrong. This new result, reached through a combination of careful observation and deduction, will be explored in the last part of our adventure. But we still have some way to go before we reach that point, which is near the summit of our journey.

At present, at the beginning of our walk, we simply note that history has shown that classifying the various types of motion is not productive. Only by trying to achieve maximum precision can we hope to arrive at the fundamental properties of motion. Precision, not classification, is the path to follow. As Ernest Rutherford said: 'All science is either physics or stamp collecting.'

To achieve precision in our description of motion, we need to select specific examples of motion and study them fully in detail. It is intuitively obvious that the most precise description is achievable for the *simplest* possible examples. In everyday life, this is the case for the motion of any non-living, solid and rigid body in our environment, such as a stone thrown through the air. Indeed, like all humans, we learned to throw objects long before we learned to walk. Throwing is one of the first physical experiments we per- Ref. 21

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

formed by ourselves.* During our early childhood, by throwing stones, toys and other objects until our parents feared for every piece of the household, we explored the perception and the properties of motion. We do the same here.

> Die Welt ist unabhängig von meinem Willen.**
> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 6.373

Perception, permanence and change

> Only wimps study only the general case; real scientists pursue examples.
> Beresford Parlett

Human beings enjoy perceiving. Perception starts before birth, and we continue enjoying it for as long as we can. That is why television, even when devoid of content, is so successful. During our walk through the forest at the foot of Motion Mountain we cannot avoid perceiving. Perception is first of all the ability to *distinguish*. We use the basic mental act of distinguishing in almost every instant of life; for example, during childhood we first learned to distinguish familiar from unfamiliar observations. This is possible in combination with another basic ability, namely the capacity to *memorize* experiences. Memory gives us the ability to experience, to talk and thus to explore nature. Perceiving, classifying and memorizing together form *learning*. Without any one of these three abilities, we could not study motion.

Children rapidly learn to distinguish *permanence* from *variability*. They learn to *recognize* human faces, even though a face never looks exactly the same each time it is seen. From recognition of faces, children extend recognition to all other observations. Recognition works pretty well in everyday life; it is nice to recognize friends, even at night, and even after many beers (not a challenge). The act of recognition thus always uses a form of *generalization*. When we observe, we always have some general idea in our mind. Let us specify the main ones.

Sitting on the grass in a clearing of the forest at the foot of Motion Mountain, surrounded by the trees and the silence typical of such places, a feeling of calmness and tranquillity envelops us. We are thinking about the essence of perception. Suddenly, something moves in the bushes; immediately our eyes turn and our attention focuses. The nerve cells that detect motion are part of the most ancient part of our brain, shared with
Ref. 22 birds and reptiles: the brain stem. Then the cortex, or modern brain, takes over to analyse the type of motion and to identify its origin. Watching the motion across our field of vision, we observe two invariant entities: the fixed landscape and the moving animal. After we recognize the animal as a deer, we relax again.

How did we distinguish between landscape and deer? Perception involves several processes in the eye and in the brain. An essential part for these processes is motion, as is
Ref. 23 best deduced from the flip film shown in the lower left corners of these pages. Each image shows only a rectangle filled with a mathematically random pattern. But when the

* The importance of throwing is also seen from the terms derived from it: in Latin, words like *subject* or 'thrown below', *object* or 'thrown in front', and *interjection* or 'thrown in between'; in Greek, it led to terms like *symbol* or 'thrown together', *problem* or 'thrown forward', *emblem* or 'thrown into', and – last but not least – *devil* or 'thrown through'.

** 'The world is independent of my will.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 11 How do we distinguish a deer from its environment? (© Tony Rodgers)

pages are scanned in rapid succession, you discern a shape – a square – moving against a fixed background. At any given instant, the square cannot be distinguished from the background; there is no visible object at any given instant of time. Nevertheless it is easy to perceive its motion.* Perception experiments such as this one have been performed in many variations. For example, it was found that detecting a moving square against a random background is nothing special to humans; flies have the same ability, as do, in fact, all animals that have eyes.

The flip film in the lower left corner, like many similar experiments, illustrates two central attributes of motion. First, motion is perceived only if an *object* can be distinguished from a *background* or *environment*. Many motion illusions focus on this point.** Second, motion is required to *define* both the object and the environment, and to distinguish them from each other. In fact, the concept of space is – among others – an abstraction of the idea of background. The background is extended; the moving entity is localized. Does this seem boring? It is not; just wait a second.

We call the set of localized aspects that remain invariant or permanent during motion, such as size, shape, colour etc., taken together, a (physical) *object* or a (physical) *body*. We will tighten the definition shortly, since otherwise images would be objects as well. In other words, right from the start we experience motion as a *relative* process; it is perceived in relation and in opposition to the environment. The concept of an object is therefore also a relative concept. But the basic conceptual distinction between localized, isolable objects and the extended environment is not trivial or unimportant. First, it has the appearance of a circular definition. (Do you agree?) This issue will keep us busy later on. Second, we are so used to our ability of isolating local systems from the environment that we take it for granted. However, as we will see in the last part of our walk, this distinc-

Challenge 8 s

Page 317

* The human eye is rather good at detecting motion. For example, the eye can detect motion of a point of light even if the change of angle is smaller than that which can be distinguished in a fixed image. Details of this and similar topics for the other senses are the domain of perception research.

Ref. 11

** The topic of motion perception is full of interesting aspects. An excellent introduction is chapter 6 of the beautiful text by Donald D. Hoffman, *Visual Intelligence – How We Create What We See*, W.W. Norton & Co., 1998. His collection of basic motion illusions can be experienced and explored on the associated aris.ss.uci.edu/cogsci/personnel/hoffman/hoffman.html website.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



TABLE 2 Family tree of the basic physical concepts

motion
the basic type of change

parts	*relations*	*background*
permanent	variable	permanent
bounded	unbounded	extended
shaped	unshaped	measurable

objects	*images*	*states*	*interactions*	*phase space*	*space-time*
impenetrable	penetrable	global	local	composed	simple

The corresponding aspects:

mass	intensity	instant	source	dimension	curvature
size	colour	position	domain	distance	topology
charge	appearance	momentum	strength	volume	distance
spin	disappearance	energy	direction	subspaces	area
etc.	etc.	etc.	etc.	etc.	etc.

world – nature – universe – cosmos
the collection of all parts, relations and backgrounds

Page 1417

tion turns out to be logically and experimentally impossible!* Our walk will lead us to discover the reason for this impossibility and its important consequences. Finally, apart from moving entities and the permanent background, we need a third concept, as shown in Table 2.

> Wisdom is one thing: to understand the thought which steers all things through all things.
> Heraclitus of Ephesus

Ref. 24

Does the world need states?

> Das Feste, das Bestehende und der Gegenstand sind Eins. Der Gegenstand ist das Feste, Bestehende; die Konfiguration ist das Wechselnde, Unbeständige.**
> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 2.027 – 2.0271

* Contrary to what is often read in popular literature, the distinction *is* possible in quantum theory. It becomes impossible only when quantum theory is unified with general relativity.
** 'The fixed, the existent and the object are one. The object is the fixed, the existent; the configuration is the changing, the variable.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



What distinguishes the various patterns in the lower left corners of this text? In everyday life we would say: the *situation* or *configuration* of the involved entities. The situation somehow describes all those aspects that can differ from case to case. It is customary to call the list of all *variable* aspects of a set of objects their *(physical) state of motion*, or simply their *state*.

The situations in the lower left corners differ first of all in *time*. Time is what makes opposites possible: a child is in a house and the same child is outside the house. Time describes and resolves this type of contradiction. But the state not only distinguishes situations in time: the state contains *all* those aspects of a system (i.e., of a group of objects) that set it apart from all *similar* systems. Two objects can have the same mass, shape, colour, composition and be indistinguishable in all other intrinsic properties; but at least they will differ in their position, or their velocity, or their orientation. The state pinpoints the *individuality* of a physical system,* and allows us to distinguish it from exact copies of itself. Therefore, the state also describes the relation of an object or a system with respect to its environment. Or in short: *the state describes all aspects of a system that depend on the observer.* These properties are not boring – just ponder this: does the universe have a state?

Challenge 10 s

Describing nature as a collection of permanent entities and changing states is the starting point of the study of motion. The various aspects of objects and of their states are called *observables*. All these rough, preliminary definitions will be refined step by step in the following. Using the terms just introduced, we can say that *motion is the change of state of objects*.**

States are required for the description of motion. In order to proceed and to achieve a *complete* description of motion, we thus need a complete description of objects and a complete description of their possible states. The first approach, called Galilean physics, consists in specifying our *everyday* environment as precisely as possible.

Galilean physics in six interesting statements

The study of everyday motion, Galilean physics, is already worthwhile in itself: we will uncover many results that are in contrast with our usual experience. For example, if we recall our own past, we all have experienced how important, delightful or unwelcome *surprises* can be. Nevertheless, the study of everyday motion shows that there are *no* surprises in nature. Motion, and thus the world, is *predictable* or *deterministic*.

The main surprise is thus that there are no surprises in nature. In fact, we will uncover six aspects of the predictability of everyday motion:

* A *physical system* is a localized entity of investigation. In the classification of Table 2, the term 'physical system' is (almost) the same as 'object' or 'physical body'. Images are usually not counted as physical systems (though radiation is one). Are holes physical systems?

Challenge 9 s

** The exact separation between those aspects belonging to the object and those belonging to the state depends on the precision of observation. For example, the length of a piece of wood is not permanent; wood shrinks and bends with time, due to processes at the molecular level. To be precise, the length of a piece of wood is not an aspect of the object, but an aspect of its state. Precise observations thus *shift* the distinction between the object and its state; the distinction itself does not disappear – at least not for quite a while.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



1. We know that eyes, cameras and measurement apparatus have a finite resolution. All have a smallest distance they can observe. We know that clocks have a smallest time they can measure. Nevertheless, in everyday life all movements, their states, as well as space and time, are *continuous*.
2. We all observe that people, music and many other things in motion stop moving after a while. The study of motion yields the opposite result: motion never stops. In fact, several aspects of motion do not change, but are *conserved*: energy with mass, momentum and angular momentum are conserved in all examples of motion. No exception to conservation has ever been found. In addition, we will discover that conservation implies that motion and its properties are the same at all places and all times: motion is *universal*.
3. We all know that motion differs from rest. Nevertheless, careful study shows that there is no intrinsic difference between the two. Motion and rest depend on the observer. Motion is *relative*. This is the first step towards understanding the theory of relativity.
4. We all observe that many processes happen only in one direction. For example, spilled milk never returns into the container by itself. Nevertheless, the study of motion will show us that all everyday motion is *reversible*. Physicists call this the invariance of everyday motion under motion reversal (or, sloppily, under time reversal).
5. Most of us find scissors difficult to handle with the left hand, have difficulties to write with the other hand, and have grown with a heart on the left side. Nevertheless, our exploration will show that everyday motion is *mirror-invariant*. Mirror processes are always possible in everyday life.
6. We all are astonished by the many observations that the world offers: colours, shapes, sounds, growth, disasters, happiness, friendship, love. The variation, beauty and complexity of nature is amazing. Our study will uncover that all observations can be summarized in a simple way: all motion happens in a way that *minimize change*. Change can be measured, and nature keeps it to a minimum. In other words, despite all appearance, all motion is *simple*. States evolve by minimizing change.

These six aspects are essential in understanding motion in sport, in music, in animals, in machines and among the stars. The first part of our adventure will be an exploration of such movements and in particular, of the mentioned six key properties: continuity, conservation, reversibility, mirror-invariance, relativity and minimization.

Curiosities and fun challenges about motion*

In contrast to most animals, sedentary creatures, like plants or sea anemones, have no legs and cannot move much; for their self-defence, they developed *poisons*. Examples of such plants are the stinging nettle, the tobacco plant, digitalis, belladonna and poppy; poisons include caffeine, nicotine, and curare. Poisons such as these are at the basis of most medicines. Therefore, most medicines exist essentially because plants have no legs.

* *

* Sections entitled 'curiosities' are collections of topics and problems that allow one to check and to expand the usage of concepts already introduced.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009





FIGURE 12 A block and tackle and a differential pulley

A man climbs a mountain from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. He sleeps on the top and comes down the next day, taking again from 9 am to 1 pm for the descent. Is there a place on the path that he passes at the same time on the two days? Challenge 11 s

* *

Every time a soap bubble bursts, the motion of the surface during the burst is the same, even though it is too fast to be seen by the naked eye. Can you imagine the details? Challenge 12 s

* *

Is the motion of a ghost an example of motion? Challenge 13 s

* *

Can something stop moving? How would you show it? Challenge 14 s

* *

Does a body moving in straight line for ever show that nature is infinite? Challenge 15 s

* *

Can the universe move? Challenge 16 s

* *

To talk about precision with precision, we need to measure precision itself. How would you do that? Challenge 17 s

* *

Would we observe motion if we had no memory? Challenge 18 s

* *

What is the lowest speed you have observed? Is there a lowest speed in nature? Challenge 19 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009





FIGURE 13 What happens?



FIGURE 14 What is the speed of the rollers? Are other roller shapes possible?

* *

Challenge 20 s What is the length of rope one has to pull in order to lift a mass by a height h with a block and tackle with four wheels, as shown in Figure 12?

* *

Challenge 21 s According to legend, Sissa ben Dahir, the Indian inventor of the game of chathurangam or chess, demanded from King Shirham the following reward for his invention: he wanted one grain of wheat for the first square, two for the second, four for the third, eight for the fourth, and so on. How much time would all the wheat fields of the world take to produce the necessary rice?

* *

Challenge 22 s When a burning candle is moved, the flame lags behind the candle. How does the flame behave if the candle is inside a glass, still burning, and the glass is accelerated?

* *

Challenge 23 d A good way to make money is to build motion detectors. A motion detector is a small box with a few wires. The box produces an electrical signal whenever the box moves. What types of motion detectors can you imagine? How cheap can you make such a box? How precise?

* *

Challenge 24 d A perfectly frictionless and spherical ball lies near the edge of a perfectly flat and horizontal table, as shown in Figure 13. What happens? In what time scale?

* *

Challenge 25 s You step into a closed box without windows. The box is moved by outside forces unknown to you. Can you determine how you move from inside the box?

* *

Challenge 26 s When a block is rolled over the floor over a set of cylinders, as shown in Figure 14, how are the speed of the block and that of the cylinders related?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



* *

Ref. 18 Challenge 27 s Do you dislike formulae? If you do, use the following three-minute method to change the situation. It is worth trying it, as it will make you enjoy this book much more. Life is short; as much of it as possible, like reading this text, should be a pleasure.

1. Close your eyes and recall an experience that was *absolutely marvellous*, a situation when you felt excited, curious and positive.
2. Open your eyes for a second or two and look at page 449 – or any other page that contains many formulae.
3. Then close your eyes again and return to your marvellous experience.
4. Repeat the observation of the formulae and the visualization of your memory – steps 2 and 3 – three more times.

Then leave the memory, look around yourself to get back into the here and now, and test yourself. Look again at page 449. How do you feel about formulae now?

* *

Challenge 28 s In the sixteenth century, Niccolò Tartaglia* proposed the following problem. Three young couples want to cross a river. Only a small boat that can carry two people is available. The men are extremely jealous, and would never leave their brides with another man. How many journeys across the river are necessary?

* *

Challenge 29 s Cylinders can be used to roll a flat object over the floor, as shown in Figure 14. The cylinders keep the object plane always at the same distance from the floor. What cross-sections *other* than circular, so-called *curves of constant width*, can a cylinder have to realize the same feat? How many examples can you find? Are objects different than cylinders possible?

Summary on motion

Challenge 30 d Motion is the most fundamental observation in nature. Everyday motion is predictable or deterministic. Predictability is reflected in six aspects of motion: continuity, conservation, reversibility, mirror-invariance, relativity and minimization. Some of these aspects are valid for all motion, and some are valid only for everyday motion. Which ones, and why? We explore this now.

* Niccolò Fontana Tartaglia (1499–1557), important Renaissance mathematician.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 2

FROM MOTION MEASUREMENT TO CONTINUITY

> Physic ist wahrlich das eigentliche Studium des Menschen.*
>
> Georg Christoph Lichtenberg

The simplest description of motion is the one we all, like cats or monkeys, use unconsciously in everyday life: *only one thing can be at a given spot at a given time*. This general description can be separated into three assumptions: matter is *impenetrable* and *moves*, time is made of *instants*, and space is made of *points*. Without these three assumptions (do you agree with them?) it is not possible to define velocity in everyday life. This description of nature is called *Galilean physics*, or sometimes *Newtonian physics*.

Challenge 31 s

Galileo Galilei (1564–1642), Tuscan professor of mathematics, was a founder of modern physics and is famous for advocating the importance of observations as checks of statements about nature. By requiring and performing these checks throughout his life, he was led to continuously increase the accuracy in the description of motion. For example, Galileo studied motion by measuring change of position with a self-constructed stopwatch. His approach changed the speculative description of ancient Greece into the experimental physics of Renaissance Italy.**

The English alchemist, occultist, theologian, physicist and politician Isaac Newton (1643–1727) was one of the first to pursue with vigour the idea that different types of motion have the same properties, and he made important steps in constructing the concepts necessary to demonstrate this idea.***

The explorations by Galileo and his predecessors provided the first clear statements on the properties of speed, space and time.

* 'Physics truly is the proper study of man.' Georg Christoph Lichtenberg (1742–1799) was an important physicist and essayist.

** The best and most informative book on the life of Galileo and his times is by Pietro Redondi (see the section on page 252). Galileo was born in the year the pencil was invented. Before his time, it was impossible to do paper and pencil calculations. For the curious, the www.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de website allows you to read an original manuscript by Galileo.

*** Newton was born a year after Galileo died. Newton's other hobby, as master of the Mint, was to supervise personally the hanging of counterfeiters. About Newton's infatuation with alchemy, see the books by Dobbs. Among others, Newton believed himself to be chosen by god; he took his Latin name, *Isaacus Neuutonus*, and formed the anagram *Jeova sanctus unus*. About Newton and his importance for classical mechanics, see the text by Clifford Truesdell.

Ref. 25

Ref. 26

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 15 Galileo Galilei (1564–1642)

FIGURE 16 Some speed measurement devices: an anemometer, a tachymeter for inline skates, a sport radar gun and a Pitot–Prandtl tube in an aeroplane (© Fachhochschule Koblenz, Silva, Tracer)

What is velocity?

> There is nothing else like it.
>
> Jochen Rindt*

Velocity fascinates. To physicists, not only car races are interesting, but any moving entity is. Therefore they first measure as many examples as possible. A selection is given in Table 3. The units and prefixes used are explained in detail in Appendix C.

Everyday life teaches us a lot about motion: objects can overtake each other, and they can move in different directions. We also observe that velocities can be added or changed smoothly. The precise list of these properties, as given in Table 4, is summarized by mathematicians in a special term; they say that velocities form a *Euclidean vector space*.** More details about this strange term will be given shortly. For now we just note that in describing nature, mathematical concepts offer the most accurate vehicle.

Page 77

When velocity is assumed to be an Euclidean vector, it is called *Galilean* velocity. Velocity is a profound concept. For example, velocity does not need space and time measurements to be defined. Are you able to find a means of measuring velocities without measuring space and time? If so, you probably want to skip to page 401, jumping 2000

Challenge 33 d

* Jochen Rindt (1942–1970), famous Austrian Formula One racing car driver, speaking about speed.

** It is named after Euclid, or Eukleides, the great Greek mathematician who lived in Alexandria around 300 BCE. Euclid wrote a monumental treatise of geometry, the Στοιχεῖα or *Elements*, which is one of the milestones of human thought. The text presents the whole knowledge on geometry of that time. For the first time, Euclid introduces two approaches that are now in common use: all statements are deduced from a small number of basic 'axioms' and for every statement a 'proof' is given. The book, still in print today, has been the reference geometry text for over 2000 years. On the web, it can be found at aleph0.clarku.edu/

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 3 Some measured velocity values

Observation	Velocity
Growth of deep sea manganese crust	80 am/s
Can you find something slower?	Challenge 32 s
Stalagmite growth	0.3 pm/s
Lichen growth	down to 7 pm/s
Typical motion of continents	10 mm/a = 0.3 nm/s
Human growth during childhood, hair growth	4 nm/s
Tree growth	up to 30 nm/s
Electron drift in metal wire	1 µm/s
Sperm motion	60 to 160 µm/s
Speed of light at Sun's centre	0.1 mm/s
Ketchup motion	1 mm/s
Slowest speed of light measured in matter on Earth Ref. 27	0.3 m/s
Speed of snowflakes	0.5 m/s to 1.5 m/s
Signal speed in human nerve cells Ref. 28	0.5 m/s to 120 m/s
Wind speed at 1 Beaufort (light air)	below 1.5 m/s
Speed of rain drops, depending on radius	2 m/s to 8 m/s
Fastest swimming fish, sailfish (*Istiophorus platypterus*)	22 m/s
Speed sailing record (by windsurfer Finian Maynard)	25.1 m/s
Fastest running animal, cheetah (*Acinonyx jubatus*)	30 m/s
Wind speed at 12 Beaufort (hurricane)	above 33 m/s
Speed of air in throat when sneezing	42 m/s
Fastest throw: a cricket ball thrown with baseball technique while running	50 m/s
Freely falling human, depending on clothing	50 to 90 m/s
Fastest bird, diving *Falco peregrinus*	60 m/s
Fastest badminton serve	70 m/s
Average speed of oxygen molecule in air at room temperature	280 m/s
Speed of sound in dry air at sea level and standard temperature	330 m/s
Cracking whip's end	750 m/s
Speed of a rifle bullet	1 km/s
Speed of crack propagation in breaking silicon	5 km/s
Highest macroscopic speed achieved by man – the *Voyager* satellite	14 km/s
Speed of Earth through universe	370 km/s
Average speed (and peak speed) of lightning tip	600 km/s (50 Mm/s)
Highest macroscopic speed measured in our galaxy Ref. 29	$0.97 \cdot 10^8$ m/s
Speed of electrons inside a colour TV	$1 \cdot 10^8$ m/s
Speed of radio messages in space	299 792 458 m/s
Highest ever measured group velocity of light	$10 \cdot 10^8$ m/s
Speed of light spot from a light tower when passing over the Moon	$2 \cdot 10^9$ m/s
Highest proper velocity ever achieved for electrons by man	$7 \cdot 10^{13}$ m/s
Highest possible velocity for a light spot or shadow	no limit

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



TABLE 4 Properties of everyday – or Galilean – velocity

Velocities can	Physical property	Mathematical name	Definition
Be distinguished	distinguishability	element of set	Page 822
Change gradually	continuum	real vector space	Page 77, Page 896
Point somewhere	direction	vector space, dimensionality	Page 77
Be compared	measurability	metricity	Page 887
Be added	additivity	vector space	Page 77
Have defined angles	direction	Euclidean vector space	Page 77
Exceed any limit	infinity	unboundedness	Page 823

years of enquiries. If you cannot do so, consider this: whenever we measure a quantity we assume that everybody is able to do so, and that everybody will get the same result. In other words, we define *measurement* as a comparison with a standard. We thus implicitly assume that such a standard exists, i.e., that an example of a 'perfect' velocity can be found. Historically, the study of motion did not investigate this question first, because for many centuries nobody could find such a standard velocity. You are thus in good company.

Some researchers have specialized in the study of the lowest velocities found in nature: they are called geologists. Do not miss the opportunity to walk across a landscape while listening to one of them. Ref. 30

Velocity is not always an easy subject. Physicists like to say, provokingly, that what cannot be measured does not exist. Can one's own velocity in empty interstellar space be measured? Challenge 34 s

How is velocity measured in everyday life? Animals and people estimate their velocity in two ways: by estimating the frequency of their own movements, such as their steps, or by using their eyes, ears, sense of touch or sense of vibration to deduce how their own position changes with respect to the environment. But several animals have additional capabilities: certain snakes can determine speeds with their infrared-sensing organs, others with their magnetic field sensing organs. Still other animals emit sounds that create echoes in order to measure speeds to high precision. The same range of solutions is used by technical devices.

Velocity is of interest to both engineers and evolution. In general, self-propelled systems are faster the larger they are. As an example, Figure 17 shows how this applies to the cruise speed of flying things. In general, cruise speed scales with the sixth root of the weight, as shown by the trend line drawn in the graph. (Can you find out why?) By the way, similar *allometric scaling* relations hold for many other properties of moving systems, as we will see later on. Challenge 35 d

Velocity is a profound subject for an additional reason: we will discover that all seven properties of Table 4 are only approximate; *none* is actually correct. Improved experiments will uncover exceptions for every property of Galilean velocity. The failure of the last three properties of Table 4 will lead us to special and general relativity, the failure of

~djoyce/java/elements/elements.html.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009





FIGURE 17 How wing load and sea-level cruise speed scales with weight in flying objects, compared with the general trend line (after a graph © Henk Tennekes)

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 5 Speed measurement devices in biological and engineered systems

Measurement	Device	Range
Own running speed in insects, mammals and humans	leg beat frequency measured with internal clock	0 to 33 m/s
Own car speed	tachymeter attached to wheels	0 to 150 m/s
Predators and hunters measuring prey speed	vision system	0 to 30 m/s
Police measuring car speed	radar or laser gun	0 to 90 m/s
Bat measuring own and prey speed at night	doppler sonar	0 to 20 m/s
Sliding door measuring speed of approaching people	doppler radar	0 to 3 m/s
Own swimming speed in fish and humans	friction and deformation of skin	0 to 30 m/s
Own swimming speed in dolphins and ships	sonar to sea floor	0 to 20 m/s
Diving speed in fish, animals, divers and submarines	pressure change	0 to 5 m/s
Water predators and fishing boats measuring prey speed	sonar	0 to 20 m/s
Own speed relative to Earth in insects	often none (grasshoppers)	n.a.
Own speed relative to Earth in birds	visual system	0 to 60 m/s
Own speed relative to Earth in aeroplanes or rockets	radio goniometry, radar	0 to 8000 m/s
Own speed relative to air in insects and birds	filiform hair deflection, feather deflection	0 to 60 m/s
Own speed relative to air in aeroplanes	Pitot–Prandtl tube	0 to 340 m/s
Wind speed measurement in meteorological stations	thermal, rotating or ultrasound anemometers	0 to 80 m/s
Swallows measuring prey speed	visual system	0 to 20 m/s
Bats measuring prey speed	sonar	0 to 20 m/s
Pilots measuring target speed	radar	0 to 1000 m/s
Any motion on Earth	Global Positioning System, Galileo, Glonass	0 to 100 m/s
Motion of stars	optical Doppler effect	0 to 1000 km/s
Motion of star jets	optical Doppler effect	0 to 200 Mm/s

the middle two to quantum theory and the failure of the first two properties to the unified description of nature. But for now, we'll stick with Galilean velocity, and continue with another Galilean concept derived from it: time.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009





FIGURE 18 A typical path followed by a stone thrown through the air – a parabola – with photographs (blurred and stroboscopic) of a table tennis ball rebounding on a table and a stroboscopic photograph of a water droplet rebounding on a strongly hydrophobic surface (© Andrew Davidhazy, Max Groenendijk)

> Without the concepts *place*, *void* and *time*, change cannot be. [...] It is therefore clear [...] that their investigation has to be carried out, by studying each of them separately.
>
> Aristotle* *Physics*, Book III, part 1.

What is time?

> Time does not exist in itself, but only through the perceived objects, from which the concepts of past, of present and of future ensue.
>
> Lucretius,** *De rerum natura*, lib. 1, v. 460 ss.

In their first years of life, children spend a lot of time throwing objects around. The term 'object' is a Latin word meaning 'that which has been thrown in front.' Developmental psychology has shown experimentally that from this very experience children extract the concepts of time and space. Adult physicists do the same when studying motion at university.

Ref. 21

When we throw a stone through the air, we can define a *sequence* of observations. Our memory and our senses give us this ability. The sense of hearing registers the various sounds during the rise, the fall and the landing of the stone. Our eyes track the location of the stone from one point to the next. All observations have their place in a sequence, with some observations preceding them, some observations simultaneous to them, and still others succeeding them. We say that observations are perceived to happen at various *instants* and we call the sequence of all instants *time*.

* Aristotle (384/3–322), Greek philosopher and scientist.

** Titus Lucretius Carus (*c.* 95 to *c.* 55 BCE), Roman scholar and poet.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 6 Selected time measurements

Observation	Time
Shortest measurable time	10^{-44} s
Shortest time ever measured	10^{-23} s
Time for light to cross a typical atom	0.1 to 10 as
Shortest laser light pulse produced so far	200 as
Period of caesium ground state hyperfine transition	108.782 775 707 78 ps
Beat of wings of fruit fly	1 ms
Period of pulsar (rotating neutron star) PSR 1913+16	0.059 029 995 271(2) s
Human 'instant'	20 ms
Shortest lifetime of living being	0.3 d
Average length of day 400 million years ago	79 200 s
Average length of day today	86 400.002(1) s
From birth to your 1000 million seconds anniversary	31.7 a
Age of oldest living tree	4600 a
Use of human language	$2 \cdot 10^5$ a
Age of Himalayas	35 to 55 $\cdot 10^6$ a
Age of oldest rocks, found in Isua Belt, Greenland and in Porpoise Cove, Hudson Bay	$3.8 \cdot 10^9$ a
Age of Earth	$4.6 \cdot 10^9$ a
Age of oldest stars	13.7 Ga
Age of most protons in your body	13.7 Ga
Lifetime of tantalum nucleus ^{180m}Ta	10^{15} a
Lifetime of bismuth ^{209}Bi nucleus	$1.9(2) \cdot 10^{19}$ a

An observation that is considered the smallest part of a sequence, i.e., not itself a sequence, is called an *event*. Events are central to the definition of time; in particular, starting or stopping a stopwatch are events. (But do events really exist? Keep this question in the back of your head as we move on.)

Challenge 36 s

Sequential phenomena have an additional property known as stretch, extension or duration. Some measured values are given in Table 6.* *Duration* expresses the idea that sequences *take* time. We say that a sequence takes time to express that other sequences can take place in parallel with it.

How exactly is the concept of time, including sequence and duration, deduced from observations? Many people have looked into this question: astronomers, physicists, watchmakers, psychologists and philosophers. All find that *time is deduced by comparing motions*. Children, beginning at a very young age, develop the concept of 'time' from the comparison of motions in their surroundings. Grown-ups take as a standard the motion of the Sun and call the resulting type of time *local time*. From the Moon they deduce a *lunar calendar*. If they take a particular village clock on a European island they call it the

Ref. 21

* A year is abbreviated a (Latin 'annus').

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

universal time coordinate (UTC), once known as 'Greenwich mean time.'* Astronomers use the movements of the stars and call the result *ephemeris time* (or one of its successors). An observer who uses his personal watch calls the reading his *proper time*; it is often used in the theory of relativity.

Not every movement is a good standard for time. In the year 2000 an Earth rotation did not take 86 400 seconds any more, as it did in the year 1900, but 86 400.002 seconds. Can you deduce in which year your birthday will have shifted by a whole day from the time predicted with 86 400 seconds?

Page 917
Challenge 38 s

All methods for the definition of time are thus based on comparisons of motions. In order to make the concept as precise and as useful as possible, a *standard* reference motion is chosen, and with it a standard sequence and a standard duration is defined. The device that performs this task is called a *clock*. We can thus answer the question of the section title: *time is what we read from a clock*. Note that all definitions of time used in the various branches of physics are equivalent to this one; no 'deeper' or more fundamental definition is possible.** Note that the word 'moment' is indeed derived from the word 'movement'. Language follows physics in this case. Astonishingly, the definition of time just given is final; it will never be changed, not even at the top of Motion Mountain. This is surprising at first sight, because many books have been written on the nature of time. Instead, they should investigate the nature of motion! But this is the aim of our walk anyhow. We are thus set to discover all the secrets of time as a side result of our adventure. Every clock reminds us that in order to understand time, we need to understand motion.

A *clock* is thus a moving system whose position can be read. Of course, a *precise* clock is a system moving as regularly as possible, with as little outside disturbance as possible. Is there a perfect clock in nature? Do clocks exist at all? We will continue to study these questions throughout this work and eventually reach a surprising conclusion. At this point, however, we state a simple intermediate result: since clocks do exist, somehow there is in nature an intrinsic, natural and *ideal* way to measure time. Can you see it?

Challenge 39 s

Time is not only an aspect of observations, it is also a facet of personal experience. Even in our innermost private life, in our thoughts, feelings and dreams, we experience sequences and durations. Children learn to relate this internal experience of time with external observations, and to make use of the sequential property of events in their actions. Studies of the origin of psychological time show that it coincides – apart from its lack of accuracy – with clock time.*** Every living human necessarily uses in his daily life the concept of time as a combination of sequence and duration; this fact has been checked in numerous investigations. For example, the term 'when' exists in all human languages.

Ref. 32

* Official UTC is used to determine the phase of the power grid, phone companies' bit streams and the signal to the GPS system. The latter is used by many navigation systems around the world, especially in ships, aeroplanes and lorries. For more information, see the www.gpsworld.com website. The time-keeping infrastructure is also important for other parts of the modern economy. Can you spot the most important ones?

Challenge 37 s

** The oldest clocks are sundials. The science of making them is called *gnomonics*. An excellent and complete introduction into this somewhat strange world can be found at the www.sundials.co.uk website.

*** The brain contains numerous clocks. The most precise clock for short time intervals, the internal interval timer, is more accurate than often imagined, especially when trained. For time periods between a few tenths of a second, as necessary for music, and a few minutes, humans can achieve accuracies of a few per cent.

Page 1134
Ref. 31



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 7 Properties of Galilean time

Instants of time	Physical property	Mathematical name	Definition
Can be distinguished	distinguishability	element of set	Page 822
Can be put in order	sequence	order	Page 896
Define duration	measurability	metricity	Page 887
Can have vanishing duration	continuity	denseness, completeness	Page 896
Allow durations to be added	additivity	metricity	Page 887
Don't harbour surprises	translation invariance	homogeneity	Page 186
Don't end	infinity	unboundedness	Page 823
Are equal for all observers	absoluteness	uniqueness	

Time is a concept *necessary* to distinguish between observations. In any sequence, we observe that events succeed each other smoothly, apparently without end. In this context, 'smoothly' means that observations that are not too distant tend to be not too different. Yet between two instants, as close as we can observe them, there is always room for other events. Durations, or *time intervals*, measured by different people with different clocks agree in everyday life; moreover, all observers agree on the order of a sequence of events. Time is thus unique in everyday life.

The mentioned properties of everyday time, listed in Table 7, correspond to the precise version of our everyday experience of time. It is called *Galilean time;* all the properties can be expressed simultaneously by describing time with the help of real numbers. In fact, real numbers have been constructed by mathematicians to have exactly the same properties as Galilean time, as explained in the chapter on the brain. Every instant of time can be described by a real number, often abbreviated t, and the duration of a sequence of events is given by the difference between the values for the final and the starting event.

Page 831

When Galileo studied motion in the seventeenth century, there were as yet no stopwatches. He thus had to build one himself, in order to measure times in the range between a fraction and a few seconds. Can you imagine how he did it?

Challenge 40 s

We will have quite some fun with Galilean time in this part of our adventure. However, hundreds of years of close scrutiny have shown that *every single* property of time just listed is approximate, and none is strictly correct. This story is told in the rest of our adventure.

Clocks

A *clock* is a moving system whose position can be read. There are many types of clocks: stopwatches, twelve-hour clocks, sundials, lunar clocks, seasonal clocks, etc. Almost all clock types are also found in plants and animals, as shown in Table 8.

Ref. 33

Interestingly, there is a strict rule in the animal kingdom: large clocks go slow. How this happens, is shown in Figure 20, another example of an *allometric scaling 'law'*.

Ref. 34

Clock makers are experts in producing motion that is as regular as possible. We will discover some of their tricks below. We will also explore, later on, the fundamental limits for the precision of clocks.

Page 145

Page 1136

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009





FIGURE 19 Different types of clocks: a high-tech sundial (size c. 30 cm), a naval pocket chronometer (size c. 6 cm), and a caesium atomic clock (size c. 4 m) (© Carlo Heller at www.heliosuhren.de, anonymous, INMS)

Why do clocks go clockwise?

Challenge 41 s

"What time is it at the North Pole now?"

All rotational motions in our society, such as athletic races, horse, bicycle or ice skating races, turn anticlockwise. Likewise, every supermarket leads its guests anticlockwise through the hall. Mathematicians call this the positive rotation sense. Why? Most people are right-handed, and the right hand has more freedom at the outside of a circle. Therefore thousands of years ago chariot races in stadia went anticlockwise. As a result, all

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 8 Examples of biological rhythms and clocks

Living being	Oscillating system	Period
Sand hopper (*Talitrus saltator*)	knows in which direction to flee from the position of the Sun or Moon	circadian
Human (*Homo sapiens*)	gamma waves in the brain	0.023 to 0.03 s
	alpha waves in the brain	0.08 to 0.13 s
	heart beat	0.3 to 1.5 s
	delta waves in the brain	0.3 to 10 s
	blood circulation	30 s
	cellular circahoral rhythms	1 to 2 ks
	rapid-eye-movement sleep period	5.4 ks
	nasal cycle	4 to 14 ks
	growth hormone cycle	11 ks
	suprachiasmatic nuclei (SCN), circadian hormone concentration, temperature, etc.; leads to jet lag	90 ks
	monthly period	2.4(4) Ms
	built-in aging	3.2(3) Gs
Common fly (*Musca domestica*)	wing beat	30 ms
Fruit fly (*Drosophila melanogaster*)	wing beat for courting	34 ms
Most insects (e.g. wasps, fruit flies)	winter approach detection (diapause) by length of day measurement; triggers metabolism changes	yearly
Algae (*Acetabularia*)	Adenosinetriphosphate (ATP) concentration	
Moulds (e.g. *Neurospora crassa*)	conidia formation	circadian
Many flowering plants	flower opening and closing	circadian
Tobacco plant	flower opening clock; triggered by length of days, discovered in 1920 by Garner and Allard	annual
Arabidopsis	circumnutation	circadian
	growth	a few hours
Telegraph plant (*Desmodium gyrans*)	side leaf rotation	200 s
Forsythia europaea, *F. suspensa*, *F. viridissima*, *F. spectabilis*	Flower petal oscillation, discovered by Van Gooch in 2002	5.1 ks

races still do so to this day. That is why runners move anticlockwise. For the same reason, helical stairs in castles are built in such a way that defending right-handers, usually from above, have that hand on the outside.

On the other hand, the clock imitates the shadow of sundials; obviously, this is true on the northern hemisphere only, and only for sundials on the ground, which were the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009





FIGURE 20 How biological rhythms scale with size in mammals (© Enrique Morgado)

most common ones. (The old trick to determine south by pointing the hour hand of a horizontal watch to the Sun and halving the angle between it and the direction of 12 o'clock does not work on the southern hemisphere.) So every clock implicitly continues to state on which hemisphere it was invented. In addition, it also tells us that sundials on walls came in use much later than those on the floor.

Does time flow?

> Wir können keinen Vorgang mit dem 'Ablauf der Zeit' vergleichen – diesen gibt es nicht –, sondern nur mit einem anderen Vorgang (etwa dem Gang des Chronometers).*
>
> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 6.3611

The expression 'the flow of time' is often used to convey that in nature change follows after change, in a steady and continuous manner. But though the hands of a clock 'flow', time itself does not. Time is a concept introduced specially to describe the flow of events around us; it does not itself flow, it *describes* flow. Time does not advance. Time is neither linear nor cyclic. The idea that time flows is as hindering to understanding nature as is

* 'We cannot compare any process with 'the passage of time' – there is no such thing – but only with another process (say, with the working of a chronometer).'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Page 717 the idea that mirrors exchange right and left.

The misleading use of the expression 'flow of time', propagated first by some flawed Ref. 35 Greek thinkers and then again by Newton, continues. Aristotle (384/3–322 BCE), careful to think logically, pointed out its misconception, and many did so after him. Nevertheless, expressions such as 'time reversal', the 'irreversibility of time', and the much-abused Challenge 42 e 'time's arrow' are still common. Just read a popular science magazine chosen at random. The fact is: time cannot be reversed, only motion can, or more precisely, only velocities of objects; time has no arrow, only motion has; it is not the flow of time that humans are unable to stop, but the motion of all the objects in nature. Incredibly, there are even books Ref. 36 written by respected physicists that study different types of 'time's arrows' and compare them with each other. Predictably, no tangible or new result is extracted. Time does not flow.

In the same manner, colloquial expressions such as 'the start (or end) of time' should be avoided. A motion expert translates them straight away into 'the start (or end) of motion'.

What is space?

> The introduction of numbers as coordinates [...] is an act of violence [...].
>
> Hermann Weyl, *Philosophie der Mathematik und Naturwissenschaft*.*

Whenever we distinguish two objects from each other, such as two stars, we first of all distinguish their positions. We distinguish positions with our senses of sight, touch, hearing and proprioperception. Position is therefore an important aspect of the physical state of an object. A position is taken by only one object at a time. Positions are limited. The set of all available positions, called *(physical) space*, acts as both a container and a background.

Closely related to space and position is *size*, the set of positions an objects occupies. Small objects occupy only subsets of the positions occupied by large ones. We will discuss size shortly.

How do we deduce space from observations? During childhood, humans (and most higher animals) learn to bring together the various perceptions of space, namely the visual, the tactile, the auditory, the kinaesthetic, the vestibular etc., into one coherent set of experiences and description. The result of this learning process is a certain concept of space in the brain. Indeed, the question 'where?' can be asked and answered in all languages of the world. Being more precise, adults derive space from distance measurements. The concepts of length, area, volume, angle and solid angle are all deduced with their help. Geometers, surveyors, architects, astronomers, carpet salesmen and producers of metre sticks base their trade on distance measurements. Space is a concept formed to summarize all the distance relations between objects for a precise description of observations.

Metre sticks work well only if they are straight. But when humans lived in the jungle, there were no straight objects around them. No straight rulers, no straight tools, noth-

* Hermann Weyl (1885–1955) was one of the most important mathematicians of his time, as well as an important theoretical physicist. He was one of the last universalists in both fields, a contributor to quantum theory and relativity, father of the term 'gauge' theory, and author of many popular texts.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009







FIGURE 21 Two proofs of the three-dimensionality of space: the vestibular labyrinth in the inner ear of mammals (here a human) and a knot (© Northwestern University)

Challenge 43 s ing. Today, a cityscape is essentially a collection of straight lines. Can you describe how humans achieved this?

Once humans came out of the jungle with their newly built metre sticks, they collected a wealth of results. The main ones are listed in Table 9; they are easily confirmed by personal experience. Objects can take positions in an apparently *continuous* manner: there indeed are more positions than can be counted.* Size is captured by defining the distance between various positions, called *length*, or by using the field of view an object takes when touched, called its *surface*. Length and surface can be measured with the help of a metre stick. Selected measurement results are given in Table 10. The length of objects is independent of the person measuring it, of the position of the objects and of their orientation. In daily life the sum of angles in any triangle is equal to two right angles. There are no limits in space.

Experience shows us that space has three dimensions; we can define sequences of positions in precisely three independent ways. Indeed, the inner ear of (practically) all vertebrates has three semicircular canals that sense the body's acceleration in the three dimensions of space, as shown in Figure 21.** Similarly, each human eye is moved by
Challenge 44 s three pairs of muscles. (Why three?) Another proof that space has three dimensions is provided by shoelaces: if space had more than three dimensions, shoelaces would not be useful, because knots exist only in three-dimensional space. But why does space have three dimensions? This is one of the most difficult question of physics; it will be answered only in the very last part of our walk.

Challenge 45 s It is often said that thinking in four dimensions is impossible. That is wrong. Just try. For example, can you confirm that in four dimensions knots are impossible?

Like time intervals, length intervals can be described most precisely with the help of *real numbers*. In order to simplify communication, standard *units* are used, so that everybody uses the same numbers for the same length. Units allow us to explore the general properties of *Galilean space* experimentally: space, the container of objects, is continuous, three-dimensional, isotropic, homogeneous, infinite, Euclidean and unique or 'absolute'. In mathematics, a structure or mathematical concept with all the properties just mentioned is called a three-dimensional *Euclidean space*. Its elements, *(mathematical) points*,

* For a definition of uncountability, see page 825.

** Note that saying that space has three dimensions *implies* that space is continuous; the Dutch mathematician and philosopher Luitzen Brouwer (b. 1881 Overschie, d. 1966 Blaricum) showed that dimensionality is only a useful concept for continuous sets.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



TABLE 9 Properties of Galilean space

POINTS	PHYSICAL PROPERTY	MATHEMATICAL NAME	DEFINITION
Can be distinguished	distinguishability	element of set	Page 822
Can be lined up if on one line	sequence	order	Page 896
Can form shapes	shape	topology	Page 895
Lie along three independent directions	possibility of knots	3-dimensionality	Page 886
Can have vanishing distance	continuity	denseness, completeness	Page 896
Define distances	measurability	metricity	Page 887
Allow adding translations	additivity	metricity	Page 887
Define angles	scalar product	Euclidean space	Page 77
Don't harbour surprises	translation invariance	homogeneity	
Can beat any limit	infinity	unboundedness	Page 823
Defined for all observers	absoluteness	uniqueness	Page 56

FIGURE 22 René Descartes (1596–1650)

are described by three real parameters. They are usually written as

$$(x, y, z) \tag{1}$$

and are called *coordinates*. They specify and order the location of a point in space. (For the precise definition of Euclidean spaces, see page 77.)

What is described here in just half a page actually took 2000 years to be worked out, mainly because the concepts of 'real number' and 'coordinate' had to be discovered first. The first person to describe points of space in this way was the famous mathematician and philosopher René Descartes*, after whom the coordinates of expression (1) are named *Cartesian*.

Like time, space is a *necessary* concept to describe the world. Indeed, space is automatically introduced when we describe situations with many objects. For example, when

* René Descartes or Cartesius (b. 1596 La Haye, d. 1650 Stockholm), French mathematician and philosopher, author of the famous statement 'je pense, donc je suis', which he translated into 'cogito ergo sum' – I think therefore I am. In his view this is the only statement one can be sure of.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 10 Some measured distance values

Observation	Distance
Galaxy Compton wavelength	10^{-85} m (calculated only)
Planck length, the shortest measurable length	10^{-32} m
Proton diameter	1 fm
Electron Compton wavelength	2.426 310 215(18) pm
Hydrogen atom size	30 pm
Smallest eardrum oscillation detectable by human ear	50 pm
Size of small bacterium	0.2 µm
Wavelength of visible light	0.4 to 0.8 µm
Point: diameter of smallest object visible with naked eye	20 µm
Diameter of human hair (thin to thick)	30 to 80 µm
Total length of DNA in each human cell	2 m
Largest living thing, the fungus *Armillaria ostoyae*	3 km
Highest human-built structure, the Warsaw radio mast	647 m
Largest spider webs in Mexico	*c.* 5 km
Length of Earth's Equator	40 075 014.8(6) m
Total length of human nerve cells	$8 \cdot 10^5$ km
Average distance to Sun	149 597 870 691(30) m
Light year	9.5 Pm
Distance to typical star at night	10 Em
Size of galaxy	1 Zm
Distance to Andromeda galaxy	28 Zm
Most distant visible object	125 Ym

many spheres lie on a billiard table, we cannot avoid using space to describe the relations between them. There is no way to avoid using spatial concepts when talking about nature.

Even though we need space to talk about nature, it is still interesting to ask why this is possible. For example, since length measurement methods do exist, there must be a *natural* or *ideal* way to measure distances, sizes and straightness. Can you find it? Challenge 46 s

As in the case of time, each of the properties of space just listed has to be checked. And again, careful observations will show that each property is an approximation. In simpler and more drastic words, *all* of them are wrong. This confirms Weyl's statement at the beginning of this section. In fact, his statement about the violence connected with the introduction of numbers is told by every forest in the world, and of course also by the one at the foot of Motion Mountain. The rest of our adventure will show this.

> Μέτρον ἄριστον.*
>
> Cleobulus

* 'Measure is the best (thing).' Cleobulus (Κλεοβουλος) of Lindos, (*c.* 620–550 BCE) was another of the proverbial seven sages.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 23 Three mechanical (a vernier caliper, a micrometer screw, a moustache) and three optical (the eyes, a laser meter, a light curtain) length and distance measurement devices (© www.medien-werkstatt.de, Naples zoo, Leica Geosystems and Keyence)

Are space and time absolute or relative?

In everyday life, the concepts of Galilean space and time include two opposing aspects; the contrast has coloured every discussion for several centuries. On the one hand, space and time express something invariant and permanent; they both act like big containers for all the objects and events found in nature. Seen this way, space and time have an existence of their own. In this sense one can say that they are fundamental or *absolute*. On the other hand, space and time are tools of description that allow us to talk about rela-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 11 Length measurement devices in biological and engineered systems

Measurement	Device	Range
Humans		
Measurement of body shape, e.g. finger distance, eye position, teeth distance	muscle sensors	0.3 mm to 2 m
Measurement of object distance	stereoscopic vision	1 to 100 m
Measurement of object distance	sound echo effect	0.1 to 1000 m
Animals		
Measurement of walking distance by desert ants	step counter	up to 100 m
Measurement of flight distance by honey bees	eye	up to 3 km
Measurement of swimming distance by sharks	magnetic field map	up to 1000 km
Measurement of prey distance by snakes	infrared sensor	up to 2 m
Measurement of prey distance by bats, dolphins, and hump whales	sonar	up to 100 m
Measurement of prey distance by raptors	vision	0.1 to 1000 m
Machines		
Measurement of object distance by laser	light reflection	0.1 m to 400 Mm
Measurement of object distance by radar	radio echo	0.1 to 50 km
Measurement of object length	interferometer	0.5 µm to 50 km
Measurement of star, galaxy or quasar distance	intensity decay	up to 125 Ym
Measurement of particle size	accelerator	down to 10^{-18} m

tions between objects. In this view, they do not have any meaning when separated from objects, and only result from the relations between objects; they are derived, relational or *relative*. Which of these viewpoints do you prefer? The results of physics have alternately favoured one viewpoint or the other. We will repeat this alternation throughout our adventure, until we find the solution. And obviously, it will turn out to be a third option.

Challenge 47 e

Ref. 37

Size – why area exists, but volume does not

A central aspect of objects is their size. As a small child, under school age, every human learns how to use the properties of size and space in their actions. As adults seeking precision, the definition of *distance* as the difference between coordinates allows us to define *length* in a reliable way. It took hundreds of years to discover that this is *not* the case. Several investigations in physics and mathematics led to complications.

The physical issues started with an astonishingly simple question asked by Lewis

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009





FIGURE 24 A curvimeter or odometer (photograph © Frank Müller)



FIGURE 25 A fractal: a self-similar curve of *infinite* length (far right), and its construction

Richardson:* How long is the western coastline of Britain?

Following the coastline on a map using an odometer, a device shown in Figure 24, Richardson found that the length l of the coastline depends on the scale s (say 1 : 10 000 or 1 : 500 000) of the map used:

$$l = l_0 \, s^{0.25} \tag{2}$$

(Richardson found other numbers for other coasts.) The number l_0 is the length at scale 1 : 1. The main result is that the larger the map, the longer the coastline. What would happen if the scale of the map were increased even beyond the size of the original? The length would increase beyond all bounds. Can a coastline really have *infinite* length? Yes, it can. In fact, mathematicians have described many such curves; they are called *fractals*. An infinite number of them exist, and Figure 25 shows one example.** Can you construct another? Challenge 48 e

Length has other strange properties. The Italian mathematician Giuseppe Vitali was the first to discover that it is possible to cut a line segment of length 1 into pieces that can be reassembled – merely by shifting them in the direction of the segment – into a line segment of length 2. Are you able to find such a division using the hint that it is only possible using infinitely many pieces? Challenge 49 d

To sum up, length is well defined for lines that are straight or nicely curved, but not for intricate lines, or for lines made of infinitely many pieces. We therefore avoid fractals and other strangely shaped curves in the following, and we take special care when we talk about infinitely small segments. These are the central assumptions in the first two parts of this adventure, and we should never forget them. We will come back to these

* Lewis Fray Richardson (1881–1953), English physicist and psychologist.

** Most of these curves are *self-similar*, i.e., they follow scaling 'laws' similar to the above-mentioned. The term 'fractal' is due to the Polish mathematician Benoît Mandelbrot and refers to a strange property: in a certain sense, they have a non-integral number D of dimensions, despite being one-dimensional by construction. Mandelbrot saw that the non-integer dimension was related to the exponent e of Richardson by $D = 1 + e$, thus giving $D = 1.25$ in the example above. Ref. 38

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 26 A polyhedron with one of its dihedral angles (© Luca Gastaldi)

assumptions in the last part of our adventure.

In fact, all these problems pale when compared with the following problem. Commonly, area and volume are defined using length. You think that it is easy? You're wrong, as well as being a victim of prejudices spread by schools around the world. To define area and volume with precision, their definitions must have two properties: the values must be *additive*, i.e., for finite and infinite sets of objects, the total area and volume have to be the sum of the areas and volumes of each element of the set; and they must be *rigid*, i.e., if one cuts an area or a volume into pieces and then rearranges the pieces, the value remains the same. Are such definitions possible? In other words, do such concepts of volume and area exist?

For areas in a plane, one proceeds in the following standard way: one defines the area A of a rectangle of sides a and b as $A = ab$; since any polygon can be rearranged into a rectangle with a finite number of straight cuts, one can then define an area value for all polygons. Subsequently, one can define area for nicely curved shapes as the limit of the sum of infinitely many polygons. This method is called *integration*; it is introduced in detail in the section on physical action.

Challenge 50 s

Page 195

However, integration does not allow us to define area for arbitrarily bounded regions. (Can you imagine such a region?) For a complete definition, more sophisticated tools are needed. They were discovered in 1923 by the famous mathematician Stefan Banach.* He proved that one can indeed define an area for any set of points whatsoever, even if the border is not nicely curved but extremely complicated, such as the fractal curve previously mentioned. Today this generalized concept of area, technically a 'finitely additive isometrically invariant measure,' is called a *Banach measure* in his honour. Mathematicians sum up this discussion by saying that since in two dimensions there is a Banach measure, there is a way to define the concept of area – an additive and rigid measure – for any set of points whatsoever.**

Challenge 51 s

What is the situation in *three* dimensions, i.e., for volume? We can start in the same way as for area, by defining the volume V of a rectangular polyhedron with sides a, b,

* Stefan Banach (Krakow, 1892–Lvov, 1945), important Polish mathematician.

** Actually, this is true only for sets on the plane. For curved surfaces, such as the surface of a sphere, there are complications that will not be discussed here. In addition, the problems mentioned in the definition of length of fractals also reappear for area if the surface to be measured is not flat. A typical example is the area of the human lung: depending on the level of details examined, one finds area values from a few up to over a hundred square metres.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



c as $V = abc$. But then we encounter a first problem: a general polyhedron cannot be cut into a cube by straight cuts! The limitation was discovered in 1900 and 1902 by Max Dehn.* He found that the possibility depends on the values of the edge angles, or dihedral angles, as the mathematicians call them. If one ascribes to every edge of a general polyhedron a number given by its length l times a special function $g(\alpha)$ of its dihedral angle α, then Dehn found that the sum of all the numbers for all the edges of a solid does not change under dissection, provided that the function fulfils $g(\alpha + \beta) = g(\alpha) + g(\beta)$ and $g(\pi) = 0$. An example of such a strange function g is the one assigning the value 0 to any rational multiple of π and the value 1 to a basis set of irrational multiples of π. The values for all other dihedral angles of the polyhedron can then be constructed by combination of rational multiples of these basis angles. Using this function, you may then Challenge 52 s deduce for yourself that a cube cannot be dissected into a regular tetrahedron because their respective Dehn invariants are different.**

Despite the problems with Dehn invariants, one *can* define a rigid and additive concept of volume for polyhedra, since for all polyhedra and, in general, for all 'nicely curved' shapes, one can again use integration for the definition of their volume.

Now let us consider general shapes and general cuts in three dimensions, not just the 'nice' ones mentioned so far. We then stumble on the famous *Banach–Tarski theorem* (or Ref. 39 paradox). In 1924, Stefan Banach and Alfred Tarski*** proved that it is possible to cut one sphere into five pieces that can be recombined to give two spheres, each the size of the original. This counter-intuitive result is the Banach–Tarski theorem. Even worse, another version of the theorem states: take any two sets not extending to infinity and containing a solid sphere each; then it is always possible to dissect one into the other with a *finite* number of cuts. In particular it is possible to dissect a pea into the Earth, or vice versa. Size does not count!**** Volume is thus not a useful concept at all.

The Banach–Tarski theorem raises two questions: first, can the result be applied to gold or bread? That would solve many problems. Second, can it be applied to empty Challenge 53 s space? In other words, are matter and empty space continuous? Both topics will be explored later in our walk; each issue will have its own, special consequences. For the moment, we eliminate this troubling issue by restricting our interest to smoothly curved shapes (and cutting knives). With this restriction, volumes of matter and of empty space do behave nicely: they are additive and rigid, and show no paradoxes.***** Indeed, the cuts required for the Banach–Tarski paradox are not smooth; it is not possible to perform them with an everyday knife, as they require (infinitely many) infinitely sharp bends performed with an infinitely sharp knife. Such a knife does not exist. Nevertheless, we keep

* Max Dehn (1878–1952), German mathematician, student of David Hilbert.

** This is also told in the beautiful book by M. Aigler & G. M. Ziegler, *Proofs from the Book*, Springer Verlag, 1999. The title is due to the famous habit of the great mathematician Paul Erdős to imagine that all beautiful mathematical proofs can be assembled in the 'book of proofs'.

*** Alfred Tarski (b. 1902 Warsaw, d. 1983 Berkeley), Polish mathematician.

**** The proof of the result does not need much mathematics; it is explained beautifully by Ian Stewart in Paradox of the spheres, *New Scientist*, 14 January 1995, pp. 28–31. The proof is based on the axiom of choice, Page 823 which is presented later on. The Banach–Tarski paradox also exists in four dimensions, as it does in any Ref. 40 higher dimension. More mathematical detail can be found in the beautiful book by Stan Wagon.

***** Mathematicians say that a so-called *Lebesgue measure* is sufficient in physics. This countably additive isometrically invariant measure provides the most general way to define a volume.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 27 Straight lines found in nature: cerussite (picture width approx. 3 mm, © Stephan Wolfsried) and selenite (picture width approx. 15 m, © Arch. Speleoresearch & Films/La Venta at www.laventa.it and www.naica.com.mx)

in the back of our mind that the size of an object or of a piece of empty space is a tricky quantity – and that we need to be careful whenever we talk about it.

What is straight?

When you see a solid object with a straight edge, it is a 99 %-safe bet that it is man-made. Of course, there are exceptions, as shown in Figure 27.* The largest crystals ever found are
Ref. 42 18 m in length. But in general, the contrast between the objects seen in a city – buildings, furniture, cars, electricity poles, boxes, books – and the objects seen in a forest – trees, plants, stones, clouds – is evident: in the forest nothing is straight or flat, in the city most objects are. How is it possible for humans to produce straight objects while there are almost none to be found in nature?

Page 358 Any forest teaches us the origin of straightness; it presents tall tree trunks and rays of daylight entering from above through the leaves. For this reason we call a line *straight* if it touches either a plumb-line or a light ray along its whole length. In fact, the two
Challenge 54 s definitions are equivalent. Can you confirm this? Can you find another definition? Obviously, we call a surface *flat* if for any chosen orientation and position the surface touches a plumb-line or a light ray along its whole extension.

In summary, the concept of straightness – and thus also of flatness – is defined with the help of bodies or radiation. In fact, all spatial concepts, like all temporal concepts, require motion for their definition.

A hollow Earth?

Space and straightness pose subtle challenges. Some strange people maintain that all humans live on the *inside* of a sphere; they (usually) call this the *hollow Earth theory*. They claim that the Moon, the Sun and the stars are all near the centre of the hollow sphere. They also explain that light follows curved paths in the sky and that when conventional physicists talk about a distance r from the centre of the Earth, the real hollow Earth dis-
Challenge 55 s tance is $r_{\text{he}} = R^2_{\text{Earth}}/r$. Can you show that this model is wrong? Roman Sexl** used to

* Another famous exception, unrelated to atomic structures, is the well-known Irish geological formation
Page 312 called the Giant's Causeway. Other candidates that might come to mind, such as certain bacteria which have
Ref. 41 (almost) square or (almost) triangular shapes are not counter-examples, as the shapes are only approximate.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 28 A photograph of the Earth – seen from the direction of the Sun (NASA)

ask this question to his students and fellow physicists. The answer is simple: if you think you have an argument to show that this view is wrong, you are mistaken! There is *no way* of showing that such a view is wrong. It is possible to explain the horizon, the appearance of day and night, as well as the satellite photographs of the round Earth, such as Figure 28. To explain what happened during a flight to the Moon is also fun. A coherent hollow Earth view is fully *equivalent* to the usual picture of an infinitely extended space. We will come back to this problem in the section on general relativity.

Challenge 56 e

Page 623

Curiosities and fun challenges about everyday space and time

How does one measure the speed of a gun bullet with a stop watch, in a space of $1\,m^3$, without electronics? Hint: the same method can also be used to measure the speed of light.

Challenge 57 s

* *

What is faster: an arrow or a motorbike?

Challenge 58 s

* *

How can you make a hole in a postcard that allows you to step through it?

Challenge 59 s

** Roman Sexl, (1939–1986), important Austrian physicist, author of several influential textbooks on gravitation and relativity.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 29 A model illustrating the hollow Earth theory, showing how day and night appear (© Helmut Diehl)

FIGURE 30 When is a conical glass half full?

* *

Challenge 60 s What fraction of the height of a conical glass, shown in Figure 30, must be filled to make the glass half full?

* *

Everybody knows the puzzle about the bear: A hunter leaves his home, walks 10 km to the South and 10 km to the West, shoots a bear, walks 10 km to the North, and is back home. What colour is the bear? You probably know the answer straight away. Now comes the harder question, useful for winning money in bets. The house could be on several

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 31 Can the snail reach the horse once it starts galloping away?

additional spots on the Earth; where are these less obvious spots from which a man can have *exactly* the same trip (forget the bear now) that was just described and be at home again? Challenge 61 s

* *

Imagine a rubber band that is attached to a wall on one end and is attached to a horse at the other end. On the rubber band, near the wall, there is a snail. Both the snail and the horse start moving, with typical speeds – with the rubber being infinitely stretchable. Can the snail reach the horse? Challenge 62 s

* *

For a mathematician, 1 km is the same as 1000 m. For a physicist the two are different! Indeed, for a physicist, 1 km is a measurement lying between 0.5 km and 1.5 km, whereas 1000 m is a measurement between 999.5 m and 1000.5 m. So be careful when you write down measurement values. The professional way is to write, for example, 1000(8) m to mean 1000 ± 8 m, i.e., a value between 992 and 1008 m.

* *

Imagine a black spot on a white surface. What is the colour of the line separating the spot from the background? This question is often called Peirce's puzzle. Challenge 63 s

* *

Also bread is an (approximate) fractal, though an irregular one. The fractal dimension of bread is around 2.7. Try to measure it! Challenge 64 s

* *

How do you find the centre of a beer mat using paper and pencil? Challenge 65 e

* *

How often in 24 hours do the hour and minute hands of a clock lie on top of each other? For clocks that also have a second hand, how often do all three hands lie on top of each other? Challenge 66 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



* *

How many times in twelve hours can the two hands of a clock be *exchanged* with the
Challenge 67 s result that the new situation shows a *valid* time? What happens for clocks that also have a third hand for seconds?

* *

Challenge 68 s How many minutes does the Earth rotate in one minute?

* *

What is the highest speed achieved by throwing (with and without a racket)? What was
Challenge 69 s the projectile used?

* *

A rope is put around the Earth, on the Equator, as tightly as possible. The rope is then
Challenge 70 s lengthened by 1 m. Can a mouse slip under the rope?

* *

Jack was rowing his boat on a river. When he was under a bridge, he dropped a ball into the river. Jack continued to row in the same direction for 10 minutes after he dropped the ball. He then turned around and rowed back. When he reached the ball, the ball had
Challenge 71 s floated 600 m from the bridge. How fast was the river flowing?

* *

Adam and Bert are brothers. Adam is 18 years old. Bert is twice as old as at the time when
Challenge 72 e Adam was the age that Bert is now. How old is Bert?

* *

'Where am I?' is a common question; 'When am I?' is never asked, not even in other
Challenge 73 s languages. Why?

* *

Challenge 74 s Is there a smallest time interval in nature? A smallest distance?

* *

Given that you know what straightness is, how would you characterize or define the cur-
Challenge 75 s vature of a curved line using numbers? And that of a surface?

* *

Challenge 76 s What is the speed of your eyelid?

* *

The surface area of the human body is about 400 m^2. Can you say where this large num-
Challenge 77 s ber comes from?

* *

How does a *vernier* work? It is called *nonius* in other languages. The first name is de-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009





FIGURE 32 A 9-to-10 vernier/nonius/clavius and a 19-to-20 version (in fact, a 38-to-40 version) in a caliper (© www.medien-werkstatt.de)



FIGURE 33 Leaving a parking space

rived from a French military engineer* who did not invent it, the second is a play of words on the Latinized name of the Portuguese inventor of a more elaborate device** and the Latin word for 'nine'. In fact, the device as we know it today – shown in Figure 32 – was designed around 1600 by Christophonius Clavius,*** the same astronomer whose studies were the basis of the Gregorian calendar reform of 1582. Are you able to design a vernier/nonius/clavius that, instead of increasing the precision tenfold, does so by an arbitrary factor? Is there a limit to the attainable precision? Challenge 78 s

* *

Page 58 Fractals in three dimensions bear many surprises. Let us generalize Figure 25 to three dimensions. Take a regular tetrahedron; then glue on every one of its triangular faces a smaller regular tetrahedron, so that the surface of the body is again made up of many equal regular triangles. Repeat the process, gluing still smaller tetrahedrons to these new (more numerous) triangular surfaces. What is the shape of the final fractal, after an infinite number of steps? Challenge 79 s

* *

Motoring poses many mathematical problems. A central one is the following parking issue: what is the shortest distance d from the car in front necessary to leave a parking spot without using reverse gear? (Assume that you know the geometry of your car, as shown in Figure 33, and its smallest outer turning radius R, which is known for every car.) Next question: what is the smallest gap required when you are allowed to manoeuvre back and forward as often as you like? Now a problem to which no solution seems to be available in the literature: How does the gap depend on the number, n, of times you use reverse gear? (The author had offered 50 euro for the first well-explained solution; the solution by Daniel Hawkins is now found in the appendix.) Challenge 80 s Challenge 81 s Challenge 82 s

* Pierre Vernier (1580–1637), French military officer interested in cartography.
** Pedro Nuñes or Peter Nonnius (1502–1578), Portuguese mathematician and cartographer.
*** Christophonius Clavius or Schlüssel (1537–1612), Bavarian astronomer, one of the main astronomers of his time.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



TABLE 12 The exponential notation: how to write small and large numbers

Number	Exponential notation	Number	Exponential notation
1	10^0		
0.1	10^{-1}	10	10^1
0.2	$2 \cdot 10^{-1}$	20	$2 \cdot 10^1$
0.0324	$3.24 \cdot 10^{-2}$	32.4	$3.24 \cdot 10^1$
0.01	10^{-2}	100	10^2
0.001	10^{-3}	1000	10^3
0.000 1	10^{-4}	10 000	10^4
0.000 056	$5.6 \cdot 10^{-5}$	56 000	$5.6 \cdot 10^4$
0.000 01	10^{-5} etc.	100 000	10^5 etc.

* *

Scientists use a special way to write large and small numbers, explained in Table 12.

* *

Ref. 43 In 1996 the smallest experimentally probed distance was 10^{-19} m, achieved between quarks at Fermilab. (To savour the distance value, write it down without the exponent.)
Challenge 83 s What does this measurement mean for the continuity of space?

* *

Zeno, the Greek philosopher, discussed in detail what happens to a moving object at a given instant of time. To discuss with him, you decide to build the fastest possible shutter for a photographic camera that you can imagine. You have all the money you want. What
Challenge 84 s is the shortest shutter time you would achieve?

* *

Can you prove Pythagoras' theorem by geometrical means alone, without using
Challenge 85 s coordinates? (There are more than 30 possibilities.)

* *

Page 62 Why are most planets and moons, including ours, (almost) spherical (see, for example,
Challenge 86 s Figure 28)?

* *

A rubber band connects the tips of the two hands of a clock. What is the path followed
Challenge 87 s by the mid-point of the band?

* *

There are two important quantities connected to angles. As shown in Figure 34, what is usually called a *(plane) angle* is defined as the ratio between the lengths of the arc and the radius. A right angle is $\pi/2$ *radian* (or $\pi/2$ rad) or 90°.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 34 The definition of plane and solid angles



FIGURE 35 How the apparent size of the Moon and the Sun changes during a day

The *solid angle* is the ratio between area and the square of the radius. An eighth of a sphere is $\pi/2$ *steradian* or $\pi/2$ sr. (Mathematicians, of course, would simply leave out the steradian unit.) As a result, a small solid angle shaped like a cone and the angle of the cone tip are *different*. Can you find the relationship? Challenge 88 s

* *

The definition of angle helps to determine the size of a firework display. Measure the time T, in seconds, between the moment that you see the rocket explode in the sky and the moment you hear the explosion, measure the (plane) angle α – pronounced 'alpha' – of the ball formed by the firework with your hand. The diameter D is

$$D \approx \frac{6\,\mathrm{m}}{s\,^\circ} T \alpha \,. \tag{3}$$

Why? For more about fireworks, see the cc.oulu.fi/~kempmp website. By the way, the angular distance between the knuckles of an extended fist are about 3°, 2° and 3°, the size of an extended hand 20°. Can you determine the other angles related to your hand? Challenge 89 e Challenge 90 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 36 How the size of the Moon actually changes during its orbit (© Anthony Ayiomamitis)

* *

Using angles, the *sine*, *cosine*, *tangent*, *cotangent*, *secant* and *cosecant* can be defined. Look them up in your trigonometry text from high school. Can you confirm that $\sin 15° = (\sqrt{6} - \sqrt{2})/4$, $\sin 18° = (-1 + \sqrt{5})/4$, $\sin 36° = \sqrt{10 - 2\sqrt{5}}/4$, $\sin 54° = (1 + \sqrt{5})/4$ and that $\sin 72° = \sqrt{10 + 2\sqrt{5}}/4$? Can you show also that

Challenge 91 e

$$\frac{\sin x}{x} = \cos\frac{x}{2}\cos\frac{x}{4}\cos\frac{x}{8}\ldots \tag{4}$$

is correct?

* *

Measuring angular size with the eye only is tricky. For example, can you say whether the Moon is larger or smaller than the nail of your thumb at the end of your extended arm? Angular size is not an intuitive quantity; it requires measurement instruments.

Challenge 92 e

A famous example, shown in Figure 35, illustrates the difficulty of estimating angles. Both the Sun and the Moon seem larger when they are on the horizon. In ancient times, Ptolemy explained this so-called *Moon illusion* by an unconscious apparent distance change induced by the human brain. Indeed, the Moon illusion disappears when you look at the Moon through your legs. In fact, the Moon is even *further away* from the observer when it is just above the horizon, and thus its image is *smaller* than it was a few hours earlier, when it was high in the sky. Can you confirm this?

Challenge 93 s

The Moon's angualr size changes even more due to another effect: the orbit of the Moon round the Earth is elliptical. An example of the consequence is shown in Figure 36.

* *

Galileo also made mistakes. In his famous book, the *Dialogues*, he says that the curve formed by a thin chain hanging between two nails is a parabola, i.e., the curve defined by $y = x^2$. That is not correct. What is the correct curve? You can observe the shape

Challenge 94 d

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 37 A famous puzzle: how are the four radii related?



FIGURE 38 Two ladder puzzles: a moderately difficult (left) and a difficult one (right)

(approximately) in the shape of suspension bridges.

* *

Draw three circles, of different sizes, that touch each other, as shown in Figure 37. Now draw a fourth circle in the space between, touching the outer three. What simple relation do the inverse radii of the four circles obey? Challenge 95 s

* *

Ref. 44 There are many puzzles about ladders. Two are illustrated in Figure 38. If a 5 m ladder is put against a wall in such a way that it just touches a box with 1 m height and depth, how high does the ladder reach? Challenge 96 s If two ladders are put against two facing walls, and if the lengths of the ladders and the height of the crossing point are known, how distant are the walls? Challenge 97 d

* *

With two rulers, you can add and subtract numbers by lying them side by side. Are you able to design rulers that allow you to multiply and divide in the same manner? Challenge 98 s

* *

How many days would a year have if the Earth turned the other way with the same rotation frequency? Challenge 99 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009





FIGURE 39 What is the area ABC, given the other three areas and three right angles at O?

FIGURE 40 Anticrepuscular rays - where is the Sun in this situation? (© Peggy Peterson)

* *

Take a tetrahedron OABC whose triangular sides OAB, OBC and OAC are rectangular in O. In other words, the edges OA, OB and OC are all perpendicular to each other. In the tetrahedron, the areas of the triangles OAB, OBC and OAC are respectively 8, 4 and 1.
Challenge 100 s What is the area of triangle ABC?

* *

Challenge 101 s The Sun is hidden in the spectacular situation shown in Figure 40 Where is it?

* *

A slightly different, but equally fascinating situation – and useful for getting used to perspective drawing – appears when you have a lighthouse in your back. Can you draw the
Challenge 102 ny rays you see in the sky up to the horizon?

* *

Two cylinders of equal radius intersect at a right angle. What is the value of the intersection volume? (First make a drawing.)
Challenge 103 s

* *

Two sides of a hollow cube with side length 1 dm are removed, to yield a tunnel with square opening. Is it true that a cube with edge length 1.06 dm can be made to pass
Challenge 104 s through the hollow cube with side length 1 dm?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

Ref. 45 Could a two-dimensional universe exist? Alexander Dewdney imagined such a universe in great detail and wrote a well-known book about it. He describes houses, the transportation system, digestion, reproduction and much more. Can you explain why a two-
Challenge 105 d dimensional universe is impossible?

* *

Challenge 106 s Some researchers are investigating whether time could be two-dimensional. Can this be?

* *

Other researchers are investigating whether space could have more than three dimen-
Challenge 107 ny sions. Can this be?

Summary about everyday space and time

Motion defines speed, time and length. Observations of everyday life and precision experiments are conveniently and precisely described by modelling velocity as a Euclidean vector, space as a three-dimensional Euclidean space, and time as a one-dimensional real line. Modelling velocity, time and space as continuous quantities is precise and convenient. However, this common model cannot be checked. For example, no experiments can check distances larger than 10^{25} m or smaller than 10^{-25} m; the model is likely to be incorrect there. We will find out later on that this is indeed the case.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 3

HOW TO DESCRIBE MOTION – KINEMATICS

> La filosofia è scritta in questo grandissimo libro che continuamente ci sta aperto innanzi agli occhi (io dico l'universo) ... Egli è scritto in lingua matematica.*
>
> Galileo Galilei, *Il saggiatore* VI.

Experiments show that the properties of Galilean time and space are extracted from the environment by most higher animals and by young children. Among others, this has been tested for cats, dogs, rats, mice, ants, fish and many other species. They all find the same results.

First of all, *motion is change of position with time*. This description is illustrated by rapidly flipping the lower left corners of this book, starting at page 190. Each page simulates an instant of time, and the only change that takes place during motion is in the position of the object, represented by the dark spot. The other variations from one picture to the next, which are due to the imperfections of printing techniques, can be taken to simulate the inevitable measurement errors.

Calling 'motion' the change of position with time is *neither* an explanation *nor* a definition, since both the concepts of time and position are deduced from motion itself. It is only a *description* of motion. Still, the description is useful, because it allows for high precision, as we will find out by exploring gravitation and electrodynamics. After all, precision is our guiding principle during this promenade. Therefore the detailed description of changes in position has a special name: it is called *kinematics*.

The idea of change of positions implies that the object can be *followed* during its motion. This is not obvious; in the section on quantum theory we fill find examples where this is impossible. But in everyday life, objects can always be tracked. The set of all positions taken by an object over time forms ist *path* or *trajectory*. The origin of this concept is evident when one watches fireworks or again the flip film in the lower left corners starting at page 190.

Ref. 46

In everyday life, animals and humans agree on the Euclidean properties of velocity, space and time. In particular, this implies that a trajectory can be described by specifying three numbers, three *coordinates* (x, y, z) – one for each dimension – as continuous functions of time t. (Functions are defined in detail on page 826.) This is usually written as $\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{x}(t) = (x(t), y(t), z(t))$. For example, already Galileo found, using stopwatch

* Science is written in this huge book that is continuously open before our eyes (I mean the universe) ... It is written in mathematical language.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009





FIGURE 41 Two ways to test that the time of free fall does not depend on horizontal velocity

and ruler, that the height z of any thrown or falling stone changes as

$$z(t) = z_0 + v_0\,(t - t_0) - \tfrac{1}{2} g\,(t - t_0)^2 \tag{5}$$

where t_0 is the time the fall starts, z_0 is the initial height, v_0 is the initial velocity in the vertical direction and $g = 9.8\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$ is a constant that is found to be the same, within about one part in 300, for all falling bodies on all points of the surface of the Earth. Where do the value $9.8\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$ and its slight variations come from? A preliminary answer will be given shortly, but the complete elucidation will occupy us during the larger part of this hike.

Ref. 47

Equation (5) allows us to determine the depth of a well, given the time a stone takes to reach its bottom. The equation also gives the speed v with which one hits the ground after jumping from a tree, namely $v = \sqrt{2gh}$. A height of 3 m yields a velocity of 27 km/h. The velocity is thus proportional only to the square root of the height. Does this mean that one's strong fear of falling results from an overestimation of its actual effects?

Challenge 108 s

Challenge 109 s

Galileo was the first to state an important result about free fall: the motions in the horizontal and vertical directions are *independent*. He showed that the time it takes for a cannon ball that is shot exactly horizontally to fall is *independent* of the strength of the gunpowder, as shown in Figure 41. Many great thinkers did not agree with this statement even after his death: in 1658 the Academia del Cimento even organized an experiment to check this assertion, by comparing the flying cannon ball with one that simply fell vertically. Can you imagine how they checked the simultaneity? Figure 41 also shows how you can check this at home. In this experiment, whatever the spring load of the cannon, the two bodies will always collide in mid-air (if the table is high enough), thus proving the assertion.

Ref. 48

Challenge 110 s

In other words, a flying canon ball is not accelerated in the horizontal direction. Its horizontal motion is simply unchanging. By extending the description of equation (5)

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009





FIGURE 42 Various types of graphs describing the same path of a thrown stone

with the two expressions for the horizontal coordinates x and y, namely

$$x(t) = x_0 + v_{x0}(t - t_0)$$
$$y(t) = y_0 + v_{y0}(t - t_0)\,, \tag{6}$$

a *complete* description for the path followed by thrown stones results. A path of this shape is called a *parabola*; it is shown in Figures 18, 41 and 42. (A parabolic shape is also used for light reflectors inside pocket lamps or car headlights. Can you show why?)

Page 45
Challenge 111 s
Ref. 49

Physicists enjoy generalizing the idea of a path. As Figure 42 shows, a path is a trace left in a diagram by a moving object. Depending on what diagram is used, these paths have different names. Hodographs are used in weather forecasting. Space-time diagrams are useful to make the theory of relativity accessible. The *configuration space* is spanned by the coordinates of all particles of a system. For many particles, it is has a high number of dimensions. It plays an important role in self-organization. The difference between chaos and order can be described as a difference in the properties of paths in configuration space. The phase space diagram is also called *state space diagram*. It plays an essential role in thermodynamics.

Throwing, jumping and shooting

The kinematic description of motion is useful for answering a whole range of questions.

* *

What is the upper limit for the long jump? The running speed world record in 1997 was 12 m/s ≈ 43 km/h by Ben Johnson, and the women's record was 11 m/s ≈ 40 km/h. However, long jumpers never run much faster than about 9.5 m/s. How much extra jump

Ref. 50

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 43 Three superimposed images of a frass pellet shot away by a caterpillar inside a rolled-up leaf (© Stanley Caveney)

distance could they achieve if they could run full speed? How could they achieve that? In addition, long jumpers take off at angles of about 20°, as they are not able to achieve a higher angle at the speed they are running. How much would they gain if they could achieve 45°? (Is 45° the optimal angle?)

Ref. 51

Challenge 112 s

* *

How can the speed of falling rain be measured using an umbrella? The answer is important: the same method can also be used to measure the speed of light, as we will find out later. (Can you guess how?)

Challenge 113 s

Page 403

* *

When a dancer jumps in the air, how many times can it rotate around its vertical axis before arriving back on earth?

Challenge 114 ny

* *

Numerous species of moth and butterfly caterpillars shoot away their frass – to put it more crudely: their shit – so that its smell does not help predators to locate them. Stanley Caveney and his team took photographs of this process. Figure 43 shows a caterpillar (yellow) of the skipper *Calpodes ethlius* inside a rolled up green leaf caught in the act. Given that the record distance observed is 1.5 m (though by another species, *Epargyreus clarus*), what is the ejection speed? How do caterpillars achieve it?

Ref. 52

Challenge 115 s

* *

What is the horizontal distance one can reach by throwing a stone, given the speed and the angle from the horizontal at which it is thrown?

Challenge 116 s

* *

What is the maximum numbers of balls that could be juggled at the same time?

Challenge 117 s

* *

Is it true that rain drops would kill if it weren't for the air resistance of the atmosphere? What about hail?

Challenge 118 s

* *

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009





FIGURE 44 The height achieved by jumping animals

Challenge 119 s Are bullets, fired into the air from a gun, dangerous when they fall back down?

* *

Challenge 120 s Police finds a dead human body at the bottom of cliff with a height of 30 m, at a distance of 12 m from the cliff. Was it suicide or murder?

* *

Challenge 121 s Most animals, regardless of their size, achieve jumping heights of at most 2 m, as shown in Figure 44. The explanation of this fact takes only two lines. Can you find it?

The last two issues arise because equation (5) does not hold in all cases. For example, leaves or potato crisps do not follow it. As Galileo already knew, this is a consequence of air resistance; we will discuss it shortly. Because of air resistance, the path of a stone is not always a parabola.

Challenge 122 s In fact, there are other situations where the path of a falling stone is not a parabola. Can you find one?

Enjoying vectors

Physical quantities with a defined direction, such as speed, are described with three numbers, or three components, and are called *vectors*. Learning to calculate with such multi-component quantities is an important ability for many sciences. Here is a summary.

Vectors can be pictured by small arrows. Note that vectors do not have specified points at which they start: two arrows with same direction and the same length are the *same* vector, even if they start at different points in space. Since vectors behave like arrows, they can be added and they can be multiplied by numbers. For example, stretching an arrow $\boldsymbol{a} = (a_x, a_y, a_z)$ by a number c corresponds, in component notation, to the vector $c\boldsymbol{a} = (ca_x, ca_y, ca_z)$.

In precise, mathematical language, a vector is an element of a set, called *vector space*, in which the following properties hold for all vectors $\boldsymbol{a}$ and $\boldsymbol{b}$ and for all numbers c and d:

$$c(\boldsymbol{a} + \boldsymbol{b}) = c\boldsymbol{a} + c\boldsymbol{b} \quad , \quad (c + d)\boldsymbol{a} = c\boldsymbol{a} + d\boldsymbol{a} \quad , \quad (cd)\boldsymbol{a} = c(d\boldsymbol{a}) \quad \text{and} \quad 1\boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{a} \; . \tag{7}$$

Examples of vector spaces are the set of all *positions* of an object, or the set of all its

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 45 The derivative in a point as the limit of secants

Challenge 123 s possible velocities. Does the set of all rotations form a vector space?

All vector spaces allow the definition of a unique *null vector* and of one *negative vector* Challenge 124 e for each vector.

In most vector spaces of importance in science the concept of *length* (specifying the 'magnitude') can be introduced. This is done via an intermediate step, namely the introduction of the scalar product of two vectors. The *scalar product* between two vectors $\boldsymbol{a}$ and $\boldsymbol{b}$ is a number that satisfies

$$\boldsymbol{aa} \geqslant 0\,,\ \boldsymbol{ab} = \boldsymbol{ba}\,,\ (\boldsymbol{a}+\boldsymbol{a}')\boldsymbol{b} = \boldsymbol{ab}+\boldsymbol{a}'\boldsymbol{b}\,,\ \boldsymbol{a}(\boldsymbol{b}+\boldsymbol{b}') = \boldsymbol{ab}+\boldsymbol{ab}' \text{ and } (c\boldsymbol{a})\boldsymbol{b} = \boldsymbol{a}(c\boldsymbol{b}) = c(\boldsymbol{ab})\,. \tag{8}$$

This definition of a scalar product is not unique; however, there is a *standard* scalar product. In Cartesian coordinate notation, the standard scalar product is given by

$$\boldsymbol{ab} = a_x b_x + a_y b_y + a_z b_z\,. \tag{9}$$

If the scalar product of two vectors vanishes the two vectors are *orthogonal*, at a right Challenge 125 e angle to each other. (Show it!)

The *length* or *norm* of a vector can then be defined as the square root of the scalar product of a vector with itself: $a = \sqrt{\boldsymbol{aa}}$. Often, and also in this text, lengths are written in italic letters, whereas vectors are written in bold letters. A vector space with a scalar product is called an *Euclidean* vector space.

The scalar product is also useful for specifying directions. Indeed, the scalar product between two vectors encodes the angle between them. Can you deduce this important Challenge 126 s relation?

What is rest? What is velocity?

In the Galilean description of nature, motion and rest are opposites. In other words, a body is at rest when its position, i.e., its coordinates, do not change with time. In other words, (Galilean) *rest* is defined as

$$\boldsymbol{x}(t) = \text{const}\,. \tag{10}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 46 Gottfried Leibniz (1646–1716)

We recall that $\boldsymbol{x}(t)$ is the abbreviation for the three coordinates $(x(t), y(t), z(t))$. Later we will see that this definition of rest, contrary to first impressions, is not much use and will have to be expanded. Nevertheless, any definition of rest implies that non-resting objects can be distinguished by comparing the rapidity of their displacement. Thus we can define the *velocity* $\boldsymbol{v}$ of an object as the change of its position $\boldsymbol{x}$ with time t. This is usually written as

$$\boldsymbol{v} = \frac{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}}{\mathrm{d}t} \,. \tag{11}$$

In this expression, valid for each coordinate separately, $\mathrm{d}/\mathrm{d}t$ means 'change with time'. We can thus say that velocity is the *derivative* of position with respect to time. The *speed* v is the name given to the magnitude of the velocity $\boldsymbol{v}$. Derivatives are written as fractions in order to remind the reader that they are derived from the idea of slope. The expression

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}s}{\mathrm{d}t} \quad \text{is meant as an abbreviation of} \quad \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \frac{\Delta s}{\Delta t} \,, \tag{12}$$

a shorthand for saying that the *derivative at a point* is the limit of the secant slopes in the neighbourhood of the point, as shown in Figure 45. This definition implies the working rules

Challenge 127 e

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}(s+r)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{\mathrm{d}s}{\mathrm{d}t} + \frac{\mathrm{d}r}{\mathrm{d}t} \quad , \quad \frac{\mathrm{d}(cs)}{\mathrm{d}t} = c\frac{\mathrm{d}s}{\mathrm{d}t} \quad , \quad \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\frac{\mathrm{d}s}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{\mathrm{d}^2 s}{\mathrm{d}t^2} \quad , \quad \frac{\mathrm{d}(sr)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{\mathrm{d}s}{\mathrm{d}t}r + s\frac{\mathrm{d}r}{\mathrm{d}t} \,, \tag{13}$$

c being any number. This is all one ever needs to know about derivatives. Quantities such as $\mathrm{d}t$ and $\mathrm{d}s$, sometimes useful by themselves, are called *differentials*. These concepts are due to Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz.* Derivatives lie at the basis of all calculations based on the continuity of space and time. Leibniz was the person who made it possible to describe and use velocity in physical formulae and, in particular, to use the idea of velocity at a given point in time or space for calculations.

The definition of velocity assumes that it makes sense to take the limit $\Delta t \to 0$. In other words, it is assumed that infinitely small time intervals do exist in nature. The definition

* Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (b. 1646 Leipzig, d. 1716 Hannover), Saxon lawyer, physicist, mathematician, philosopher, diplomat and historian. He was one of the great minds of mankind; he invented the differential calculus (before Newton) and published many influential and successful books in the various fields he explored, among them *De arte combinatoria*, *Hypothesis physica nova*, *Discours de métaphysique*, *Nouveaux essais sur l'entendement humain*, the *Théodicée* and the *Monadologia*.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

of velocity with derivatives is possible only because both space and time are described by sets which are *continuous*, or in mathematical language, *connected and complete*. In the rest of our walk we shall not forget that from the beginning of classical physics, *infinities* are present in its description of nature. The infinitely small is part of our definition of velocity. Indeed, differential calculus can be defined as the study of infinity and its uses. We thus discover that the appearance of infinity does not automatically render a description impossible or imprecise. In order to remain precise, physicists use only the smallest two of the various possible types of infinities. Their precise definition and an overview of other types are introduced in an upcoming chapter.

Page 825

The appearance of infinity in the usual description of motion was first criticized in his famous ironical arguments by Zeno of Elea (around 445 BCE), a disciple of Parmenides. In his so-called third argument, Zeno explains that since at every instant a given object occupies a part of space corresponding to its size, the notion of velocity at a given instant makes no sense; he provokingly concludes that therefore motion does not exist. Nowadays we would not call this an argument against the *existence* of motion, but against its usual *description*, in particular against the use of infinitely divisible space and time. (Do you agree?) Nevertheless, the description criticized by Zeno actually works quite well in everyday life. The reason is simple but deep: in daily life, changes are indeed continuous.

Ref. 53

Challenge 128 e

Large changes in nature are made up of many small changes. This property of nature is not obvious. For example, we note that we have tacitly assumed that the path of an object is not a fractal or some other badly behaved entity. In everyday life this is correct; in other domains of nature it is not. The doubts of Zeno will be partly rehabilitated later in our walk, and increasingly so the more we proceed. The rehabilitation is only partial, as the solution will be different from that which he envisaged; on the other hand, the doubts about the idea of 'velocity at a point' will turn out to be well-founded. For the moment though, we have no choice: we continue with the basic assumption that in nature changes happen smoothly.

Page 1401

Why is velocity necessary as a concept? Aiming for precision in the description of motion, we need to find the complete list of aspects necessary to specify the state of an object. The concept of velocity is obviously on this list.

Acceleration

Continuing along the same line, we call *acceleration* $\boldsymbol{a}$ of a body the change of velocity $\boldsymbol{v}$ with time, or

$$\boldsymbol{a} = \frac{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{v}}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{\mathrm{d}^2\boldsymbol{x}}{\mathrm{d}t^2} \,. \tag{14}$$

Acceleration is what we feel when the Earth trembles, an aeroplane takes off, or a bicycle goes round a corner. More examples are given in Table 13. Like velocity, acceleration has both a magnitude and a direction, properties indicated by the use of **bold** letters for their abbreviations. In short, acceleration, like velocity, is a vector quantity.

Acceleration is felt. The body is deformed and the sensors in our semicircular canals in the ear feel it. Higher accelerations can have stronger effects. For example, when accelerating a sitting person in the direction of the head at two or three times the value of usual gravitational acceleration, eyes stop working and the sight is greyed out, because

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 13 Some measured acceleration values

Observation	Acceleration
What is the lowest you can find?	Challenge 129 s
Back-acceleration of the galaxy M82 by its ejected jet	10 fm/s^2
Acceleration of a young star by an ejected jet	10 pm/s^2
Acceleration of the Sun in its orbit around the Milky Way	0.2 nm/s^2
Unexplained deceleration of the Pioneer satellites	0.8 nm/s^2
Centrifugal acceleration at Equator due to Earth's rotation	33 mm/s^2
Electron acceleration in household electricity wire due to alternating current	50 mm/s^2
Acceleration of fast underground train	1.3 m/s^2
Gravitational acceleration on the Moon	1.6 m/s^2
Gravitational acceleration on the Earth's surface, depending on location	9.8 ± 0.1 m/s^2
Standard gravitational acceleration	9.806 65 m/s^2
Highest acceleration for a car or motorbike with engine-driven wheels	15 m/s^2
Space rockets at take-off	20 to 90 m/s^2
Acceleration of cheetah	32 m/s^2
Gravitational acceleration on Jupiter's surface	240 m/s^2
Acceleration of thrown stone	*c.* 120 m/s^2
Acceleration that triggers air bags in cars	360 m/s^2
Fastest leg-powered acceleration (by the froghopper, *Philaenus spumarius*, an insect)	4 km/s^2
Tennis ball against wall	0.1 Mm/s^2
Bullet acceleration in rifle	5 Mm/s^2
Fastest centrifuges	0.1 Gm/s^2
Acceleration of protons in large accelerator	90 Tm/s^2
Acceleration of protons inside nucleus	10^{31} m/s^2
Highest possible acceleration in nature	10^{52} m/s^2

the blood cannot reach the eye any more. Between 3 and 5g of continuous acceleration, or 7 to 9g of short time acceleration, consciousness is lost, because the brain does not receive enough blood, and blood may leak out of the feet or lower legs. High acceleration in the direction of the feet of a sitting person can lead to haemorrhagic strokes in the brain. The people most at risk are jet pilots; they have special clothes that send compressed air onto the pilot's bodies to avoid blood accumulating in the wrong places.

In a usual car, or on a motorbike, we can *feel* being accelerated. (These accelerations are below 1g and are therefore harmless.) Can you think of a situation where one is accelerated but does *not* feel it? Challenge 130 s

Higher derivatives than acceleration can also be defined in the same manner. They add little to the description of nature, because – as we will show shortly – neither these higher derivatives nor even acceleration itself are useful for the description of the state Challenge 131 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 14 Some acceleration sensors

Measurement	Sensor	Range
Direction of gravity in plants (roots, trunk, branches, leaves)	statoliths in cells	0 to 10 m/s^2
Direction and value of accelerations in mammals	the membranes in each semicircular canal, and the utricule and saccule in the inner ear	0 to 20 m/s^2
Direction and value of acceleration in modern step counters for hikers	piezoelectric sensors	0 to 20 m/s^2
Direction and value of acceleration in car crashes	airbag sensor using piezoelectric ceramics	0 to 2000 m/s^2



FIGURE 47 Three accelerometers: a one-axis piezoelectric airbag sensor, a three-axis capacitive accelerometer, and the utricule and saccule in the three semicircular canals inside the human ear (© Bosch, Rieker Electronics, Northwestern University)

of motion of a system.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Objects and point particles

> Wenn ich den Gegenstand kenne, so kenne ich auch sämtliche Möglichkeiten seines Vorkommens in Sachverhalten.*
>
> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 2.0123

One aim of the study of motion is to find a complete and precise description of both states and objects. With the help of the concept of space, the description of objects can be refined considerably. In particular, one knows from experience that all objects seen in daily life have an important property: they can be divided into *parts*. Often this observation is expressed by saying that all objects, or bodies, have two properties. First, they are made out of *matter*,** defined as that aspect of an object responsible for its impenetrability, i.e., the property preventing two objects from being in the same place. Secondly, bodies have a certain form or *shape*, defined as the precise way in which this impenetrability is distributed in space.

Challenge 132 e

In order to describe motion as accurately as possible, it is convenient to start with those bodies that are as simple as possible. In general, the smaller a body, the simpler it is. A body that is so small that its parts no longer need to be taken into account is called a *particle*. (The older term *corpuscle* has fallen out of fashion.) Particles are thus idealized small stones. The extreme case, a particle whose size is *negligible* compared with the dimensions of its motion, so that its position is described completely by a *single* triplet of coordinates, is called a *point particle* or a *point mass*. In equation (5), the stone was assumed to be such a point particle.

Do point-like objects, i.e., objects smaller than anything one can measure, exist in daily life? Yes and no. The most notable examples are the stars. At present, angular sizes as small as 2 μrad can be measured, a limit given by the fluctuations of the air in the atmosphere. In space, such as for the Hubble telescope orbiting the Earth, the angular limit is due to the diameter of the telescope and is of the order of 10 nrad. Practically all stars seen from Earth are smaller than that, and are thus effectively 'point-like', even when seen with the most powerful telescopes.

As an exception to the general rule, the size of a few large and nearby stars, of red giant type, can be measured with special instruments.*** Betelgeuse, the higher of the two shoulders of Orion shown in Figure 48, Mira in Cetus, Antares in Scorpio, Aldebaran in Taurus and Sirius in Canis Major are examples of stars whose size has been measured; they are all only a few light years from Earth. Of course, like the Sun, all other stars have a finite size, but one cannot prove this by measuring dimensions in photographs. (True?)

Ref. 55

Challenge 133 s

* 'If I know an object, then I also know all the possibilities of its occurrence in atomic facts.'

Ref. 54

** Matter is a word derived from the Latin 'materia', which originally meant 'wood' and was derived via intermediate steps from 'mater', meaning 'mother'.

*** The website www.astro.uiuc.edu/~kaler/sow/sowlist.html gives an introduction to the different types of stars. The www.astro.wisc.edu/~dolan/constellations website provides detailed and interesting information about constellations.

For an overview of the planets, see the beautiful book by K. R. Lang & C. A. Whitney, *Vagabonds de l'espace – Exploration et découverte dans le système solaire*, Springer Verlag, 1993. The most beautiful pictures of the stars can be found in D. Malin, *A View of the Universe*, Sky Publishing and Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 48 Orion in natural colours (© Matthew Spinelli) and Betelgeuse (ESA, NASA)

The difference between 'point-like' and finite size sources can be seen with the naked eye: at night, stars twinkle, but planets do not. (Check it!) This effect is due to the turbulence of air. Turbulence has an effect on the almost point-like stars because it deflects light rays by small amounts. On the other hand, air turbulence is too weak to lead to twinkling of sources of larger angular size, such as planets or artificial satellites,* because the deflection is averaged out in this case.

Challenge 134 e

An object is *point-like for the naked eye* if its angular size is smaller than about $2' = 0.6$ mrad. Can you estimate the size of a 'point-like' dust particle? By the way, an object is *invisible* to the naked eye if it is point-like *and* if its luminosity, i.e., the intensity of the light from the object reaching the eye, is below some critical value. Can you estimate whether there are any man-made objects visible from the Moon, or from the space shuttle?

Challenge 135 s

Challenge 136 s

The above definition of 'point-like' in everyday life is obviously misleading. Do proper, real point particles exist? In fact, is it at all possible to show that a particle has vanishing size? This question will be central in the last two parts of our walk. In the same way, we need to ask and check whether points in space do exist. Our walk will lead us to the astonishing result that all the answers to these questions are negative. Can you imagine why? Do not be disappointed if you find this issue difficult; many brilliant minds have had the same problem.

Challenge 137 s

However, many particles, such as electrons, quarks or photons are point-like for all practical purposes. Once one knows how to describe the motion of point particles, one can also describe the motion of extended bodies, rigid or deformable, by assuming that they are made of parts. This is the same approach as describing the motion of an animal as a whole by combining the motion of its various body parts. The simplest description, the *continuum approximation*, describes extended bodies as an infinite collection of point particles. It allows us to understand and to predict the motion of milk and honey, the motion of the air in hurricanes and of perfume in rooms. The motion of fire and all other gaseous bodies, the bending of bamboo in the wind, the shape changes of chewing gum, and the growth of plants and animals can also be described in this way.

Ref. 56

A more precise description than the continuum approximation is given below. Nev-

Page 976

* A *satellite* is an object circling a planet, like the Moon; an *artificial satellite* is a system put into orbit by humans, like the Sputniks.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 49 How an object can rotate continuously without tangling up the connection to a second object

ertheless, all observations so far have confirmed that the motion of large bodies can be described to high precision as the result of the motion of their parts. This approach will guide us through the first two parts of our mountain ascent. Only in the final part will we discover that, at a fundamental scale, this decomposition is impossible.

Legs and wheels

The parts of a body determine its shape. Shape is an important aspect of bodies: among other things, it tells us how to count them. In particular, living beings are always made of a single body. This is not an empty statement: from this fact we can deduce that animals cannot have wheels or propellers, but only legs, fins, or wings. Why?

Living beings have only one surface; simply put, they have only one piece of skin. Appendix B Mathematically speaking, animals are *connected*. Ref. 57 This is often assumed to be obvious, and it is often mentioned that the blood supply, the nerves and the lymphatic connections to a rotating part would get tangled up. However, this argument is not so simple, as Figure 49 shows. It shows that it is indeed possible to rotate a body continuously against a second one, without tangling up the connections. Can you find an example for this kind of motion in your own body? Challenge 138 s Are you able to see how many cables may be attached to the rotating body of the figure without hindering the rotation? Challenge 139 s

Despite the possibility of animals having rotating parts, the method of Figure 49 still cannot be used to make a practical wheel or propeller. Challenge 140 s Can you see why? Evolution had no choice: it had to avoid animals with parts rotating around axles. That is the reason that propellers and wheels do not exist in nature. Of course, this limitation does not rule out Ref. 58 that living bodies move by rotation as a whole: tumbleweed, seeds from various trees, some insects, certain other animals, children and dancers occasionally move by rolling or rotating as a whole.

Single bodies, and thus all living beings, can only move through *deformation* of their shape: therefore they are limited to walking, running, rolling, crawling or flapping wings or fins. Ref. 59 Extreme examples of leg use in nature are shown in Figure 50; rolling spiders that use their legs to steer the rolling have also been found recently. Walking on water is shown in Figure 100 on page 140; examples of wings are given in Figure 573 on page 1305. In contrast, systems of several bodies, such as bicycles, pedal boats or other machines, can move *without* any change of shape of their components, thus enabling the use of axles with wheels, propellers or other rotating devices.*

* Despite the disadvantage of not being able to use rotating parts and of being restricted to one piece only, nature's moving constructions, usually called animals, often outperform human built machines. As an ex-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 50 'Wheels' and legs in living beings: the rolling shrimp *Nannosquilla decemspinosa* (2 cm body length, 1.5 rotations per second, up to 2 m, can even roll slightly uphill slopes), the rolling caterpillar *Pleurotya ruralis* (can only roll downhill, to escape predators), the Red millipede *Aphistogoniulus erythrocephalus* (15 cm body length) and a Gekko on a glass pane (15 cm body length) (© Robert Full, John Brackenbury / Science Photo Library, David Parks and Marcel Berendsen)

In summary, whenever we observe a construction in which some part is turning continuously (and without the 'wiring' of the figure) we know immediately that it is an artefact: it is a machine, not a living being (but built by one). However, like so many statements about living creatures, this one also has exceptions. The distinction between one and two bodies is poorly defined if the whole system is made of only a few molecules. This happens most clearly inside bacteria. Organisms such as *Escherichia coli*, the well-known bacterium found in the human gut, or bacteria from the *Salmonella* family, all swim using flagella. *Flagella* are thin filaments, similar to tiny hairs that stick out of the cell membrane. In the 1970s it was shown that each flagellum, made of one or a few long molecules with a diameter of a few tens of nanometres, does in fact turn about its axis. A bacterium is able to turn its flagella in both clockwise and anticlockwise directions, can achieve more than 1000 turns per second, and can turn all its flagella in perfect synchronization. (These wheels are so tiny that they do not need a mechanical connection.) Therefore wheels actually do exist in living beings, albeit only tiny ones. But let us now continue with our study of simple objects.

Page 1307

Ref. 60

ample, compare the size of the smallest flying systems built by evolution with those built by humans. (See, e.g. pixelito.reference.be.) There are two reasons for this discrepancy. First, nature's systems have integrated repair and maintenance systems. Second, nature can build large structures inside containers with small openings. In fact, nature is very good at what people do when they build sailing ships inside glass bottles. The human body is full of such examples; can you name a few?

Challenge 141 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 51 Are comets, such as the beautiful comet McNaught seen in 2007, images or bodies? How can one settle the issue? (© Robert McNaught)

Curiosities and fun challenges about kinematics

Challenge 142 s What is the biggest wheel ever made?

* *

A soccer ball is shot, by a goalkeeper, with around 30 m/s. Calculate the distance it should fly and compare it with the distances found in a soccer match. Where does the difference Challenge 143 s come from?

* *

A train starts to travel at a constant speed of 10 m/s between two cities A and B, 36 km apart. The train will take one hour for the journey. At the same time as the train, a fast dove starts to fly from A to B, at 20 m/s. Being faster than the train, the dove arrives at B first. The dove then flies back towards A; when it meets the train, it turns back again, to city B. It goes on flying back and forward until the train reaches B. What distance did Challenge 144 e the dove cover?

* *

Balance a pencil vertically (tip upwards!) on a piece of paper near the edge of a table. Challenge 145 e How can you pull out the paper without letting the pencil fall?

* *

Is a return flight by plane – from a point A to B and back to A – faster if the wind blows

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 146 e or if it does not?

* *

The level of acceleration a human can survive depends on the duration over which one is subjected to it. For a tenth of a second, $30\,g = 300\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$, as generated by an ejector seat in an aeroplane, is acceptable. (It seems that the record acceleration a human has survived is about $80\,g = 800\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$.) But as a rule of thumb it is said that accelerations of $15\,g = 150\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$ or more are fatal.

* *

The highest *microscopic* accelerations are observed in particle collisions, where one gets values up to $10^{35}\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$. The highest *macroscopic* accelerations are probably found in the collapsing interiors of *supernovae*, exploding stars which can be so bright as to be visible in the sky even during the daytime. A candidate on Earth is the interior of collapsing bubbles in liquids, a process called *cavitation*. Cavitation often produces light, an effect Ref. 61 discovered by Frenzel and Schulte in 1934 and called *sonoluminescence*. (See Figure 94.) It appears most prominently when air bubbles in water are expanded and contracted by underwater loudspeakers at around 30 kHz and allows precise measurements of bubble motion. At a certain threshold intensity, the bubble radius changes at 1500 m/s in as little Ref. 62 as a few μm, giving an acceleration of several $10^{11}\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$.

* *

Legs are easy to build. Nature has even produced a millipede, *Illacme plenipes*, that has 750 legs. The animal is 3 to 4 cm long and about 0.5 mm wide. This seems to be the record so far.

Summary of kinematics

The description of everyday motion of mass points with three coordinates as $(x(t), y(t), z(t))$ is simple, precise and complete. It assumes that objects can be followed along there paths. Therefore, the description does not work for an important case: the motion of images.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 4

FROM OBJECTS AND IMAGES TO CONSERVATION

Walking through a forest we observe two rather different types of motion: the breeze moves the leaves, and at the same time their shadows move on the ground. Shadows Ref. 63 are a simple type of image. Both objects and images are able to move. Running tigers, falling snowflakes, and material ejected by volcanoes are examples of motion, since they all change position over time. For the same reason, the shadow following our body, the beam of light circling the tower of a lighthouse on a misty night, and the rainbow that constantly keeps the same apparent distance from the hiker are examples of motion.

Everybody who has ever seen an animated cartoon knows that images can move in more surprising ways than objects. Images can change their size, shape and even colour, a feat only few objects are able to perform.* Images can appear and disappear without trace, multiply, interpenetrate, go backwards in time and defy gravity or any other force. Images, even ordinary shadows, can move faster than light. Images can float in space and keep the same distance from approaching objects. Objects can do almost none of Ref. 65 this. In general, the 'laws of cartoon physics' are rather different from those in nature. In fact, the motion of images does not seem to follow any rules, in contrast to the motion of objects. On the other hand, both objects and images differ from their environment in that they have *boundaries* defining their size and shape. We feel the need for precise criteria allowing the two cases to be distinguished.

Making a clear distinction between images and objects is performed using the same method that children or animals use when they stand in front of a mirror for the first time: they try to *touch* what they see. Indeed, if we are able to touch what we see – or more precisely, if we are able to move it – we call it an *object*, otherwise an *image*.** Page 1071 Images cannot be touched, but objects can. Images cannot hit each other, but objects can. And as everybody knows, touching something means feeling that it resists movement.

* Excluding very slow changes such as the change of colour of leaves in the Fall, in nature only certain crystals, the octopus, the chameleon and a few other animals achieve this. Of man-made objects, television, Challenge 147 s computer displays, heated objects and certain lasers can do it. Do you know more examples? An excellent source of information on the topic of colour is the book by K. Nassau, *The Physics and Chemistry of Colour – the fifteen causes of colour*, J. Wiley & Sons, 1983. In the popular science domain, the most beautiful book is the classic work by the Flemish astronomer Marcel G. J. Minnaert, *Light and Colour in the Outdoors*, Springer, 1993, an updated version based on his wonderful book series, *De natuurkunde van 't vrije veld*, Ref. 64 Thieme & Cie, 1937. Reading it is a must for all natural scientists. On the web, there is also the – simpler, but excellent – webexhibits.org/causesofcolour website.

** One could propose including the requirement that objects may be rotated; however, this requirement gives difficulties in the case of atoms, as explained on page 1039, and with elementary particles, so that rotation is not made a separate requirement.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 52 In which direction does the bicycle turn?

Certain bodies, such as butterflies, pose little resistance and are moved with ease, others, such as ships, resist more, and are moved with more difficulty. This resistance to motion – more precisely, to change of motion – is called *inertia*, and the difficulty with which a body can be moved is called its *(inertial) mass*. Images have neither inertia nor mass.

Summing up, for the description of motion we must distinguish bodies, which can be touched and are impenetrable, from images, which cannot and are not. Everything visible is either an object or an image; there is no third possibility. (Do you agree?) If the object is so far away that it cannot be touched, such as a star or a comet, it can be difficult to decide whether one is dealing with an image or an object; we will encounter this difficulty repeatedly. For example, how would you show that comets are objects and not images, as Galileo claimed?

Challenge 148 s

Challenge 149 s

In the same way that objects are made of *matter*, images are made of *radiation*. Images are the domain of shadow theatre, cinema, television, computer graphics, belief systems and drug experts. Photographs, motion pictures, ghosts, angels, dreams and many hallucinations are images (sometimes coupled with brain malfunction). To understand images, we need to study radiation (plus the eye and the brain). However, due to the importance of objects – after all we are objects ourselves – we study the latter first.

Ref. 66

Motion and contact

> “Democritus affirms that there is only one type of movement: That resulting from collision.”
>
> Aetius, *Opinions*.

Ref. 67

When a child rides a monocycle, she or he makes use of a general rule in our world: one body acting on another puts it in motion. Indeed, in about six hours, anybody can learn to ride and enjoy a monocycle. As in all of life's pleasures, such as toys, animals, women, machines, children, men, the sea, wind, cinema, juggling, rambling and loving, something pushes something else. Thus our first challenge is to describe this transfer of motion in more precise terms.

Contact is not the only way to put something into motion; a counter-example is an apple falling from a tree or one magnet pulling another. Non-contact influences are more fascinating: nothing is hidden, but nevertheless something mysterious happens. Contact motion seems easier to grasp, and that is why one usually starts with it. However, despite this choice, non-contact forces are not easily avoided. Taking this choice one has a similar experience to that of cyclists. (See Figure 52.) If you ride a bicycle at a sustained speed and try to turn left by pushing the right-hand steering bar, you will turn *right*. By the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 53 Collisions define mass

FIGURE 54 The standard kilogram (© BIPM)

way, this surprising effect, also known to motor bike riders, obviously works only above a certain minimal speed. Can you determine what this speed is? Be careful! Too strong a push will make you fall. Challenge 150 s

Something similar will happen to us as well; despite our choice for contact motion, the rest of our walk will rapidly force us to study non-contact interactions.

What is mass?

> Δός μοι ποῦ στω καὶ κινῶ τὴν γῆν.
> Da ubi consistam, et terram movebo.*
>
> Archimedes

When we push something we are unfamiliar with, such as when we kick an object on the street, we automatically pay attention to the same aspect that children explore when they stand in front of a mirror for the first time, or when they see a red laser spot for the first time. They check whether the unknown entity can be pushed, and they pay attention to how the unknown object moves under their influence. The high precision version of the experiment is shown in Figure 53. Repeating the experiment with various pairs of objects, we find – as in everyday life – that a fixed quantity m_i can be ascribed to every object i. The more difficult it is to move an object, the higher the quantity; it is determined by the relation

$$\frac{m_2}{m_1} = -\frac{\Delta v_1}{\Delta v_2} \tag{15}$$

* 'Give me a place to stand, and I'll move the Earth.' Archimedes (*c.* 283–212), Greek scientist and engineer. This phrase was attributed to him by Pappus. Already Archimedes knew that the distinction used by lawyers between movable and immovable property made no sense. Ref. 68

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 55 Antoine Lavoisier (1743–1794) and his wife

where Δv is the velocity change produced by the collision. The number m_i is called the *mass* of the object i.

In order to have mass values that are common to everybody, the mass value for one particular, selected object has to be fixed in advance. This special object, shown in Figure 54 is called the *standard kilogram* and is kept with great care under vacuum in a glass container in Sèvres near Paris. It is touched only once every few years because otherwise dust, humidity, or scratches would change its mass. Through the standard kilogram the value of the mass of every other object in the world is determined.

The mass thus measures the difficulty of getting something moving. High masses are harder to move than low masses. Obviously, only objects have mass; images don't. (By the way, the word 'mass' is derived, via Latin, from the Greek μαζα – bread – or the Hebrew 'mazza' – unleavened bread. That is quite a change in meaning.)

Ref. 54

Experiments with everyday life objects also show that throughout any collision, the sum of all masses is *conserved*:

$$\sum_i m_i = \text{const} \,. \tag{16}$$

The principle of conservation of mass was first stated by Antoine-Laurent Lavoisier.* Conservation of mass also implies that the mass of a composite system is the sum of the mass of the components. In short, *Galilean mass is a measure for the quantity of matter.*

* Antoine-Laurent Lavoisier (1743–1794), French chemist and a genius. Lavoisier was the first to understand that combustion is a reaction with oxygen; he discovered the components of water and introduced mass measurements into chemistry. There is a good, but most probably false story about him: When he was (unjustly) sentenced to the guillotine during the French revolution, he decided to use the situations for a scientific experiment. He would try to blink his eyes as frequently as possible after his head was cut off, in order to show others how long it takes to lose consciousness. Lavoisier managed to blink eleven times. It is unlcear whether the story is true or not. It is known, however, that it could be true. Indeed, if a decapitated has no pain or shock, he can remain conscious for up to half a minute.

Ref. 69

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 56 Christiaan Huygens (1629–1695)



FIGURE 57 Is this dangerous?

Momentum and mass

The definition of mass can also be given in another way. We can ascribe a number m_i to every object i such that for collisions free of outside interference the following sum is unchanged *throughout* the collision:

$$\sum_i m_i \boldsymbol{v}_i = \text{const} \,. \tag{17}$$

The product of the velocity $\boldsymbol{v}_i$ and the mass m_i is called the *momentum* of the body. The sum, or *total momentum* of the system, is the same before and after the collision; momentum is a *conserved* quantity. *Momentum conservation defines mass.* The two conservation principles (16) and (17) were first stated in this way by the important Dutch physicist Christiaan Huygens.* Momentum and mass are conserved in everyday motion of objects. Neither quantity can be defined for the motion of images. Some typical momentum values are given in Table 15.

Momentum conservation implies that when a moving sphere hits a resting one of the same mass and without loss of energy, a simple rule determines the angle between the directions the two spheres take after the collision. Can you find this rule? It is particularly useful when playing billiards. We will find out later that it is *not* valid in special relativity.

Challenge 151 s

Another consequence of momentum conservation is shown in Figure 57: a man is

* Christiaan Huygens (b. 1629 's Gravenhage, d. 1695 Hofwyck) was one of the main physicists and mathematicians of his time. Huygens clarified the concepts of mechanics; he also was one of the first to show that light is a wave. He wrote influential books on probability theory, clock mechanisms, optics and astronomy. Among other achievements, Huygens showed that the Orion Nebula consists of stars, discovered Titan, the moon of Saturn, and showed that the rings of Saturn consist of rock. (This is in contrast to Saturn itself, whose density is lower than that of water.)

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 15 Some measured momentum values

Observation	Momentum
Momentum of a green photon	$1.2 \cdot 10^{-27}$ Ns
Average momentum of oxygen molecule in air	10^{-26} Ns
X-ray photon momentum	10^{-23} Ns
γ photon momentum	10^{-17} Ns
Highest particle momentum in accelerators	1 fNs
Highest possible momentum of a single elementary particle – the Planck momentum	6.5 Ns
Fast billiard ball	3 Ns
Flying rifle bullet	10 Ns
Box punch	15 to 50 Ns
Comfortably walking human	80 Ns
Lion paw strike	kNs
Whale tail blow	kNs
Car on highway	40 kNs
Impact of meteorite with 2 km diameter	100 TNs
Momentum of a galaxy in galaxy collision	up to 10^{46} Ns

lying on a bed of nails with a large block of concrete on his stomach. Another man is hitting the concrete with a heavy sledgehammer. As the impact is mostly absorbed by the concrete, there is no pain and no danger – unless the concrete is missed. Why? Challenge 152 s

The above definition of mass has been generalized by the physicist and philosopher Ernst Mach* in such a way that it is valid even if the two objects interact without contact, as long as they do so along the line connecting their positions. The mass ratio between two bodies is defined as a negative inverse acceleration ratio, thus as

$$\frac{m_2}{m_1} = -\frac{a_1}{a_2} \,, \tag{18}$$

where a is the acceleration of each body during the interaction. This definition has been studied in much detail in the physics community, mainly in the nineteenth century. A few points sum up the results:

— The definition of mass *implies* the conservation of total momentum $\sum mv$. Momentum conservation is *not* a separate principle. Conservation of momentum cannot be checked experimentally, because mass is defined in such a way that the principle holds.

* Ernst Mach (1838 Chrlice–1916 Vaterstetten), Austrian physicist and philosopher. The *mach* unit for aeroplane speed as a multiple of the speed of sound in air (about 0.3 km/s) is named after him. He developed the so-called Mach–Zehnder interferometer; he also studied the basis of mechanics. His thoughts about mass and inertia influenced the development of general relativity, and led to Mach's principle, which will appear later on. He was also proud to be the last scientist denying – humorously, and against all evidence – the existence of atoms.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

— The definition of mass *implies* the equality of the products $m_1 a_1$ and $-m_2 a_2$. Such products are called *forces*. The equality of acting and reacting forces is not a separate principle; mass is defined in such a way that the principle holds.
— The definition of mass is *independent* of whether contact is involved or not, and whether the origin of the accelerations is due to electricity, gravitation, or other interactions.* Since the interaction does not enter the definition of mass, mass values defined with the help of the electric, nuclear or gravitational interaction all agree, as long as momentum is conserved. All known interactions conserve momentum. For some unfortunate historical reasons, the mass value measured with the electric or nuclear interactions is called the 'inertial' mass and the mass measured using gravity is called the 'gravitational' mass. As it turns out, this artificial distinction has no real meaning; this becomes especially clear when one takes an observation point that is far away from all the bodies concerned.
— The definition of mass requires observers at rest or in inertial motion.

By measuring the masses of bodies around us, as given in Table 16, we can explore the science and art of experiments. We also discover the main properties of mass. It is *additive* in everyday life, as the mass of two bodies combined is equal to the sum of the two separate masses. Furthermore, mass is *continuous*; it can seemingly take any positive value. Finally, mass is *conserved*; the mass of a system, defined as the sum of the mass of all constituents, does not change over time if the system is kept isolated from the rest of the world. Mass is not only conserved in collisions but also during melting, evaporation, digestion and all other processes.

Later we will find that in the case of mass all these properties, summarized in Table 17, are only approximate. Precise experiments show that none of them are correct.** For the moment we continue with the present, Galilean concept of mass, as we have not yet a better one at our disposal.

In a famous experiment in the sixteenth century, for several weeks Santorio Santorio (Sanctorius) (1561–1636), friend of Galileo, lived with all his food and drink supply, and also his toilet, on a large balance. He wanted to test mass conservation. How did the measured weight change with time? Challenge 154 s

The definition of mass through momentum conservation implies that when an object falls, the Earth is accelerated upwards by a tiny amount. If one could measure this tiny amount, one could determine the mass of the Earth. Unfortunately, this measurement is impossible. Can you find a better way to determine the mass of the Earth? Challenge 155 s

Summarizing Table 17, the mass of a body is thus most precisely described by a *positive* real number, often abbreviated m or M. This is a direct consequence of the impenetrability of matter. Indeed, a *negative* (inertial) mass would mean that such a body would move in the opposite direction of any applied force or acceleration. Such a body could not be kept in a box; it would break through any wall trying to stop it. Strangely enough, nega-

* As mentioned above, only *central* forces obey the relation (18) used to define mass. Central forces act between the centre of mass of bodies. We give a precise definition later. However, since all fundamental forces are central, this is not a restriction. There seems to be one notable exception: magnetism. Is the definition of mass valid in this case? Page 105 Challenge 153 s

** In particular, in order to define mass we must be able to *distinguish* bodies. This seems a trivial requirement, but we discover that this is not always possible in nature.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 16 Some measured mass values

OBSERVATION	MASS
Probably lightest known object: neutrino	*c.* 210^{-36} kg
Mass increase due to absorption of one green photon	$4.1 \cdot 10^{-36}$ kg
Lightest known charged object: electron	$9.109\,381\,88(72) \cdot 10^{-31}$ kg
Atom of argon	39.962 383 123(3) u = 66.359 1(1) yg
Lightest object ever weighed (a gold particle)	0.39 ag
Human at early age (fertilized egg)	10^{-8} g
Water adsorbed on to a kilogram metal weight	10^{-5} g
Planck mass	$2.2 \cdot 10^{-5}$ g
Fingerprint	10^{-4} g
Typical ant	10^{-4} g
Water droplet	1 mg
Honey bee, *Apis mellifera*	0.1 g
Euro coin	7.5 g
Blue whale, *Balaenoptera musculus*	180 Mg
Heaviest living things, such as the fungus *Armillaria ostoyae* or a large Sequoia *Sequoiadendron giganteum*	10^6 kg
Heaviest train ever	$99.7 \cdot 10^6$ kg
Largest ocean-going ship	$400 \cdot 10^6$ kg
Largest object moved by man (Troll gas rig)	$687.5 \cdot 10^6$ kg
Large antarctic iceberg	10^{15} kg
Water on Earth	10^{21} kg
Earth's mass	$5.98 \cdot 10^{24}$ kg
Solar mass	$2.0 \cdot 10^{30}$ kg
Our galaxy's visible mass	$3 \cdot 10^{41}$ kg
Our galaxy's estimated total mass	$2 \cdot 10^{42}$ kg
virgo supercluster	$2 \cdot 10^{46}$ kg
Total mass visible in the universe	10^{54} kg

tive mass bodies would still fall downwards in the field of a large positive mass (though more slowly than an equivalent positive mass). Are you able to confirm this? Challenge 156 e However, a small positive mass object would float away from a large negative-mass body, as you can easily deduce by comparing the various accelerations involved. A positive and a negative mass of the same value would stay at constant distance and spontaneously accelerate away along the line connecting the two masses. Challenge 157 e Note that both energy and momentum are conserved in all these situations.* Negative-mass bodies have never been observed.

* For more curiosities, see R. H. PRICE, Negative mass can be positively amusing, *American Journal of Physics* **61**, pp. 216–217, 1993. Negative mass particles in a box would heat up a box made of positive mass while traversing its walls, and accelerating, i.e., losing energy, at the same time. Page 99 They would allow one to build a *perpetuum mobile* of the second kind, i.e., a device circumventing the second principle of thermodynamics. Challenge 158 e Moreover, such a system would have no thermodynamic equilibrium, because its energy could

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 17 Properties of Galilean mass

Masses	Physical property	Mathematical name	Definition
Can be distinguished	distinguishability	element of set	Page 822
Can be ordered	sequence	order	Page 876
Can be compared	measurability	metricity	Page 887
Can change gradually	continuity	completeness	Page 896
Can be added	quantity of matter	additivity	Page 77
Beat any limit	infinity	unboundedness, openness	Page 823
Do not change	conservation	invariance	$m = \text{const}$
Do not disappear	impenetrability	positivity	$m \geqslant 0$

TABLE 18 Some mass sensors

Measurement	Sensor	Range
Sense of touch	pressure sensitive cells	1 mg to 500 kg
Doppler effect on light reflected of the object	interferometer	1 mg to 100 g
Precision scale	balance, pendulum, or spring	1 pg to 10^3 kg
Truck scale	hydraulic balance	1 to $60 \cdot 10^3$ kg
Ship weight	water volume measurement	up to $500 \cdot 10^6$ kg



FIGURE 58 Mass measurement devices: a vacuum balance used in 1890 by Dmitriy Ivanovich Mendeleyev and a modern laboratory balance (© Thinktank Trust, Mettler-Toledo)

Page 444, page 1049 Antimatter, which will be discussed later, also has positive mass.

decrease forever. The more one thinks about negative mass, the more one finds strange properties contradicting observations. By the way, what is the range of possible mass values for tachyons? Challenge 159 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 59 What happens in these four situations?

Is motion eternal? – Conservation of momentum

> Every body continues in the state of rest or of uniform motion in a straight line except in so far as it doesn't.
>
> Arthur Eddington*

The product $\boldsymbol{p} = m\boldsymbol{v}$ of mass and velocity is called the *momentum* of a particle; it describes the tendency of an object to keep moving during collisions. The larger it is, the harder it is to stop the object. Like velocity, momentum has a direction and a magnitude: it is a vector. In French, momentum is called 'quantity of motion', a more appropriate term. In the old days, the term 'motion' was used instead of 'momentum', for example by Newton. Relation (17), the conservation of momentum, therefore expresses the conservation of motion during interactions.

Momentum, like energy is an *extensive quantity*. That means that it can be said that both *flow* from one body to the other, and that they can be *accumulated* in bodies, in the same way that water flows and can be accumulated in containers. Imagining momentum as something that can be *exchanged* between bodies in collisions is always useful when thinking about the description of moving objects.

Momentum is conserved. That explains the limitations you might experience when being on a perfectly frictionless surface, such as ice or a polished, oil covered marble: you cannot propel yourself forward by patting your own back. (Have you ever tried to put a cat on such a marble surface? It is not even able to stand on its four legs. Neither
Challenge 160 s are humans. Can you imagine why?) Momentum conservation also answers the puzzles of Figure 59.

The conservation of momentum and mass also means that teleportation ('beam me
Challenge 161 s up') is impossible in nature. Can you explain this to a non-physicist?

Momentum conservation implies that momentum can be imagined to be like an invisible fluid. In an interaction, the invisible fluid is transferred from one object to another. However, the sum is always constant.

Momentum conservation implies that motion never stops; it is only *exchanged*. On the other hand, motion often 'disappears' in our environment, as in the case of a stone dropped to the ground, or of a ball left rolling on grass. Moreover, in daily life we often observe the creation of motion, such as every time we open a hand. How do these

* Arthur Eddington (1882–1944), British astrophysicist.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

examples fit with the conservation of momentum?

It turns out that the answer lies in the microscopic aspects of these systems. A muscle only *transforms* one type of motion, namely that of the electrons in certain chemical compounds* into another, the motion of the fingers. The working of muscles is similar to that of a car engine transforming the motion of electrons in the fuel into motion of the wheels. Both systems need fuel and get warm in the process.

We must also study the microscopic behaviour when a ball rolls on grass until it stops. The disappearance of motion is called *friction*. Studying the situation carefully, one finds that the grass and the ball heat up a little during this process. During friction, visible motion is transformed into heat. Later, when we discover the structure of matter, it will become clear that heat is the disorganized motion of the microscopic constituents of every material. When these constituents all move in the same direction, the object as a whole moves; when they oscillate randomly, the object is at rest, but is warm. Heat is a form of motion. Friction thus only seems to be disappearance of motion; in fact it is a transformation of ordered into unordered motion.

Despite momentum conservation, *macroscopic* perpetual motion does not exist, since friction cannot be completely eliminated.** Motion is eternal only at the microscopic scale. In other words, the disappearance and also the spontaneous appearance of motion in everyday life is an illusion due to the limitations of our senses. For example, the motion proper of every living being exists before its birth, and stays after its death. The same happens with its energy. This result is probably the closest one can get to the idea of everlasting life from evidence collected by observation. It is perhaps less than a coincidence that energy used to be called *vis viva*, or 'living force', by Leibniz and many others.

Since motion is conserved, it has no origin. Therefore, at this stage of our walk we cannot answer the fundamental questions: Why does motion exist? What is its origin? The end of our adventure is nowhere near.

More conservation – energy

When collisions are studied in detail, a second conserved quantity turns up. Experiments show that in the case of perfect, or elastic collisions – collisions without friction – the

Ref. 70

* Usually adenosine triphosphate (ATP), the fuel of most processes in animals.

** Some funny examples of past attempts to built a *perpetual motion machine* are described in Stanislav Michel, *Perpetuum mobile*, VDI Verlag, 1976. Interestingly, the idea of eternal motion came to Europe from India, via the Islamic world, around the year 1200, and became popular as it opposed the then standard view that all motion on Earth disappears over time. See also the web.archive.org/web/20040812085618/http://www.geocities.com/mercutio78_99/pmm.html and the www.lhup.edu/~dsimanek/museum/unwork.htm websites. The conceptual mistake made by eccentrics and used by crooks is always the same: the hope of overcoming friction. (In fact, this applied only to the perpetual motion machines of the second kind; those of the first kind – which are even more in contrast with observation – even try to generate energy from nothing.)

Ref. 71

If the machine is well constructed, i.e., with little friction, it can take the little energy it needs for the sustenance of its motion from very subtle environmental effects. For example, in the Victoria and Albert Museum in London one can admire a beautiful clock powered by the variations of air pressure over time.

Challenge 162 s

Low friction means that motion takes a long time to stop. One immediately thinks of the motion of the planets. In fact, there *is* friction between the Earth and the Sun. (Can you guess one of the mechanisms?) But the value is so small that the Earth has already circled around the Sun for thousands of millions of years, and will do so for quite some time more.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 60 Robert Mayer (1814–1878)

following quantity, called the *kinetic energy* T of the system, is also conserved:

$$T = \sum_i \tfrac{1}{2} m_i \boldsymbol{v}_i^2 = \sum_i \tfrac{1}{2} m_i v_i^2 = \text{const} \,. \tag{19}$$

Kinetic energy is the ability that a body has to induce change in bodies it hits. Kinetic energy thus depends on the mass and on the square of the speed v of a body. The full name 'kinetic energy' was introduced by Gustave-Gaspard Coriolis.*

Energy is a word taken from ancient Greek; originally it was used to describe character, and meant 'intellectual or moral vigour'. It was taken into physics by Thomas Young (1773–1829) in 1807 because its literal meaning is 'force within'. (The letters E, W, A and several others are also used to denote energy.) Another, equivalent definition of energy will become clear later: energy is what can be transformed into heat.

(Physical) *energy* is the measure of the ability to generate motion. A body has a lot of energy if it has the ability to move many other bodies. Energy is a single number; it has no direction. The total momentum of two equal masses moving with opposite velocities is zero; their total energy increases with velocity. Energy thus also measures motion, but in a different way than momentum. Energy measures motion in a more global way. An equivalent definition is the following. Energy is the ability to perform work. Here, the physical concept of work is just the precise version of what is meant by work in everyday life.**

Do not be surprised if you do not grasp the difference between momentum and energy straight away: physicists took about two centuries to figure it out. For some time they even insisted on using the same word for both, and often they didn't know which situation required which concept. So you are allowed to take a few minutes to get used to it.

Both energy and momentum measure how systems change. Momentum tells how systems change over distance, energy measures how systems change over time. Momentum is needed to compare motion here and there. Energy is needed to compare motion now and later. Some measured energy values are given in Table 19.

One way to express the difference between energy and momentum is to think about the following challenges. Is it more difficult to stop a running man with mass m and

* Gustave-Gaspard Coriolis (b. 1792 Paris, d. 1843 Paris), French engineer and mathematician. He introduced the modern concepts of 'work' and of 'kinetic energy', and discovered the Coriolis effect. Coriolis also introduced the factor 1/2, in order that the relation $\mathrm{d}T/\mathrm{d}v = p$ would be obeyed. (Why?)

Challenge 163 s

** (Physical) *work* is the product of force and distance in direction of the force.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 19 Some measured energy values

Observation	Energy
Average kinetic energy of oxygen molecule in air	6 zJ
Green photon energy	0.37 aJ
X-ray photon energy	1 fJ
γ photon energy	1 pJ
Highest particle energy in accelerators	0.1 µJ
Kinetic energy of a flying mosquito	0.2 µJ
Comfortably walking human	20 J
Flying arrow	50 J
Right hook in boxing	50 J
Energy in torch battery	1 kJ
Energy in explosion of 1 g TNT	4.1 kJ
Energy of 1 kcal	4.18 kJ
Flying rifle bullet	10 kJ
One gram of fat	38 kJ
One gram of gasoline	44 kJ
Apple digestion	0.2 MJ
Car on highway	0.3 to 1 MJ
Highest laser pulse energy	1.8 MJ
Lightning flash	up to 1 GJ
Planck energy	2.0 GJ
Small nuclear bomb (20 ktonne)	84 TJ
Earthquake of magnitude 7	2 PJ
Largest nuclear bomb (50 Mtonne)	210 PJ
Impact of meteorite with 2 km diameter	1 EJ
Yearly machine energy use	420 EJ
Rotation energy of Earth	$2 \cdot 10^{29}$ J
Supernova explosion	10^{44} J
Gamma ray burst	up to 10^{47} J
Energy content $E = mc^2$ of Sun's mass	$1.8 \cdot 10^{47}$ J
Energy content of Galaxy's central black hole	$4 \cdot 10^{53}$ J

Challenge 164 e speed v, or one with mass $m/2$ and speed $2v$, or one with mass $m/2$ and speed $\sqrt{2}v$? You may want to ask a rugby-playing friend for confirmation.

Another distinction is illustrated by athletics: the *real* long jump world record, almost 10 m, is still kept by an athlete who in the early twentieth century ran with two weights in his hands, and then threw the weights behind him at the moment he took off. Can you Challenge 165 s explain the feat?

When a car travelling at 100 m/s runs head-on into a parked car of the same kind and Challenge 166 s make, which car receives the greatest damage? What changes if the parked car has its

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

brakes on?

To get a better feeling for energy, here is an additional approach. The world consumption of energy by human machines (coming from solar, geothermal, biomass, wind, nuclear, hydro, gas, oil, coal, or animal sources) in the year 2000 was about 420 EJ,* for a world population of about 6000 million people. To see what this energy consumption means, we translate it into a personal power consumption; we get about 2.2 kW. The watt W is the unit of power, and is simply defined as 1 W = 1 J/s, reflecting the definition of *(physical) power* as energy used per unit time. (The precise wording is: power is energy flowing per time through a defined closed surface.) As a working person can produce mechanical work of about 100 W, the average human energy consumption corresponds to about 22 humans working 24 hours a day. (See Table 20 for some power values found in nature.) In particular, if we look at the energy consumption in First World countries, the average inhabitant there has machines working for them equivalent to several hundred 'servants'. Can you point out some of these machines?

Ref. 72

Challenge 167 s

Kinetic energy is thus not conserved in everyday life. For example, in non-elastic collisions, such as that of a piece of chewing gum hitting a wall, kinetic energy is lost. *Friction* destroys kinetic energy. At the same time, friction produces heat. It was one of the important conceptual discoveries of physics that *total* energy is conserved if one includes the discovery that heat is a form of energy. Friction is thus in fact a process transforming kinetic energy, i.e., the energy connected with the motion of a body, into heat. On a microscopic scale, energy is conserved.** Indeed, without energy conservation, the concept of time would not be definable. We will show this connection shortly.

In summary, in addition to mass and energy, everyday linear motion also conserves energy. To discover the last conserved quantity, we explore another type of motion.

Rotation

Rotation keeps us alive. Without the change of day and night, we would be either fried or frozen to death, depending on our location on our planet. A short exploration of rotation is thus appropriate.

All objects have the ability to rotate. We saw before that a body is described by its reluctance to move; similarly, a body also has a reluctance to turn. This quantity is called its *moment of inertia* and is often abbreviated Θ – pronounced 'theta'. The speed or rate of rotation is described by *angular velocity*, usually abbreviated ω – pronounced 'omega'. A few values found in nature are given in Table 22.

The observables that describe rotation are similar to those describing linear motion, as shown in Table 23. Like mass, the moment of inertia is defined in such a way that the

Page 909

* For the explanation of the abbreviation E, see Appendix C.

** In fact, the conservation of energy was stated in its full generality in public only in 1842, by Julius Robert Mayer. He was a medical doctor by training, and the journal *Annalen der Physik* refused to publish his paper, as it supposedly contained 'fundamental errors'. What the editors called errors were in fact mostly – but not only – contradictions of their prejudices. Later on, Helmholtz, Thomson-Kelvin, Joule and many others acknowledged Mayer's genius. However, the first to have stated energy conservation in its modern form was the French physicist Sadi Carnot (1796–1832) in 1820. To him the issue was so clear that he did not publish the result. In fact he went on and discovered the second 'law' of thermodynamics. Today, energy conservation, also called the first 'law' of thermodynamics, is one of the pillars of physics, as it is valid in all its domains.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 20 Some measured power values

Observation	Power
Radio signal from the Galileo space probe sending from Jupiter	10 zW
Power of flagellar motor in bacterium	0.1 pW
Power consumption of a typical cell	1 pW
sound power at the ear at hearing threshold	2.5 pW
CR-R laser, at 780 nm	40-80 mW
Sound output from a piano playing fortissimo	0.4 W
Incandescent light bulb light output	1 to 5 W
Incandescent light bulb electricity consumption	25 to 100 W
A human, during one work shift of eight hours	100 W
One horse, for one shift of eight hours	300 W
Eddy Merckx, the great bicycle athlete, during one hour	500 W
Metric horse power power unit ($75\,\mathrm{kg} \cdot 9.81\,\mathrm{m/s^2} \cdot 1\,\mathrm{m/s}$)	735.5 W
British horse power power unit	745.7 W
Large motorbike	100 kW
Electrical power station output	0.1 to 6 GW
World's electrical power production in 2000	450 GW
Power used by the geodynamo	200 to 500 GW
Input on Earth surface: Sun's irradiation of Earth Ref. 73	0.17 EW
Input on Earth surface: thermal energy from inside of the Earth	32 TW
Input on Earth surface: power from tides (i.e., from Earth's rotation)	3 TW
Input on Earth surface: power generated by man from fossil fuels	8 to 11 TW
Lost from Earth surface: power stored by plants' photosynthesis	40 TW
World's record laser power	1 PW
Output of Earth surface: sunlight reflected into space	0.06 EW
Output of Earth surface: power radiated into space at 287 K	0.11 EW
Peak power of the largest nuclear bomb	5 YW
Sun's output	384.6 YW
Maximum power in nature, $c^5/4G$	$9.1 \cdot 10^{51}$ W

sum of *angular momenta* L – the product of moment of inertia and angular velocity – is conserved in systems that do not interact with the outside world:

$$\sum_i \Theta_i \boldsymbol{\omega}_i = \sum_i \boldsymbol{L}_i = \text{const} \,. \tag{20}$$

In the same way that the conservation of linear momentum defines mass, the conservation of angular momentum defines the moment of inertia.

The moment of inertia can be related to the mass and shape of a body. If the body is

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 21 Some power sensors

Measurement	Sensor	Range
Heart beat as power meter	deformation sensor and clock	75 to 2 000 W
Fitness power meter	piezoelectric sensor	75 to 2 000 W
Electricity meter at home	rotating aluminium disc	20 to 10 000 W
Power meter for car engine	electromagnetic brake	up to 1 MW
Laser power meter	photoelectric effect in semiconductor	up to 10 GW
Calorimeter for chemical reactions	temperature sensor	up to 1 MW
Calorimeter for particles	light detector	up to a few μJ

TABLE 22 Some measured rotation frequencies

Observation	Angular velocity $\omega = 2\pi/T$
Galactic rotation	$2\pi \cdot 0.14 \cdot 10^{-15}/\,\mathrm{s} = 2\pi\,/(220 \cdot 10^6\,\mathrm{a})$
Average Sun rotation around its axis	$2\pi \cdot 3.8 \cdot 10^{-7}/\,\mathrm{s} = 2\pi\,/\,30\,\mathrm{d}$
Typical lighthouse	$2\pi \cdot 0.08/\,\mathrm{s}$
Pirouetting ballet dancer	$2\pi \cdot 3/\,\mathrm{s}$
Ship's diesel engine	$2\pi \cdot 5/\,\mathrm{s}$
Helicopter rotor	$2\pi \cdot 5.3/\,\mathrm{s}$
Washing machine	up to $2\pi \cdot 20/\,\mathrm{s}$
Bacterial flagella	$2\pi \cdot 100/\,\mathrm{s}$
Fast CD recorder	up to $2\pi \cdot 458/\,\mathrm{s}$
Racing car engine	up to $2\pi \cdot 600/\,\mathrm{s}$
Fastest turbine built	$2\pi \cdot 10^3/\,\mathrm{s}$
Fastest pulsars (rotating stars)	up to at least $2\pi \cdot 716/\,\mathrm{s}$
Ultracentrifuge	$> 2\pi \cdot 2 \cdot 10^3/\,\mathrm{s}$
Dental drill	up to $2\pi \cdot 13 \cdot 10^3/\,\mathrm{s}$
Technical record	$2\pi \cdot 333 \cdot 10^3/\,\mathrm{s}$
Proton rotation	$2\pi \cdot 10^{20}/\,\mathrm{s}$
Highest possible, Planck angular velocity	$2\pi \cdot 10^{35}/\,\mathrm{s}$

imagined to consist of small parts or mass elements, the resulting expression is

$$\Theta = \sum_n m_n r_n^2 \,, \tag{21}$$

where r_n is the distance from the mass element m_n to the axis of rotation. Can you confirm the expression? Therefore, the moment of inertia of a body depends on the chosen axis of rotation. Can you confirm that this is so for a brick?

Challenge 168 e
Challenge 169 s

In contrast to the case of mass, there is no conservation of the moment of inertia. The

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 23 Correspondence between linear and rotational motion

Quantity	Linear motion		Rotational motion	
State	time	t	time	t
	position	$\boldsymbol{x}$	angle	$\boldsymbol{\varphi}$
	momentum	$p = m\boldsymbol{v}$	angular momentum	$\boldsymbol{L} = \Theta\boldsymbol{\omega}$
	energy	$mv^2/2$	energy	$\Theta\omega^2/2$
Motion	velocity	$\boldsymbol{v}$	angular velocity	$\boldsymbol{\omega}$
	acceleration	$\boldsymbol{a}$	angular acceleration	$\boldsymbol{\alpha}$
Reluctance to move	mass	m	moment of inertia	Θ
Motion change	force	$m\boldsymbol{a}$	torque	$\Theta\boldsymbol{\alpha}$



FIGURE 61 Angular momentum and the two versions of the right-hand rule

value of the moment of inertia depends on the location of the axis used for its definition. For each axis direction, one distinguishes an *intrinsic* moment of inertia, when the axis passes through the centre of mass of the body, from an *extrinsic* moment of inertia, when it does not.* In the same way, one distinguishes intrinsic and extrinsic angular momenta. (By the way, the *centre of mass* of a body is that imaginary point which moves straight during vertical fall, even if the body is rotating. Can you find a way to determine its location for a specific body?)

Challenge 171 s

We now define the *rotational energy* as

$$E_{\text{rot}} = \tfrac{1}{2}\Theta\,\omega^2 = \frac{L^2}{2\Theta}\,. \tag{23}$$

The expression is similar to the expression for the kinetic energy of a particle. Can you guess how much larger the rotational energy of the Earth is compared with the yearly

* Extrinsic and intrinsic moment of inertia are related by

$$\Theta_{\text{ext}} = \Theta_{\text{int}} + md^2\,, \tag{22}$$

where d is the distance between the centre of mass and the axis of extrinsic rotation. This relation is called *Steiner's parallel axis theorem*. Are you able to deduce it?

Challenge 170 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 62 How a snake turns itself around its axis



FIGURE 63 Can the ape reach the banana?

Challenge 172 s electricity usage of humanity? In fact, if you could find a way to harness this energy, you would become famous. For undistorted rotated objects, rotational energy is conserved.

Every object that has an orientation also has an intrinsic angular momentum. (What Challenge 173 s about a sphere?) Therefore, point particles do not have intrinsic angular momenta – at least in first approximation. (This conclusion will change in quantum theory.) The *extrinsic* angular momentum $\boldsymbol{L}$ of a point particle is given by

$$\boldsymbol{L} = \boldsymbol{r} \times \boldsymbol{p} = \frac{2\boldsymbol{a}(T)m}{T} \quad \text{so that} \quad L = r\,p = \frac{2A(T)m}{T} \tag{24}$$

where $\boldsymbol{p}$ is the momentum of the particle, $\boldsymbol{a}(T)$ is the surface swept by the position vector $\boldsymbol{r}$ of the particle during time T.* The angular momentum thus points along the rotation axis, following the right-hand rule, as shown in Figure 61.

As in the case of linear motion, rotational energy and angular momentum are not always conserved in the macroscopic world: rotational energy can change due to friction, and angular momentum can change due to external forces (torques). However, for closed (undisturbed) systems both quantities are always conserved. In particular, on a microscopic scale, most objects are undisturbed, so that conservation of rotational energy and angular momentum is especially obvious there.

---

* For the curious, the result of the *cross product* or *vector product* $\boldsymbol{a} \times \boldsymbol{b}$ between two vectors $\boldsymbol{a}$ and $\boldsymbol{b}$ is defined as that vector that is orthogonal to both, whose orientation is given by the *right-hand rule*, and whose length is given by $ab \sin \sphericalangle(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b})$, i.e., by the surface area of the parallelogram spanned by the two Challenge 174 e vectors. From the definition you can show that the vector product has the properties

$$\begin{aligned}
&\boldsymbol{a} \times \boldsymbol{b} = -\boldsymbol{b} \times \boldsymbol{a}\,, \quad \boldsymbol{a} \times (\boldsymbol{b} + \boldsymbol{c}) = \boldsymbol{a} \times \boldsymbol{b} + \boldsymbol{a} \times \boldsymbol{c}\,, \quad \lambda \boldsymbol{a} \times \boldsymbol{b} = \lambda(\boldsymbol{a} \times \boldsymbol{b}) = \boldsymbol{a} \times \lambda \boldsymbol{b}\,, \quad \boldsymbol{a} \times \boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{0}\,, \\
&\boldsymbol{a}(\boldsymbol{b} \times \boldsymbol{c}) = \boldsymbol{b}(\boldsymbol{c} \times \boldsymbol{a}) = \boldsymbol{c}(\boldsymbol{a} \times \boldsymbol{b})\,, \quad \boldsymbol{a} \times (\boldsymbol{b} \times \boldsymbol{c}) = \boldsymbol{b}(\boldsymbol{ac}) - \boldsymbol{c}(\boldsymbol{ab})\,, \\
&(\boldsymbol{a} \times \boldsymbol{b})(\boldsymbol{c} \times \boldsymbol{d}) = \boldsymbol{a}(\boldsymbol{b} \times (\boldsymbol{c} \times \boldsymbol{d})) = (\boldsymbol{ac})(\boldsymbol{bd}) - (\boldsymbol{bc})(\boldsymbol{ad})\,, \\
&(\boldsymbol{a} \times \boldsymbol{b}) \times (\boldsymbol{c} \times \boldsymbol{d}) = \boldsymbol{c}((\boldsymbol{a} \times \boldsymbol{b})\boldsymbol{d}) - \boldsymbol{d}((\boldsymbol{a} \times \boldsymbol{b})\boldsymbol{c})\,, \quad \boldsymbol{a} \times (\boldsymbol{b} \times \boldsymbol{c}) + \boldsymbol{b} \times (\boldsymbol{c} \times \boldsymbol{a}) + \boldsymbol{c} \times (\boldsymbol{a} \times \boldsymbol{b}) = 0\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Page 885 The vector product exists (almost) only in three-dimensional vector spaces. (See Appendix B.) The cross product vanishes if and only if the vectors are parallel. The parallelepiped spanned by three vectors $\boldsymbol{a}$, $\boldsymbol{b}$ and Challenge 175 e $\boldsymbol{c}$ has the volume $V = \boldsymbol{c}\,(\boldsymbol{a} \times \boldsymbol{b})$. The pyramid or tetrahedron formed by the three vectors has one sixth of that volume.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 64 The velocities and unit vectors for a rolling wheel



FIGURE 65 A simulated photograph of a rolling wheel with spokes

On a frictionless surface, as approximated by smooth ice or by a marble floor covered by a layer of oil, it is impossible to move forward. In order to move, we need to push *against* something. Is this also the case for rotation?

We note that the effects of rotation and many sensors for rotation are the same as for acceleration. But a few sensors for rotation are fundamentally new. In particular, we will Page 120 meet the gyroscope shortly.

Surprisingly, it is possible to turn even *without* pushing against something. You can check this on a well-oiled rotating office chair: simply rotate an arm above the head. After each turn of the hand, the orientation of the chair has changed by a small amount. Indeed, conservation of angular momentum and of rotational energy do not prevent bodies from changing their orientation. Cats learn this in their youth. After they have learned the trick, if they are dropped legs up, they can turn themselves in such a way that they always Ref. 74 land feet first. Snakes also know how to rotate themselves, as Figure 62 shows. During the Olympic Games one can watch board divers and gymnasts perform similar tricks. Challenge 176 d Rotation is thus different from translation in this aspect. (Why?)

Angular momentum is conserved. This statement is valid for any axis, provided that external forces (torques) play no role. To make the point, Jean-Marc Lévy-Leblond poses Ref. 2 the problem of Figure 63. Can the ape reach the banana without leaving the plate, assuming Challenge 177 s that the plate on which the ape rests can turn around the axis without friction?

Rolling wheels

Rotation is an interesting phenomenon in many ways. A rolling wheel does *not* turn around its axis, but around its point of contact. Let us show this.

A wheel of radius R is *rolling* if the speed of the axis v_{axis} is related to the angular velocity ω by

$$\omega = \frac{v_{\text{axis}}}{R} \,. \tag{26}$$

For any point P on the wheel, with distance r from the axis, the velocity v_{P} is the sum of the motion of the axis and the motion around the axis. Figure 64 shows that v_{P} is orthogonal to d, the distance between the point P and the contact point of the wheel. Challenge 178 e The figure also shows that the length ratio between v_{P} and d is the same as between v_{axis}

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 66 The measured motion of a walking human (© Ray McCoy)

and R. As a result, we can write

$$\boldsymbol{v}_P = \boldsymbol{\omega} \times \boldsymbol{d} \,, \tag{27}$$

which shows that a rolling wheel does indeed rotate about its point of contact with the ground.

Surprisingly, when a wheel rolls, some points on it move towards the wheel's axis, some stay at a fixed distance and others move away from it. Can you determine where these various points are located? Together, they lead to an interesting pattern when a rolling wheel with spokes, such as a bicycle wheel, is photographed.

Challenge 179 s
Ref. 75
Ref. 76

With these results you can tackle the following beautiful challenge. When a turning bicycle wheel is put on a slippery surface, it will slip for a while and then end up rolling. How does the final speed depend on the initial speed and on the friction?

Challenge 180 d

How do we walk?

> Golf is a good walk spoiled.
>
> Mark Twain

Why do we move our arms when walking or running? To save energy or to be graceful? In fact, whenever a body movement is performed with as little energy as possible, it is natural and graceful. This correspondence can indeed be taken as the actual definition of grace. The connection is common knowledge in the world of dance; it is also a central aspect of the methods used by actors to learn how to move their bodies as beautifully as possible.

Ref. 20

To convince yourself about the energy savings, try walking or running with your arms fixed or moving in the opposite direction to usual: the effort required is considerably higher. In fact, when a leg is moved, it produces a torque around the body axis which has to be counterbalanced. The method using the least energy is the swinging of arms. Since the arms are lighter than the legs, they must move further from the axis of the body, to compensate for the momentum; evolution has therefore moved the attachment of the arms, the shoulders, farther apart than those of the legs, the hips. Animals on two

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 67 The parallax – not drawn to scale

legs but no arms, such as penguins or pigeons, have more difficulty walking; they have to move their whole torso with every step.

Which muscles do most of the work when walking, the motion that experts call *gait*? Ref. 77 In 1980, Serge Gracovetsky found that in human gait a large fraction of the power comes from the muscles along the *spine*, not from those of the legs. (Indeed, people without legs are also able to walk. However, a number of muscles in the legs must work in oder to walk normally.) When you take a step, the lumbar muscles straighten the spine; this automatically makes it turn a bit to one side, so that the knee of the leg on that side automatically comes forward. When the foot is moved, the lumbar muscles can relax, and then straighten again for the next step. In fact, one can experience the increase in Challenge 181 e tension in the *back* muscles when walking without moving the arms, thus confirming where the human engine is located.

Human legs differ from those of apes in a fundamental aspect: humans are able to run. In fact the whole human body has been optimized for running, an ability that no other primate has. The human body has shed most of its hair to achieve better cooling, has evolved the ability to run while keeping the head stable, has evolved the right length of arms for proper balance when running, and even has a special ligament in the back that works as a shock absorber while running. In other words, running is the most human of all forms of motion.

Curiosities and fun challenges about conservation

> It is a mathematical fact that the casting of this pebble from my hand alters the centre of gravity of the universe.
>
> Thomas Carlyle,* *Sartor Resartus III.*

A car at a certain speed uses 7 litres of gasoline per 100 km. What is the combined air Challenge 183 s and rolling resistance? (Assume that the engine has an efficiency of 25%.)

* *

A cork is attached to a thin string a metre long. The string is passed over a long rod

Challenge 182 s * Thomas Carlyle (1797–1881), Scottish essayist. Do you agree with the quotation?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 68 Is it safe to let the cork go?



FIGURE 69 A simple model for continents and mountains

held horizontally, and a wine glass is attached at the other end. If you let go the cork in Figure 68, nothing breaks. Why not? And what happens? Challenge 184 s

* *

In 1907, Duncan MacDougalls, a medical doctor, measured the weight of dying people, in the hope to see whether death leads to a mass change. He found a sudden decrease between 10 and 20 g at the moment of death. He attributed it to the soul exiting the body. Can you find a more satisfying explanation? Ref. 78 Challenge 185 s

* *

The Earth's crust is less dense (2.7 kg/l) than the Earth's mantle (3.1 kg/l) and floats on it. As a result, the lighter crust below a mountain ridge must be much deeper than below a plain. If a mountain rises 1 km above the plain, how much deeper must the crust be below it? The simple block model shown in Figure 69 works fairly well; first, it explains why, near mountains, measurements of the deviation of free fall from the vertical line lead to so much lower values than those expected without a deep crust. Later, sound measurements have confirmed directly that the continental crust is indeed thicker beneath mountains. Challenge 186 s

* *

Take a pile of coins. One can push out the coins, starting with the one at the bottom, by shooting another coin over the table surface. The method also helps to visualize two-dimensional momentum conservation. Challenge 187 e

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 70 A well-known toy



FIGURE 71 An elastic collision that seems not to obey energy conservation

* *

In early 2004, two men and a woman earned £ 1.2 million in a single evening in a London casino. They did so by applying the formulae of Galilean mechanics. They used the method pioneered by various physicists in the 1950s who built various small computers that could predict the outcome of a roulette ball from the initial velocity imparted by the croupier. In the case in Britain, the group added a laser scanner to a smart phone that measured the path of a roulette ball and predicted the numbers where it would arrive. In this way, they increased the odds from 1 in 37 to about 1 in 6. After six months of investigations, Scotland Yard ruled that they could keep the money they won.

Ref. 79

In fact around the same time, a few people earned around 400 000 euro over a few weeks by using the same method in Germany, but with no computer at all. In certain casinos, machines were throwing the roulette ball. By measuring the position of the zero to the incoming ball with the naked eye, these gamblers were able to increase the odds of the bets they placed during the last allowed seconds and thus win a considerable sum purely through fast reactions.

* *

The toy of Figure 70 shows interesting behaviour: when a number of spheres are lifted and dropped to hit the resting ones, the same number of spheres detach on the other side, whereas the previously dropped spheres remain motionless. At first sight, all this seems to follow from energy and momentum conservation. However, energy and momentum conservation provide only two equations, which are insufficient to explain or determine the behaviour of five spheres. Why then do the spheres behave in this way? And why do they all swing in phase when a longer time has passed?

Challenge 188 d

* *

A surprising effect is used in home tools such as hammer drills. We remember that when a small ball elastically hits a large one at rest, both balls move after the hit, and the small one obviously moves faster than the large one. Despite this result, when a short cylin-

Ref. 80

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 72 The centre of mass defines stability



FIGURE 73 How does the ladder fall?

der hits a long one of the same diameter and material, but with a length that is some *integer* multiple of that of the short one, something strange happens. After the hit, the small cylinder remains almost at rest, whereas the large one moves, as shown in Figure 71. Even though the collision is elastic, conservation of energy seems not to hold in this case. (In fact this is the reason that demonstrations of elastic collisions in schools are always Challenge 189 d performed with spheres.) What happens to the energy?

* *

Does a wall get a stronger jolt when it is hit by a ball rebounding from it or when it is hit Challenge 190 s by a ball that remains stuck to it?

* *

Housewives know how to extract a cork of a wine bottle using a cloth. Can you imagine Challenge 191 s how? They also know how to extract the cork with the cloth if the cork has fallen inside the bottle. How?

* *

The sliding ladder problem, shown schematically in Figure 73, asks for the detailed motion of the ladder over time. The problem is more difficult than it looks, even if friction Challenge 192 ny is not taken into account. Can you say whether the lower end always touches the floor?

* *

A homogeneous ladder of length 5 m and mass 30 kg leans on a wall. The angle is 30°; the static friction coefficient on the wall is negligible, and on the floor it is 0.3. A person of mass 60 kg climbs the ladder. What is the maximum height the person can climb before the ladder starts sliding? This and many puzzles about ladders can be found on www.mathematische-basteleien.de/leiter.htm.

* *

Ref. 81 A common fly on the stern of a 30 000 ton ship of 100 m length tilts it by less than the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 74 Is this a possible situation or is it a fake photograph?

diameter of an atom. Today, distances that small are easily measured. Can you think of at least two methods, one of which should not cost more than 2000 euro? Challenge 193 s

* *

Is the image of three stacked spinning tops shown in Figure 74 a true photograph, showing a real observation, or is it the result of digital composition, showing an impossible situation? Challenge 194 ny

* *

How does the kinetic energy of a rifle bullet compare to that of a running man? Challenge 195 s

* *

What happens to the size of an egg when one places it in a jar of vinegar for a few days? Challenge 196 s

* *

What is the amplitude of a pendulum oscillating in such a way that the absolute value of its acceleration at the lowest point and at the return point are equal? Challenge 197 s

* *

Can you confirm that the value of the acceleration of a drop of water falling through vapour is $g/7$? Challenge 198 d

* *

You have two hollow spheres: they have the same weight, the same size and are painted in the same colour. One is made of copper, the other of aluminium. Obviously, they fall with the same speed and acceleration. What happens if they both roll down a tilted plane? Challenge 199 ny

* *

What is the shape of a rope when rope jumping? Challenge 200 ny

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 75 A commercial clock that needs no special energy source, because it takes its energy from the environment (© Jaeger-LeCoultre)

* *

Challenge 201 s How can you determine the speed of a rifle bullet with only a scale and a metre stick?

* *

Challenge 202 e Why does a gun make a hole in a door but cannot push it open, in exact contrast to what a finger can do?

* *

Challenge 203 s What is the curve described by the midpoint of a ladder sliding down a wall?

* *

Challenge 204 s A high-tech company, see www.enocean.com, sells electric switches for room lights that have no cables and no power cell (battery). You can glue such a switch to the centre of a window pane. How is this possible?

* *

Challenge 205 s Since over 50 years, a famous Swiss clock maker sells table clocks with a rotating pendulum that need no battery and no manual rewinding, as they take up energy from the environment. A specimen is shown in Figure 75. Can you imagine how this clock works?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

Which engine is more efficient: a moped or a human on a bicycle?

Summary on conservation

> The gods are not as rich as one might think: what they give to one, they take away from the other.
>
> Antiquity

We have encountered four conservation principles that are valid for closed systems in everyday life:

— conservation of total linear momentum,
— conservation of total angular momentum,
— conservation of total energy,
— conservation of total mass.

Later on, the theory of special relativity will show that the last two quantities are conserved only when taken together. None of these conservation laws applies to motion of images.

These conservation principles are among the great results in science. They limit the surprises that nature can offer: conservation means that linear momentum, angular momentum, and mass–energy can neither be created from nothing, nor can they disappear into nothing. Conservation limits creation. The above quote, almost blasphemous, expresses this idea.

Page 219

Later on we will find out that these results could have been deduced from three simple observations: closed systems behave the same independently of where they are, in what direction they are oriented and of the time at which they are set up. Motion is universal. In more abstract and somewhat more general terms, physicists like to say that all conservation principles are consequences of the invariances, or symmetries, of nature.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 5

FROM THE ROTATION OF THE EARTH TO THE RELATIVITY OF MOTION

> Eppur si muove!
>
> Anonymous*

Is the Earth rotating? The search for answers to this question gives a beautiful cross section of the history of classical physics. Around the year 265 BCE, the Greek thinker Ref. 82 Aristarchos of Samos maintained that the Earth rotates. He had measured the parallax of the Moon (today known to be up to 0.95°) and of the Sun (today known to be 8.8′).** The *parallax* is an interesting effect; it is the angle describing the difference between the directions of a body in the sky when seen by an observer on the surface of the Earth and when seen by a hypothetical observer at the Earth's centre. (See Figure 67.) Aristarchos noticed that the Moon and the Sun *wobble* across the sky, and this wobble has a period of 24 hours. He concluded that the Earth rotates.

Page 403 Measurements of the aberration of light also show the rotation of the Earth; it can be detected with a telescope while looking at the stars. The *aberration* is a change of the expected light direction, which we will discuss shortly. At the Equator, Earth rotation adds an angular deviation of 0.32′, changing sign every 12 hours, to the aberration due to the motion of the Earth around the Sun, about 20.5′. In modern times, astronomers have found a number of additional proofs, but none is accessible to the man on the street.

Furthermore, the measurements showing that the Earth is not a sphere, but is *flattened* at the poles, confirmed the rotation of the Earth. Again, however, this eighteenth century measurement by Maupertuis*** is not accessible to everyday observation.

Then, in the years 1790 to 1792 in Bologna, Giovanni Battista Guglielmini (1763–1817) finally succeeded in measuring what Galileo and Newton had predicted to be the simplest proof for the Earth's rotation. On the Earth, objects do not fall vertically, but are slightly deviated to the east. This deviation appears because an object keeps the larger hor-

* 'And yet she moves' is the sentence about the Earth attributed, most probably incorrectly, to Galileo since the 1640s. It is true, however, that at his trial he was forced to publicly retract the statement of a moving Earth to save his life. For more details, see the section on page 252.

** For the definition of angles see page 68, and for the definition of angle units see Appendix C.

*** Pierre Louis Moreau de Maupertuis (1698–1759), French physicist and mathematician. He was one of the key figures in the quest for the principle of least action, which he named in this way. He was also founding president of the Berlin Academy of Sciences. Maupertuis thought that the principle reflected the maximization of goodness in the universe. This idea was thoroughly ridiculed by Voltaire in this *Histoire du Docteur Akakia et du natif de Saint-Malo*, 1753. Maupertuis (www.voltaire-integral.com/Html/23/08DIAL.htm) performed his measurement of the Earth to distinguish between the theory of gravitation of Newton and that of Descartes, who had predicted that the Earth is elongated at the poles, instead of flattened.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 76 Earth's deviation from spherical shape due to its rotation (exaggerated)

FIGURE 77 The Coriolis effect: on a rotating object, freely moving object deviate from the straight line

izontal velocity it had at the height from which it started falling, as shown in Figure 78. Guglielmini's result was the first non-astronomical proof of the Earth's rotation. The experiments were repeated in 1802 by Johann Friedrich Benzenberg (1777–1846). Using metal balls which he dropped from the Michaelis tower in Hamburg – a height of 76 m – Benzenberg found that the deviation to the east was 9.6 mm. Can you confirm that the value measured by Benzenberg almost agrees with the assumption that the Earth turns once every 24 hours? (There is also a much smaller deviation towards the Equator, not measured by Guglielmini, Benzenberg or anybody after them up to this day; however, it completes the list of effects on free fall by the rotation of the Earth.) Both deviations are easily understood if we use the result (described below) that falling objects describe an ellipse around the centre of the rotating Earth. The elliptical shape shows that the path of a thrown stone does not lie on a plane for an observer standing on Earth; for such an observer, the exact path thus cannot be drawn on a piece of paper.

Challenge 206 ny

Page 155

In 1835, Gustave-Gaspard Coriolis discovered a closely related effect that nobody had as yet noticed in everyday life. Imagine a ball that rolls over a table. For a person on the floor, the ball rolls in a straight line. Now imagine that the table rotates. For the person on the floor, the ball still rolls in a straight line. But for a person on the rotating table, the ball traces a *curved* path. In short, any object that travels in a rotating background is subject to a transversal acceleration. This is the so-called *Coriolis acceleration* (or Coriolis effect).

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 78 The deviations of free fall towards the east and towards the Equator due to the rotation of the Earth

Now, the Earth is a rotating background. On the northern hemisphere, the rotation is anticlockwise. As the result, any moving object is slightly deviated to the right (while the magnitude of its velocity stays constant). On Earth, like on all rotating backgrounds, the *Coriolis acceleration* $\boldsymbol{a}$ results from the change of distance to the rotation axis. Can you deduce the analytical expression for it, namely $\boldsymbol{a}_C = -2\boldsymbol{\omega} \times \boldsymbol{v}$?

Challenge 207 s

On Earth, the Coriolis acceleration generally has a small value. Therefore it is best observed either in large-scale or high-speed phenomena. Indeed, the Coriolis acceleration determines the handedness of many large-scale phenomena with a spiral shape, such as the directions of cyclones and anticyclones in meteorology, the general wind patterns on Earth and the deflection of ocean currents and tides. These phenomena have opposite handedness on the northern and the southern hemisphere. Most beautifully, the Coriolis acceleration explains why icebergs do not follow the direction of the wind as they drift away from the polar caps. The Coriolis acceleration also plays a role in the flight of cannon balls (that was the original interest of Coriolis), in satellite launches, in the motion of sunspots and even in the motion of electrons in molecules. All these phenomena are of opposite sign on the northern and southern hemispheres and thus prove the rotation of the Earth. (In the First World War, many naval guns missed their targets in the southern hemisphere because the engineers had compensated them for the Coriolis effect in the northern hemisphere.)

Ref. 83

Ref. 84

Only in 1962, after several earlier attempts by other researchers, Asher Shapiro was the first to verify that the Coriolis effect has a tiny influence on the direction of the vortex formed by the water flowing out of a bathtub. Instead of a normal bathtub, he had to use a carefully designed experimental set-up because, contrary to an often-heard assertion, no such effect can be seen in a real bathtub. He succeeded only by carefully eliminating all disturbances from the system; for example, he waited 24 hours after the filling of the reservoir (and never actually stepped in or out of it!) in order to avoid any left-over motion of water that would disturb the effect, and built a carefully designed, completely rotationally-symmetric opening mechanism. Others have repeated the experiment in the southern hemisphere, finding opposite rotation direction and thus confirming the result. In other words, the handedness of usual bathtub vortices is *not* caused by the rotation of the Earth, but results from the way the water starts to flow out. But let us go on with the story about the Earth's rotation.

Ref. 85

Ref. 85

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 79 The turning motion of a pendulum showing the rotation of the Earth

In 1851, the French physician-turned-physicist Jean Bernard Léon Foucault (b. 1819 Paris, d. 1868 Paris) performed an experiment that removed all doubts and rendered him world-famous practically overnight. He suspended a 67 m long pendulum* in the Panthéon in Paris and showed the astonished public that the direction of its swing changed over time, rotating slowly. To anybody with a few minutes of patience to watch the change of direction, the experiment proved that the Earth rotates. If the Earth did not rotate, the swing of the pendulum would always continue in the same direction. On a rotating Earth, in Paris, the direction changes to the right, in clockwise sense, as shown in Figure 79. The direction does not change if the pendulum is located at the Equator, and it changes to the left in the southern hemisphere.** A modern version of the pendulum can be observed via the web cam at pendelcam.kip.uni-heidelberg.de/; high speed films of the pendulum's motion during day and night can be downloaded at www.kip.uni-heidelberg.de/OeffWiss/Pendel-Internetauftritt/zeitraffer.php. (Several pendulum animations, with exaggerated deviation, can be found at commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Foucault_pendulum).

The time over which the orientation of the pendulum's swing performs a full turn – the *precession time* – can be calculated. Study a pendulum starting to swing in the North–South direction and you will find that the precession time T_{Foucault} is given by

Challenge 209 d

$$T_{\text{Foucault}} = \frac{23\,\text{h}\ 56\,\text{min}}{\sin\varphi} \tag{28}$$

where φ is the latitude of the location of the pendulum, e.g. 0° at the Equator and 90° at the North Pole. This formula is one of the most beautiful results of Galilean kinematics.***

Challenge 208 d
Ref. 86

* Why was such a long pendulum necessary? Understanding the reasons allows one to repeat the experiment at home, using a pendulum as short as 70 cm, with the help of a few tricks. To observe the effect with a simple set-up, attach a pendulum to your office chair and rotate the chair slowly.

** The discovery also shows how precision and genius go together. In fact, the first person to observe the effect was Vincenzo Viviani, a student of Galilei, as early as 1661! Indeed, Foucault had read about Viviani's work in the publications of the Academia dei Lincei. But it took Foucault's genius to connect the effect to the rotation of the Earth; nobody had done so before him.

*** The calculation of the period of Foucault's pendulum assumes that the precession rate is constant during a rotation. This is only an approximation (though usually a good one).

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 80 The gyroscope: the original system by Foucault with its freely movable spinning top, the mechanical device to bring it to speed, the optical device to detect its motion, the general construction principle, and a modern (triangular) ring laser gyroscope, based on colour change of rotating laser light instead of angular changes of a rotating mass (© CNAM, JAXA)

Foucault was also the inventor and namer of the *gyroscope*. He built the device, shown in Figure 80, in 1852, one year after his pendulum. With it, he again demonstrated the rotation of the Earth. Once a gyroscope rotates, the axis stays fixed in space – but only when seen from distant stars or galaxies. (This is not the same as talking about absolute space. Why?) For an observer on Earth, the axis direction changes regularly with a period of 24 hours. Gyroscopes are now routinely used in ships and in aeroplanes to give the direction of north, because they are more precise and more reliable than magnetic compasses. In the most modern versions, one uses laser light running in circles instead of rotating masses.*

Challenge 210 s

In 1909, Roland von Eötvös measured a simple effect: due to the rotation of the Earth, the weight of an object depends on the direction in which it moves. As a result, a balance in rotation around the vertical axis does not stay perfectly horizontal: the balance starts to oscillate slightly. Can you explain the origin of the effect?

Challenge 212 s

Challenge 211 s * Can you guess how rotation is detected in this case?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 81 Showing the rotation of the Earth through the rotation of an axis



FIGURE 82 Demonstrating the rotation of the Earth with water

Ref. 87 In 1910, John Hagen published the results of an even simpler experiment, proposed by Louis Poinsot in 1851. Two masses are put on a horizontal bar that can turn around a vertical axis, a so-called *isotomeograph*. If the two masses are slowly moved towards the support, as shown in Figure 81, and if the friction is kept low enough, the bar rotates. Obviously, this would not happen if the Earth were not rotating. Can you explain the Challenge 213 s observation? This little-known effect is also useful for winning bets between physicists.

Ref. 88 In 1913, Arthur Compton showed that a closed tube filled with water and some small floating particles (or bubbles) can be used to show the rotation of the Earth. The device is called a *Compton tube* or *Compton wheel*. Compton showed that when a horizontal tube filled with water is rotated by 180°, something happens that allows one to prove that the Earth rotates. The experiment, shown in Figure 82, even allows measurement of the Challenge 214 d latitude of the point where the experiment is made. Can you guess what happens?

Page 1006 In 1925, Albert Michelson* and his collaborators in Illinois built several interferometers for light and detected the rotation of the Earth. One system is shown in Figure 83; the largest interferometer they constructed had an arm length of 32 m. Interferometers produce bright and dark fringes of light; the position of the fringes depends on the speed at which the interferometers rotates. The fringe shift is due to an effect first measured in 1913 by the French physicist Georges Sagnac: the rotation of a complete ring interferometer with angular frequency (vector) $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ produces a fringe shift of angular phase $\Delta\varphi$ given Challenge 215 s by

$$\Delta\varphi = \frac{8\pi\, \boldsymbol{\Omega}\, \boldsymbol{a}}{c\,\lambda} \tag{29}$$

where $\boldsymbol{a}$ is the area (vector) enclosed by the two interfering light rays, λ their wavelength and c the speed of light. The effect is now called the *Sagnac effect*, even though it had Ref. 89 already been predicted 20 years earlier by Oliver Lodge.** Also for a fixed interferometer, Michelson and his team found a fringe shift with a period of 24 hours and of exactly

* Albert Abraham Michelson (b. 1852 Strelno, d. 1931 Pasadena) Prussian–Polish–US-American physicist, obsessed by the precise measurement of the speed of light, received the Nobel Prize in Physics in 1907.

** Oliver Lodge (1851–1940) was a British physicist who studied electromagnetic waves and tried to commu-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 83 One of the early interferometers built by Michelson and Morley, and a modern precision ring laser interferometer (© Bundesamt für Kartographie und Geodäsie, Carl Zeiss)

the magnitude predicted by the rotation of the Earth with equation (29). Modern high precision versions use ring lasers with areas of only a few square metres, but which are able to measure variations of the rotation rates of the Earth of less than one part per million. Indeed, over the course of a year the length of a day varies irregularly by a few milliseconds, mostly due to influences from the Sun or the Moon, due to weather changes and due to hot magma flows deep inside the Earth.* But also earthquakes, the El Niño effect in the climate and the filling of large water dams have effects on the rotation of the Earth. All these effects can be studied with such precision interferometers; these can also be used for research into the motion of the soil due to lunar tides or earthquakes, and for checks on the theory of special relativity.

Ref. 90

In 1948, Hans Bucka developed the simplest experiment so far to show the rotation of the Earth. A metal rod allows one to detect the rotation of the Earth after only a few seconds of observation. The experiment can be easily be performed in class. Can you guess how it works?

Ref. 91

Challenge 216 s

nicate with the dead. A strange but influential figure, his ideas are often cited when fun needs to be made of physicists; for example, he was one of those (rare) physicists who believed that at the end of the nineteenth century physics was complete.

* The growth of leaves on trees and the consequent change in the Earth's moment of inertia, already studied in 1916 by Harold Jeffreys, is way too small to be seen, so far.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 84 Observing the rotation of the Earth in two seconds

In summary, observations show that the Earth surface rotates at 463 m/s at the Equator, a larger value than that of the speed of sound in air – about 340 m/s in usual conditions – and that we are in fact *whirling* through the universe.

How does the Earth rotate?

Is the rotation of the Earth *constant* over geological time scales? That is a hard question. If you find a method leading to an answer, publish it! (The same is true for the question whether the length of the year is constant.) Only a few methods are known, as we will find out shortly.

Ref. 92

The rotation of the Earth is not even constant during a human lifespan. It varies by a few parts in 10^8. In particular, on a 'secular' time scale, the length of the day increases by about 1 to 2 ms per century, mainly because of the friction by the Moon and the melting of the polar ice caps. This was deduced by studying historical astronomical observations of the ancient Babylonian and Arab astronomers. Additional 'decadic' changes have an amplitude of 4 or 5 ms and are due to the motion of the liquid part of the Earth's core.

Ref. 93

The seasonal and biannual changes of the length of the day – with an amplitude of 0.4 ms over six months, another 0.5 ms over the year, and 0.08 ms over 24 to 26 months – are mainly due to the effects of the atmosphere. In the 1950s the availability of precision measurements showed that there is even a 14 and 28 day period with an amplitude of 0.2 ms, due to the Moon. In the 1970s, when wind oscillations with a length scale of about 50 days were discovered, they were also found to alter the length of the day, with an amplitude of about 0.25 ms. However, these last variations are quite irregular.

But why does the Earth rotate at all? The rotation derives from the rotating gas cloud at the origin of the solar system. This connection explains that the Sun and all planets, except one, turn around themselves in the same direction, and that they also all turn around the Sun in that same direction. But the complete story is outside the scope of this text.

Ref. 94

The rotation around its axis is not the only motion of the Earth; it performs other motions as well. This was already known long ago. In 128 BCE, the Greek astronomer Hipparchos discovered what is today called the *(equinoctial) precession*. He compared a

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 85 The precession and the nutation of the Earth's axis

measurement he made himself with another made 169 years before. Hipparchos found that the Earth's axis points to different stars at different times. He concluded that the sky was moving. Today we prefer to say that the axis of the Earth is moving. During a period of 25 800 years the axis draws a cone with an opening angle of 23.5°. This motion, shown in Figure 85, is generated by the tidal forces of the Moon and the Sun on the equatorial bulge of the Earth that results form its flattening. The Sun and the Moon try to align the axis of the Earth at right angles to the Earth's path; this torque leads to the precession of the Earth's axis.

Precession is a motion common to all rotating systems: it appears in planets, spinning tops and atoms. (Precession is also at the basis of the surprise related to the suspended wheel shown on page 191.) Precession is most easily seen in spinning tops, be they suspended or not. An example is shown in Figure 86; for atomic nuclei or planets, just imagine that the suspending wire is missing and the rotating body less flat.

In addition, the axis of the Earth is not even fixed relative to the Earth's surface. In 1884, by measuring the exact angle above the horizon of the celestial North Pole, Friedrich Küstner (1856–1936) found that the axis of the Earth *moves* with respect to the Earth's crust, as Bessel had suggested 40 years earlier. As a consequence of Küstner's discovery, the International Latitude Service was created. The *polar motion* Küstner discovered turned out to consist of three components: a small linear drift – not yet understood – a

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 86 Precession of a suspended spinning top (mpg film © Lucas V. Barbosa)



FIGURE 87 The motion of the North Pole from 2003 to 2007, including the prediction until 2008 (left) and the average position since 1900 (right) – with 0.1 arcsecond being around 3.1 m on the surface of the Earth – not showing the diurnal and semidiurnal variations of a fraction of a millisecond of arc due to the tides (from http://hpiers.obspm.fr/eop-pc)

yearly elliptical motion due to seasonal changes of the air and water masses, and a circular motion* with a period of about 1.2 years due to fluctuations in the pressure at the bottom of the oceans. In practice, the North Pole moves with an amplitude of about 15 m around an average central position, as shown in Figure 87. Short term variations of the

Ref. 95

* The circular motion, a wobble, was predicted by the great Swiss mathematician Leonhard Euler (1707–1783). In an incredible story, using Euler's and Bessel's predictions and Küstner's data, in 1891 Seth Chandler claimed to be the discoverer of the circular component.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 88 The continental plates are the objects of tectonic motion

North Pole position, due to local variations in atmospheric pressure, to weather change and to the tides, have also been measured. Ref. 96

In 1912, the German meteorologist and geophysicist Alfred Wegener (1880–1930) discovered an even larger effect. After studying the shapes of the continental shelves and the geological layers on both sides of the Atlantic, he conjectured that the continents *move*, and that they are all fragments of a single continent that broke up 200 million years ago.*

Even though at first derided across the world, Wegener's discoveries were correct. Modern satellite measurements, shown in Figure 88, confirm this model. For example, the American continent moves away from the European continent by about 10 mm every year. There are also speculations that this velocity may have been much higher at certain periods in the past. The way to check this is to look at the magnetization of sedimental rocks. At present, this is still a hot topic of research. Following the modern version of the model, called *plate tectonics*, the continents (with a density of $2.7 \cdot 10^3\,\mathrm{kg/m^3}$) float on the fluid mantle of the Earth (with a density of $3.1 \cdot 10^3\,\mathrm{kg/m^3}$) like pieces of cork on water, and the convection inside the mantle provides the driving mechanism for the motion. Page 110, page 780 Ref. 97

Does the Earth move?

The centre of the Earth is not at rest in the universe. In the third century BCE Aristarchos of Samos maintained that the Earth turns around the Sun. However, a fundamental difficulty of the heliocentric system is that the stars look the same all year long. How can this be, if the Earth travels around the Sun? The distance between the Earth and the Sun has been known since the seventeenth century, but it was only in 1837 that Friedrich Wilhelm

* In this old continent, called Gondwanaland, there was a huge river that flowed westwards from the Chad to Guayaquil in Ecuador. After the continent split up, this river still flowed to the west. When the Andes appeared, the water was blocked, and many millions of years later, it flowed back. Today, the river still flows eastwards and is called the Amazon River.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 24 Modern measurement data about the motion of the Earth (from hpiers.obspm.fr/eop-pc)

Observable	Symbol	Value
Mean angular velocity of Earth	Ω	72.921 150(1) µrad/s
Nominal angular velocity of Earth (epoch 1820)	Ω_N	72.921 151 467 064 µrad/s
Conventional mean solar day (epoch 1820)	d	86 400 s
Conventional sidereal day	d_{si}	86 164.090 530 832 88 s
Ratio conv. mean solar day to conv. sidereal day	$k = d/d_{si}$	1.002 737 909 350 795
Conventional duration of the stellar day	d_{st}	86 164.098 903 691 s
Ratio conv. mean solar day to conv. stellar day	$k' = d/d_{st}$	1.002 737 811 911 354 48
General precession in longitude	p	5.028 792(2) ″/a
Obliquity of the ecliptic (epoch 2000)	ε_0	23° 26′ 21.4119 ″
Küstner-Chandler period in terrestrial frame	T_{KC}	433.1(1.7) d
Quality factor of the Küstner-Chandler peak	Q_{KC}	170
Free core nutation period in celestial frame	T_F	430.2(3) d
Quality factor of the free core nutation	Q_F	$2 \cdot 10^4$
Astronomical unit	AU	149 597 870.691(6) km
Sidereal year (epoch 2000)	a_{si}	365.256 363 004 d = 365 d 6 h 9 min 9.76 s
Tropical year	a_{tr}	365.242 190 402 d = 365 d 5 h 48 min 45.25 s
Mean Moon period	T_M	27.321 661 55(1) d
Earth's equatorial radius	a	6 378 136.6(1) m
First equatorial moment of inertia	A	$8.0101(2) \cdot 10^{37}$ kg m^2
Longitude of principal inertia axis A	λ_A	−14.9291(10)°
Second equatorial moment of inertia	B	$8.0103(2) \cdot 10^{37}$ kg m^2
Axial moment of inertia	C	$8.0365(2) \cdot 10^{37}$ kg m^2
Equatorial moment of inertia of mantle	A_m	$7.0165 \cdot 10^{37}$ kg m^2
Axial moment of inertia of mantle	C_m	$7.0400 \cdot 10^{37}$ kg m^2
Earth's flattening	f	1/298.25642(1)
Astronomical Earth's dynamical flattening	$H = (C - A)/C$	0.003 273 794 9(1)
Geophysical Earth's dynamical flattening	$e = (C - A)/A$	0.003 284 547 9(1)
Earth's core dynamical flattening	e_f	0.002 646(2)
Second degree term in Earth's gravity potential	$J_2 = -(A + B - 2C)/(2MR^2)$	$1.082\,635\,9(1) \cdot 10^{-3}$
Secular rate of J_2	dJ_2/dt	$-2.6(3) \cdot 10^{-11}$ /a
Love number (measures shape distortion by tides)	k_2	0.3
Secular Love number	k_s	0.9383
Mean equatorial gravity	g_{eq}	9.780 3278(10) m/s^2
Geocentric constant of gravitation	GM	$3.986\,004\,418(8) \cdot 10^{14}$ m^3/s^2
Heliocentric constant of gravitation	$GM_\odot$	$1.327\,124\,420\,76(50) \cdot 10^{20}$ m^3/s^2
Moon-to-Earth mass ratio	μ	0.012 300 038 3(5)

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 89 Friedrich Wilhelm Bessel (1784–1846)

Bessel* became the first to observe the *parallax* of a star. This was a result of extremely careful measurements and complex calculations: he discovered the *Bessel functions* in order to realize it. He was able to find a star, 61 Cygni, whose apparent position changed with the month of the year. Seen over the whole year, the star describes a small ellipse in the sky, with an opening of 0.588″ (this is the modern value). After carefully eliminating all other possible explanations, he deduced that the change of position was due to the motion of the Earth around the Sun, and from the size of the ellipse he determined the distance to the star to be 105 Pm, or 11.1 light years.

Challenge 217 s

Bessel had thus managed for the first time to measure the distance of a star. By doing so he also proved that the Earth is not fixed with respect to the stars in the sky and that the Earth indeed revolves around the Sun. The motion itself was not a surprise. It confirmed the result of the mentioned aberration of light, discovered in 1728 by James Bradley** and to be discussed shortly; the Earth moves around the Sun.

Page 403

With the improvement of telescopes, other motions of the Earth were discovered. In 1748, James Bradley announced that there is a small regular *change* of the precession, which he called *nutation*, with a period of 18.6 years and an angular amplitude of 19.2″. Nutation occurs because the plane of the Moon's orbit around the Earth is not exactly the same as the plane of the Earth's orbit around the Sun. Are you able to confirm that this situation produces nutation?

Challenge 218 ny

Astronomers also discovered that the 23.5° tilt – or *obliquity* – of the Earth's axis, the angle between its intrinsic and its orbital angular momentum, actually changes from 22.1° to 24.5° with a period of 41 000 years. This motion is due to the attraction of the Sun and the deviations of the Earth from a spherical shape. In 1941, during the Second World War, the Serbian astronomer Milutin Milankovitch (1879–1958) retreated into solitude and studied the consequences. In his studies he realized that this 41 000 year period of the obliquity, together with an average period of 22 000 years due to precession,*** gives rise

* Friedrich Wilhelm Bessel (1784–1846), Westphalian astronomer who left a successful business career to dedicate his life to the stars, and became the foremost astronomer of his time.

** James Bradley, (1693–1762), English astronomer. He was one of the first astronomers to understand the value of precise measurement, and thoroughly modernized Greenwich. He discovered the aberration of light, a discovery that showed that the Earth moves and also allowed him to measure the speed of light; he also discovered the nutation of the Earth.

*** In fact, the 25 800 year precession leads to three insolation periods, of 23 700, 22 400 and 19 000 years,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 90 Changes in the Earth's motion around the Sun



FIGURE 91 The angular size of the sun changes due to the elliptical motion of the Earth (© Anthony Ayiomamitis)

to the more than 20 *ice ages* in the last 2 million years. This happens through stronger or weaker irradiation of the poles by the Sun. The changing amounts of melted ice then lead to changes in average temperature. The last ice age had is peak about 20 000 years ago and ended around 11 800 years ago; the next is still far away. A spectacular confirmation of the

due to the interaction between precession and perihelion shift.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 92 Modern measurements showing how Earth's precession parameter (black curve A) and obliquity (black curve D) influence the average temperature (coloured curve B) and the irradiation of the Earth (blue curve C) over the past 800 000 years: the obliquity deduced by Fourier analysis from the irradiation data RF (blue curve D) and the obliquity deduced by Fourier analysis from the temperature (red curve D) match the obliquity known from astronomical data (black curve D); sharp cooling events took place whenever the obliquity rose while the precession parameter was falling (marked red below the temperature curve) (© Jean Jouzel/Science from Ref. 98)

relation between ice age cycles and astronomy came through measurements of oxygen isotope ratios in ice cores and sea sediments, which allow the average temperature over the past million years to be tracked. Figure 92 shows how closely the temperature follows the changes in irradiation due to changes in obliquity and precession. Ref. 98

The Earth's orbit also changes its *eccentricity* with time, from completely circular to slightly oval and back. However, this happens in very complex ways, not with periodic regularity, and is due to the influence of the large planets of the solar system on the Earth's orbit. The typical time scale is 100 000 to 125 000 years.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 93 The motion of the Sun around the galaxy

In addition, the Earth's orbit changes in *inclination* with respect to the orbits of the other planets; this seems to happen regularly every 100 000 years. In this period the inclination changes from +2.5° to −2.5° and back.

Even the direction in which the ellipse points changes with time. This so-called *perihelion shift* is due in large part to the influence of the other planets; a small remaining part will be important in the chapter on general relativity. It was the first piece of data confirming the theory.

Obviously, the length of the year also changes with time. The measured variations are of the order of a few parts in 10^{11} or about 1 ms per year. However, knowledge of these changes and of their origins is much less detailed than for the changes in the Earth's rotation.

The next step is to ask whether the Sun itself moves. Indeed it does. Locally, it moves with a speed of 19.4 km/s towards the constellation of Hercules. This was shown by William Herschel in 1783. But globally, the motion is even more interesting. The diameter of the galaxy is at least 100 000 light years, and we are located 26 000 light years from the centre. (This has been known since 1918; the centre of the galaxy is located in the direction of Sagittarius.) At our position, the galaxy is 1 300 light years thick; presently, we are 68 light years 'above' the centre plane. The Sun, and with it the solar system, takes about 225 million years to turn once around the galactic centre, its orbital velocity being around 220 km/s. It seems that the Sun will continue moving away from the galaxy plane until it is about 250 light years above the plane, and then move back, as shown in Figure 93. The oscillation period is estimated to be around 62 million years, and has been suggested as the mechanism for the mass extinctions of animal life on Earth, possibly because some gas cloud or some cosmic radiation source may be periodically encountered on the way. The issue is still a hot topic of research.

Ref. 99

We turn around the galaxy centre because the formation of galaxies, like that of solar systems, always happens in a whirl. By the way, can you confirm from your own observation that our galaxy itself rotates?

Challenge 219 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Finally, we can ask whether the galaxy itself moves. Its motion can indeed be observed because it is possible to give a value for the motion of the Sun through the universe, defining it as the motion against the background radiation. This value has been measured to be 370 km/s. (The velocity of the *Earth* through the background radiation of course depends on the season.) This value is a combination of the motion of the Sun around the galaxy centre and of the motion of the galaxy itself. This latter motion is due to the gravitational attraction of the other, nearby galaxies in our local group of galaxies.*

Ref. 100

In summary, the Earth really moves, and it does so in rather complex ways. As Henri Poincaré would say, if we are in a given spot today, say the Panthéon in Paris, and come back to the same spot tomorrow at the same time, we are in fact 31 million kilometres away. This state of affairs would make time travel extremely difficult even if it were possible (which it is not); whenever you went back to the past, you would have to get to the old spot exactly!

Is velocity absolute? – The theory of everyday relativity

Why don't we feel all the motions of the Earth? The two parts of the answer were already given in 1632. First of all, as Galileo explained, we do not feel the accelerations of the Earth because the effects they produce are too small to be detected by our senses. Indeed, many of the mentioned accelerations do induce measurable effects only in high-precision experiments, e.g. in atomic clocks.

Page 515

But the second point made by Galileo is equally important: it is impossible to feel that we are moving. We do not feel translational, unaccelerated motions because this is impossible *in principle*. Galileo discussed the issue by comparing the observations of two observers: one on the ground and another on the most modern means of unaccelerated transportation of the time, a ship. Galileo asked whether a man on the ground and a man in a ship moving at constant speed experience (or 'feel') anything different. Einstein used observers in trains. Later it became fashionable to use travellers in rockets. (What will come next?) Galileo explained that only *relative* velocities between bodies produce effects, not the absolute values of the velocities. For the senses, there is no difference between constant, undisturbed motion, however rapid it may be, and rest. This is now called *Galileo's principle of relativity*. In everyday life we feel motion only if the means of transportation trembles (thus if it accelerates), or if we move against the air. Therefore Galileo concludes that two observers in straight and undisturbed motion against each other cannot say who is 'really' moving. Whatever their relative speed, neither of them 'feels' in motion.**

Challenge 220 e

* This is roughly the end of the ladder. Note that the expansion of the universe, to be studied later, produces no motion.

** In 1632, in his *Dialogo*, Galileo writes: 'Shut yourself up with some friend in the main cabin below decks on some large ship, and have with you there some flies, butterflies, and other small flying animals. Have a large bowl of water with some fish in it; hang up a bottle that empties drop by drop into a wide vessel beneath it. With the ship standing still, observe carefully how the little animals fly with equal speed to all sides of the cabin. The fish swim indifferently in all directions; the drops fall into the vessel beneath; and, in throwing something to your friend, you need throw it no more strongly in one direction than another, the distances being equal: jumping with your feet together, you pass equal spaces in every direction. When you have observed all these things carefully (though there is no doubt that when the ship is standing still everything must happen in this way), have the ship proceed with any speed you like, so long as the motion

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Rest is relative. Or more clearly: rest is an observer-dependent concept. This result of Galilean physics is so important that Poincaré introduced the expression 'theory of relativity' and Einstein repeated the principle explicitly when he published his famous theory of special relativity. However, these names are awkward. Galilean physics is also a theory of relativity! The relativity of rest is common to *all* of physics; it is an essential aspect of motion.

Undisturbed or uniform motion has no observable effect; only *change* of motion does. As a result, every physicist can deduce something simple about the following statement by Wittgenstein:

> Daß die Sonne morgen aufgehen wird, ist eine Hypothese; und das heißt: wir *wissen* nicht, ob sie aufgehen wird.*

The statement is *wrong*. Can you explain why Wittgenstein erred here, despite his strong desire not to?

Challenge 221 s

Is rotation relative?

When we turn rapidly, our arms lift. Why does this happen? How can our body detect whether we are rotating or not? There are two possible answers. The first approach, promoted by Newton, is to say that there is an absolute space; whenever we rotate against this space, the system reacts. The other answer is to note that whenever the arms lift, the stars also rotate, and in exactly the same manner. In other words, our body detects rotation because we move against the average mass distribution in space.

The most cited discussion of this question is due to Newton. Instead of arms, he explored the water in a rotating bucket. As usual for philosophical issues, Newton's answer was guided by the mysticism triggered by his father's early death. Newton saw absolute space as a religious concept and was not even able to conceive an alternative. Newton

is uniform and not fluctuating this way and that, you will discover not the least change in all the effects named, nor could you tell from any of them whether the ship was moving or standing still. In jumping, you will pass on the floor the same spaces as before, nor will you make larger jumps toward the stern than toward the prow even though the ship is moving quite rapidly, despite the fact that during the time you are in the air the floor under you will be going in a direction opposite to your jump. In throwing something to your companion, you will need no more force to get it to him whether he is in the direction of the bow or the stern, with yourself situated opposite. The droplets will fall as before into the vessel beneath without dropping toward the stern, although while the drops are in the air the ship runs many spans. The fish in their water will swim toward the front of their bowl with no more effort than toward the back, and will go with equal ease to bait placed anywhere around the edges of the bowl. Finally the butterflies and flies will continue their flights indifferently toward every side, nor will it ever happen that they are concentrated toward the stern, as if tired out from keeping up with the course of the ship, from which they will have been separated during long intervals by keeping themselves in the air. And if smoke is made by burning some incense, it will be seen going up in the form of a little cloud, remaining still and moving no more toward one side than the other. The cause of all these correspondences of effects is the fact that the ship's motion is common to all the things contained in it, and to the air also. That is why I said you should be below decks; for if this took place above in the open air, which would not follow the course of the ship, more or less noticeable differences would be seen in some of the effects noted.'

* 'That the Sun will rise to-morrow, is an hypothesis; and that means that we do not *know* whether it will rise.' This well-known statement is found in Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 6.36311.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 94 Observation of sonoluminescence (© Detlev Lohse)

thus sees rotation as an absolute concept. Most modern scientist have fewer problems and more common sense than Newton; as a result, today's consensus is that rotation effects are due to the mass distribution in the universe: rotation is relative. However, we have to be honest; the question cannot be settled by Galilean physics. We will need general relativity.

Curiosities and fun challenges about relativity

When travelling in the train, you can test Galileo's statement about everyday relativity of motion. Close your eyes and ask somebody to turn you around many times: are you able Challenge 222 e to say in which direction the train is running?

* *

A good bathroom scales, used to determine the weight of objects, does not show a con- Challenge 223 s stant weight when you step on it and stay motionless. Why not?

* *

Challenge 224 s If a gun located at the Equator shoots a bullet vertically, where does the bullet fall?

* *

Challenge 225 s Why are most rocket launch sites as near as possible to the Equator?

* *

Would travelling through interplanetary space be healthy? People often fantasize about long trips through the cosmos. Experiments have shown that on trips of long duration, cosmic radiation, bone weakening and muscle degeneration are the biggest dangers. Many medical experts question the viability of space travel lasting longer than a couple of years. Other dangers are rapid sunburn, at least near the Sun, and exposure to Ref. 101 the vacuum. So far only one man has experienced vacuum without protection. He lost consciousness after 14 seconds, but survived unharmed.

* *

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 226 s In which direction does a flame lean if it burns inside a jar on a rotating turntable?

* *

A ping-pong ball is attached by a string to a stone, and the whole is put under water in a jar. The set-up is shown in Figure 95. Now the jar is accelerated horizontally. In which Challenge 227 s direction does the ball move? What do you deduce for a jar at rest?

* *

Galileo's principle of everyday relativity states that it is impossible to determine an absolute velocity. It is equally impossible to determine an absolute position, an absolute time Challenge 228 ny and an absolute direction. Is this correct?

* *

Does centrifugal acceleration exist? Most university students go through the shock of meeting a teacher who says that it doesn't because it is a 'fictitious' quantity, in the face of what one experiences every day in a car when driving around a bend. Simply ask the teacher who denies it to define 'existence'. (The definition physicists usually use is given in Page 856 an upcoming chapter.) Then check whether the definition applies to the term and make Challenge 229 s up your own mind.

* *

Rotation holds a surprise for anybody who studies it carefully. Angular momentum is a quantity with a magnitude and a direction. However, it is not a vector, as any mirror shows. The angular momentum of a body circling in a plane parallel to a mirror behaves in a different way from a usual arrow: its mirror image is not reflected if it points towards Challenge 230 e the mirror! You can easily check this for yourself. For this reason, angular momentum is called a *pseudovector*. The fact has no important consequences in classical physics; but we have to keep it in mind for later occasions.

* *

What is the best way to transport a number of full coffee or tea cups while at the same Challenge 231 s time avoiding spilling any precious liquid?

* *

The Moon recedes from the Earth by 3.8 cm a year, due to friction. Can you find the Challenge 232 s mechanism responsible for the effect?

* *

What are earthquakes? *Earthquakes* are large examples of the same process that make a door squeak. The continental plates correspond to the metal surfaces in the joints of the door.

Earthquakes can be described as energy sources. The Richter scale is a direct measure of this energy. The *Richter magnitude* M_S of an earthquake, a pure number, is defined

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 95 How does the ball move when the jar is accelerated in direction of the arrow?



FIGURE 96 The famous Celtic stone and a version made with a spoon

from its energy E in joule via

$$M_s = \frac{\log(E/1\,\mathrm{J}) - 4.8}{1.5} \,. \tag{30}$$

The strange numbers in the expression have been chosen to put the earthquake values as near as possible to the older, qualitative Mercalli scale (now called EMS98) that classifies the intensity of earthquakes. However, this is not fully possible; the most sensitive instruments today detect earthquakes with magnitudes of −3. The highest value every measured was a Richter magnitude of 10, in Chile in 1960. Magnitudes above 12 are probably impossible. (Can you show why?)

Challenge 233 s

* *

Figure 96 shows the so-called *Celtic wiggle stone* (also called *wobblestone* or *rattleback*), a stone that starts rotating on a plane surface when it is put into oscillation. The size can vary between a few centimetres and a few metres. By simply bending a spoon one can realize a primitive form of this strange device, if the bend is not completely symmetrical. The rotation is always in the same direction. If the stone is put into rotation in the wrong direction, after a while it stops and starts rotating in the other sense! Can you explain the effect?

Ref. 80

Challenge 234 d

* *

What is the motion of the point on the surface of the Earth that has Sun in its zenith (i.e., vertically above it), when seen on a map of the Earth during one day, and day after day?

Challenge 235 ny

* *

The moment of inertia of a body depends on the shape of the body; usually, angular momentum and the angular velocity do not point in the same direction. Can you confirm this with an example?

Challenge 236 s

* *

Can it happen that a satellite dish for geostationary TV satellites focuses the sunshine onto the receiver?

Challenge 237 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 97 What happens when the ape climbs?

* *

Challenge 238 s Why is it difficult to fire a rocket from an aeroplane in the direction opposite to the motion of the plane?

* *

Challenge 239 s An ape hangs on a rope. The rope hangs over a wheel and is attached to a mass of equal weight hanging down on the other side, as shown in Figure 97. The rope and the wheel are massless and frictionless. What happens when the ape climbs the rope?

* *

Challenge 240 s Can a water skier move with a higher speed than the boat pulling him?

* *

Challenge 241 e Take two cans of the same size and weight, one full of ravioli and one full of peas. Which one rolls faster on an inclined plane?

* *

Challenge 242 s What is the moment of inertia of a homogeneous sphere?

* *

Challenge 243 s The moment of inertia is determined by the values of its three principal axes. These are all equal for a sphere and for a cube. Does it mean that it is impossible to distinguish a sphere from a cube by their inertial behaviour?

* *

Challenge 244 d You might know the 'Dynabee', a hand-held gyroscopic device that can be accelerated to high speed by proper movements of the hand. How does it work?

* *

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 98 A long exposure of the stars at night - over the Gemini telescope in Hawaii (© Gemini Observatory/AURA)

Challenge 245 s It is possible to make a spinning top with a metal paper clip. It is even possible to make one of those tops that turn onto their head when spinning. Can you find out how?

* *

Challenge 246 s Is it true that the Moon in the first quarter in the northern hemisphere looks like the Moon in the last quarter in the southern hemisphere?

* *

An impressive confirmation that the Earth is round can be seen at sunset, if one turns, against usual habits, one's back on the Sun. On the eastern sky one can see the impressive rise of the Earth's shadow. (In fact, more precise investigations show that it is not the shadow of the Earth alone, but the shadow of its ionosphere.) One can admire a vast shadow rising over the whole horizon, clearly having the shape of a segment of a huge circle.

* *

Challenge 247 s How would Figure 98 look if taken at the Equator?

* *

Since the Earth is round, there are many ways to drive from one point on the Earth to another along a circle segment. This has interesting consequences for volley balls and for girl-watching. Take a volleyball and look at its air inlet. If you want to move the inlet

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

to a different position with a simple rotation, you can choose the rotation axis in may
Challenge 248 e different ways. Can you confirm this? In other words, when we look in a given direction and then want to look in another, the eye can accomplish this change in different ways. The option chosen by the human eye had already been studied by medical scientists in the eighteenth century. It is called *Listing's 'law'*.* It states that all axes that nature chooses
Challenge 249 s lie in one plane. Can you imagine its position in space? Men have a real interest that this mechanism is strictly followed; if not, looking at girls on the beach could cause the muscles moving the eyes to get knotted up.

Legs or wheels? – Again

The acceleration and deceleration of standard wheel-driven cars is never much greater than about $1\,g = 9.8\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$, the acceleration due to gravity on our planet. Higher accelerations are achieved by motorbikes and racing cars through the use of suspensions that divert weight to the axes and by the use of spoilers, so that the car is pushed downwards with more than its own weight. Modern spoilers are so efficient in pushing a car towards the track that racing cars could race on the roof of a tunnel without falling down.

Through the use of special tyres these downwards forces are transformed into grip; modern racing tyres allow forward, backward and sideways accelerations (necessary for speed increase, for braking and for turning corners) of about 1.1 to 1.3 times the load. Engineers once believed that a factor 1 was the theoretical limit and this limit is still sometimes found in textbooks; but advances in tyre technology, mostly by making clever use of interlocking between the tyre and the road surface as in a gear mechanism, have allowed engineers to achieve these higher values. The highest accelerations, around $4\,g$, are achieved when part of the tyre melts and glues to the surface. Special tyres designed to make this happen are used for dragsters, but high performance radio-controlled model cars also achieve such values.

How do all these efforts compare to using legs? High jump athletes can achieve peak accelerations of about 2 to 4 g, cheetahs over $3\,g$, bushbabies up to $13\,g$, locusts about
Ref. 102 $18\,g$, and fleas have been measured to accelerate about $135\,g$. The maximum acceleration known for animals is that of click beetles, a small insect able to accelerate at over $2000\,\mathrm{m/s^2} = 200\,g$, about the same as an airgun pellet when fired. Legs are thus definitively more efficient accelerating devices than wheels – a cheetah can easily beat any car or motorbike – and evolution developed legs, instead of wheels, to improve the chances of an animal in danger getting to safety. In short, legs *outperform* wheels.

Challenge 250 s There are other reasons for using legs instead of wheels. (Can you name some?) For example, legs, unlike wheels, allow walking on water. Most famous for this ability is the *basilisk*,** a lizard living in Central America. This reptile is about 50 cm long and has a mass of about 90 g. It looks like a miniature *Tyrannosaurus rex* and is able to run over water surfaces on its hind legs. The motion has been studied in detail with high-speed cameras and by measurements using aluminium models of the animal's feet. The experi-

* If you are interested in learning in more detail how nature and the eye cope with the complexities of three dimensions, see the schorlab.berkeley.edu/vilis/whatisLL.htm and www.med.uwo.ca/physiology/courses/LLConsequencesWeb/ListingsLaw/perceptual2.htm websites.

** In the Middle Ages, the term 'basilisk' referred to a mythical monster supposed to appear shortly before the end of the world. Today, it is a small reptile in the Americas.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 99 A basilisk lizard (*Basiliscus basiliscus*) running on water, with a total length of about 25 cm, showing how the propulsing leg pushes into the water (© TERRA)

FIGURE 100 A water strider, total size about 10 mm (© Charles Lewallen)



FIGURE 101 A water walking robot, total size about 20 mm (© AIP)

ments show that the feet slapping on the water provides only 25 % of the force necessary
Ref. 103 to run above water; the other 75 % is provided by a pocket of compressed air that the basilisks create between their feet and the water once the feet are inside the water. In fact, basilisks mainly walk on air. (Both effects used by basilisks are also found in fast
Ref. 104 canoeing.) It was calculated that humans are also able to walk on water, provided their feet hit the water with a speed of 100 km/h using the simultaneous physical power of 15 sprinters. Quite a feat for all those who ever did so.

There is a second method of walking and running on water; this second method even allows its users to remain immobile on top of the water surface. This is what water striders, insects of the family *Gerridae* with a overall length of up to 15 mm, are able to do (together with several species of spiders). Like all insects, the water strider has six legs (spiders have eight). The water strider uses the back and front legs to hover over the surface, helped by thousands of tiny hairs attached to its body. The hairs, together with the surface tension of water, prevent the strider from getting wet. If you put shampoo into the water, the water strider sinks and can no longer move. The water strider uses its large middle legs as oars to advance over the surface, reaching speeds of up to 1 m/s doing so. In short, water striders actually row over water. The same mechanism is used by the
Ref. 105 small robots that can move over water and were developed by Metin Sitti and his group.

Legs pose many interesting problems. Engineers know that a staircase is comfortable to walk only if for each step the depth l plus *twice* the height h is a constant: $l + 2h =$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 251 s 0.63 ± 0.02 m. This is the so-called *staircase formula*. Why does it hold?

Challenge 252 s All animals have an *even* number of legs. Do you know an exception? Why not? In fact, one can argue that no animal has less than four legs. Why is this the case?

On the other hand, all animals with two legs have the legs side by side, whereas systems with two wheels have them one behind the other. Why is this not the other way round? Challenge 253 e

Legs also provide simple distance rulers: just count your steps. In 2006, it was discovered that this method is used by certain ant species, such as *Cataglyphis fortis*. They can count to at least 25 000, as shown by Matthias Wittlinger and his team. These ants use the ability to find the shortest way back to their home even in structureless desert terrain. Ref. 106

Why do 100 m sprinters run faster than ordinary people? A thorough investigation shows that the speed v of a sprinter is given by Ref. 107

$$v = f\, L_{\text{stride}} = f\, L_{\text{c}}\, \frac{F_{\text{c}}}{W}\,, \tag{31}$$

where f is the frequency of the legs, L_{stride} is the stride length, L_{c} is the contact length – the length that the sprinter advances during the time the foot is in contact with the floor – W the weight of the sprinter, and F_{c} the average force the sprinter exerts on the floor during contact. It turns out that the frequency f is almost the same for all sprinters; the only way to be faster than the competition is to increase the stride length L_{stride}. Also the contact length L_{c} varies little between athletes. Increasing the stride length thus requires that the athlete hits the ground with strong strokes. This is what athletic training for sprinters has to achieve.

Summary on Galilean relativity

Undisturbed or inertial motion cannot be felt or measured. It is thus impossible to distinguish motion from rest; the distinction depends on the observer: motion of bodies is relative. That is why the soil below our feet seems so stable to us, even though it moves with high speed across the universe.

Only later on will we discover that one example of motion in nature is *not* relative: the motion of light. But first we continue first with the study of motion transmitted over distance, without the use of any contact at all.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 6

MOTION DUE TO GRAVITATION

> Caddi come corpo morto cade.
>
> Dante, *Inferno*, c. V, v. 142.*

The first and main contact-free method to generate motion we discover in our environment is *height*. Waterfalls, snow, rain and falling apples all rely on it. It was one of the fundamental discoveries of physics that height has this property because there is an interaction between every body and the Earth. *Gravitation* produces an acceleration along the line connecting the centres of gravity of the body and the Earth. Note that in order to make this statement, it is necessary to realize that the Earth is a body in the same way as a stone or the Moon, that this body is finite and that therefore it has a centre and a mass. Today, these statements are common knowledge, but they are by no means evident from everyday personal experience.**

How does gravitation change when two bodies are far apart? The experts on distant objects are the astronomers. Over the years they have performed numerous measurements of the movements of the Moon and the planets. The most industrious of all was Tycho Brahe,*** who organized an industrial-scale search for astronomical facts sponsored by his king. His measurements were the basis for the research of his young assistant, the Swabian astronomer Johannes Kepler**** who found the first precise description of planetary motion. In 1684, all observations of planets and stones were condensed into an

Page 856

* 'I fell like dead bodies fall.' Dante Alighieri (1265, Firenze–1321, Ravenna), the powerful Italian poet.

** In several myths about the creation or the organization of the world, such as the biblical one or the Indian one, the Earth is not an object, but an imprecisely defined entity, such as an island floating or surrounded by water with unclear boundaries and unclear method of suspension. Are you able to convince a friend that the Earth is round and not flat? Can you find another argument apart from the roundness of the Earth's shadow when it is visible on the Moon?

Challenge 254 s

Ref. 108

A famous crook, Robert Peary, claimed to have reached the North Pole in 1909. (In fact, Roald Amundsen reached the both the South and the North Pole first.) Among others, Peary claimed to have taken a picture there, but that picture, which went round the world, turned out to be one of the proofs that he had not been there. Can you imagine how?

Challenge 255 s

By the way, if the Earth is round, the top of two buildings is further apart than their base. Can this effect be measured?

Challenge 256 s

*** Tycho Brahe (1546–1601), famous Danish astronomer, builder of Uraniaborg, the astronomical castle. He consumed almost 10 % of the Danish gross national product for his research, which produced the first star catalogue and the first precise position measurements of planets.

**** Johannes Kepler (1571 Weil der Stadt–1630 Regensburg) studied Protestant theology and became a teacher of mathematics, astronomy and rhetoric. He helped his mother to defend herself successfully in a trial where she was accused of witchcraft. His first book on astronomy made him famous, and he became

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 102 How to compare the radius of the Earth with that of the Moon during a partial lunar eclipse (© Anthony Ayiomamitis)

astonishingly simple result by the English physicist Robert Hooke:* every body of mass M attracts any other body towards its centre with an acceleration whose magnitude a is given by

$$a = G\frac{M}{r^2} \tag{32}$$

where r is the centre-to-centre distance of the two bodies. This is called the *universal 'law' of gravitation*, or universal gravity, because it is valid in general. The proportionality constant G is called the *gravitational constant*; it is one of the fundamental constants of nature, like the speed of light or the quantum of action. More about it will be said shortly. The effect of gravity thus decreases with increasing distance; gravity depends on the inverse distance squared of the bodies under consideration. If bodies are small compared with the distance r, or if they are spherical, expression (32) is correct as it stands; for non-spherical shapes the acceleration has to be calculated separately for each part of the bodies and then added together.

This inverse square dependence is often called Newton's 'law' of gravitation, because the English physicist Isaac Newton proved more elegantly than Hooke that it agreed with all astronomical and terrestrial observations. Above all, however, he organized a better public relations campaign, in which he falsely claimed to be the originator of the idea. Ref. 109

Newton published a simple proof showing that this description of astronomical motion also gives the correct description for stones thrown through the air, down here on 'father Earth'. To achieve this, he compared the acceleration a_m of the Moon with that of stones g. For the ratio between these two accelerations, the inverse square relation predicts a value $a_m/g = R^2/d_m^2$, where R is the radius of the Earth and d_m the distance of the Moon. The Moon's distance can be measured by triangulation, comparing the pos-

assistant to Tycho Brahe and then, at his teacher's death, the Imperial Mathematician. He was the first to use mathematics in the description of astronomical observations, and introduced the concept and field of 'celestial physics'.

* Robert Hooke, (1635–1703), important English physicist and secretary of the Royal Society. Apart from discovering the inverse square relation and many others, such as Hooke's 'law', he also wrote the *Micrographia*, a beautifully illustrated exploration of the world of the very small.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

ition of the Moon against the starry background from two different points on Earth.* The result is $d_m/R = 60 \pm 3$, depending on the orbital position of the Moon, so that an average ratio $a_m/g = 3.6 \cdot 10^3$ is predicted from universal gravity. But both accelerations can also be measured directly. At the surface of the Earth, stones are subject to an acceleration due to gravitation with magnitude $g = 9.8\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$, as determined by measuring the time that stones need to fall a given distance. For the Moon, the definition of acceleration, $a = \mathrm{d}v/\mathrm{d}t$, in the case of circular motion – roughly correct here – gives $a_m = d_m(2\pi/T)^2$, where $T = 2.4\,\mathrm{Ms}$ is the time the Moon takes for one orbit around the Earth.** The measurement of the radius of the Earth*** yields $R = 6.4\,\mathrm{Mm}$, so that the average Earth–Moon distance is $d_m = 0.38\,\mathrm{Gm}$. One thus has $a_m/g = 3.6 \cdot 10^3$, in agreement with the above prediction. With this famous 'Moon calculation' we have thus shown that the inverse square property of gravitation indeed describes both the motion of the Moon and that of stones. You might want to deduce the value of GM.

Challenge 260 s

From the observation that on the Earth all motion eventually comes to rest, whereas in the sky all motion is eternal, Aristotle and many others had concluded that motion in the sublunar world has different properties from motion in the translunar world. Several thinkers had criticized this distinction, notably the French philosopher and rector of the University of Paris, Jean Buridan.**** The Moon calculation was the most important result showing this distinction to be wrong. This is the reason for calling the expression (32) the *universal* 'law' of gravitation.

Ref. 112

This result allows us to answer another old question. Why does the Moon not fall from the sky? Well, the preceding discussion showed that *fall* is motion due to gravitation. Therefore the Moon actually *is* falling, with the peculiarity that instead of falling *towards* the Earth, it is continuously falling *around* it. Figure 103 illustrates the idea. The Moon is continuously missing the Earth.*****

* The first precise – but not the first – measurement was achieved in 1752 by the French astronomers Lalande and La Caille, who simultaneously measured the position of the Moon seen from Berlin and from Le Cap.

** This is deduced easily by noting that for an object in circular motion, the magnitude v of the velocity $\boldsymbol{v} = \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}/\mathrm{d}t$ is given as $v = 2\pi r/T$. The drawing of the vector $\boldsymbol{v}$ over time, the so-called *hodograph*, shows that it behaves exactly like the position of the object. Therefore the magnitude a of the acceleration $\boldsymbol{a} = \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{v}/\mathrm{d}t$ is given by the corresponding expression, namely $a = 2\pi v/T$.

Challenge 257 s

*** This is the hardest quantity to measure oneself. The most surprising way to determine the Earth's size is the following: watch a sunset in the garden of a house, with a stopwatch in hand. When the last ray of the Sun disappears, start the stopwatch and run upstairs. There, the Sun is still visible; stop the stopwatch when the Sun disappears again and note the time t. Measure the height distance h of the two eye positions where the Sun was observed. The Earth's radius R is then given by $R = k\,h/t^2$, with $k = 378 \cdot 10^6\,\mathrm{s^2}$.

Ref. 110

Challenge 258 s

There is also a simple way to measure the distance to the Moon, once the size of the Earth is known. Take a photograph of the Moon when it is high in the sky, and call θ its zenith angle, i.e., its angle from the vertical. Make another photograph of the Moon a few hours later, when it is just above the horizon. On this picture, unlike a common optical illusion, the Moon is smaller, because it is further away. With a sketch the reason for this becomes immediately clear. If q is the ratio of the two angular diameters, the Earth–Moon distance d_m is given by the relation $d_m^2 = R^2 + (2Rq\cos\theta/(1-q^2))^2$. Enjoy finding its derivation from the sketch.

Ref. 111

Page 69

Challenge 259 s

Another possibility is to determine the size of the Moon by comparing it with the size of the shadow of the Earth during a lunar eclipse, as shown in Figure 102. The distance to the Moon is then computed from its angular size, about 0.5°.

**** Jean Buridan (*c.* 1295 to *c.* 1366) was also one of the first modern thinkers to discuss the rotation of the Earth about an axis.

***** Another way to put it is to use the answer of the Dutch physicist Christiaan Huygens (1629–1695):

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 103 A physicist's and an artist's view of the fall of the Moon: a diagram by Christiaan Huygens (not to scale) and a marble statue by Auguste Rodin

FIGURE 104 A precision second pendulum, thus about 1 m in length; almost at the upper end, the vacuum chamber that compensates for changes in atmospheric pressure; towards the lower end, the wide construction that compensates for temperature variations of pendulum length; at the very bottom, the screw that compensates for local variations of the gravitational acceleration, giving a final precision of about 1 s per month (© Erwin Sattler OHG)

Universal gravity also explains why the Earth and most planets are (almost) spherical. Since gravity increases with decreasing distance, a liquid body in space will always try to form a spherical shape. Seen on a large scale, the Earth is indeed liquid. We also know that the Earth is cooling down – that is how the crust and the continents formed. The

the Moon does not fall from the sky because of the centrifugal acceleration. As explained on page 135, this explanation is nowadays out of favour at most universities.

Ref. 113 Challenge 261 d There is a beautiful problem connected to the left part of the figure: Which points on the surface of the Earth can be hit by shooting from a mountain? And which points can be hit by shooting horizontally?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

sphericity of smaller solid objects encountered in space, such as the Moon, thus means that they used to be liquid in older times.

Properties of gravitation

Gravitation implies that the path of a stone is not a parabola, as stated earlier, but actually an ellipse around the centre of the Earth. This happens for exactly the same reason that the planets move in ellipses around the Sun. Are you able to confirm this statement?

Challenge 262 ny

Universal gravitation allows us to solve a mystery. The puzzling acceleration value $g = 9.8\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$ we encountered in equation (5) is thus due to the relation

$$g = GM_{\mathrm{Earth}}/R^2_{\mathrm{Earth}} \,. \tag{33}$$

The equation can be deduced from equation (32) by taking the Earth to be spherical. The everyday acceleration of gravity g thus results from the size of the Earth, its mass, and the universal constant of gravitation G. Obviously, the value for g is almost constant on the surface of the Earth because the Earth is almost a sphere. Expression (33) also explains why g gets smaller as one rises above the Earth, and the deviations of the shape of the Earth from sphericity explain why g is different at the poles and higher on a plateau. (What would it be on the Moon? On Mars? On Jupiter?)

Challenge 263 s

By the way, it is possible to devise a simple machine, other than a yo-yo, that slows down the effective acceleration of gravity by a known amount, so that one can measure its value more easily. Can you imagine it?

Challenge 264 s

Note that 9.8 is roughly π^2. This is *not* a coincidence: the metre has been chosen in such a way to make this (roughly) correct. The period T of a swinging pendulum, i.e., a back and forward swing, is given by*

Challenge 265 s

$$T = 2\pi\sqrt{\frac{l}{g}} \,, \tag{34}$$

where l is the length of the pendulum, and $g = 9.8\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$ is the gravitational acceleration. (The pendulum is assumed to consist of a compact mass attached to a string of negligible mass.) The oscillation time of a pendulum depends only on the length of the string and on g, thus on the planet it is located on.

If the metre had been defined such that $T/2 = 1\,\mathrm{s}$, the value of the normal acceleration g would have been exactly $\pi^2\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$. Indeed, this was the first proposal for the definition of the metre; it was made in 1673 by Huygens and repeated in 1790 by Talleyrand, but was rejected by the conference that defined the metre because variations in the value of g with

Challenge 267 e

* Formula (34) is noteworthy mainly for all that is missing. The period of a pendulum does *not* depend on the mass of the swinging body. In addition, the period of a pendulum does *not* depend on the amplitude. (This is true as long as the oscillation angle is smaller than about 15°.) Galileo discovered this as a student, when observing a chandelier hanging on a long rope in the dome of Pisa. Using his heartbeat as a clock he found that even though the amplitude of the swing got smaller and smaller, the time for the swing stayed the same.

A leg also moves like a pendulum, when one walks normally. Why then do taller people tend to walk faster? Is the relation also true for animals of different size?

Challenge 266 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 105 The measurements that lead to the definition of the metre (© Ken Alder)

geographical position, temperature-induced variations of the length of a pendulum and even air pressure variations induce errors that are too large to yield a definition of useful precision. (Indeed, all these effects must be corrected in pendulum clocks, as shown in Figure 104.)

Finally, the proposal was made to define the metre as 1/40 000 000 of the circumference of the Earth through the poles, a so-called *meridian*. This proposal was almost identical to – but much more precise than – the pendulum proposal. The meridian definition of the metre was then adopted by the French national assembly on 26 March 1791, with the statement that 'a meridian passes under the feet of every human being, and all meridians are equal'. (Nevertheless, the distance from Equator to the poles is not exactly 10 Mm; that is a strange story. One of the two geographers who determined the size of the first metre stick was dishonest. The data he gave for his measurements – the general method of which is shown in Figure 105 – was fabricated. Thus the first official metre stick in Paris was shorter than it should be.)

Ref. 114

But we can still ask: Why does the Earth have the mass and size it has? And why does G have the value it has? The first question asks for a history of the solar system; it is still unanswered and is topic of research. The second question is addressed in Appendix C.

If all objects attract each other, it should also be the case for objects in everyday life. Gravity must also work *sideways*. This is indeed the case, even though the effects are so small that they were measured only long after universal gravity had predicted them. Measuring this effect allows the gravitational constant G to be determined.

Note that measuring the gravitational constant G is also the only way to determine the mass of the *Earth*. The first to do so, in 1798, was the English physicist Henry Cavendish; he used the machine, ideas and method of John Michell who died when attempting

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 106 The potential and the gradient

the experiment. Michell and Cavendish* called the aim and result of their experiments 'weighing the Earth'. Are you able to imagine how they did it? The value found in modern experiments is

Challenge 268 s

$$G = 6.7 \cdot 10^{-11}\,\mathrm{Nm^2/kg^2} = 6.7 \cdot 10^{-11}\,\mathrm{m^3/kg\,s^2}\ . \tag{35}$$

Cavendish's experiment was thus the first to confirm that gravity also works sideways.

For example, two average people 1 m apart feel an acceleration towards each other that is less than that exerted by a common fly when landing on the skin. Therefore we usually do not notice the attraction to other people. When we notice it, it is much stronger than that. This simple calculation thus proves that gravitation cannot be the true cause of people falling in love, and that sexual attraction is not of gravitational origin, but of a different source. The basis for this other interaction, love, will be studied later in our walk: it is called *electromagnetism*.

Challenge 269 s

But gravity has more interesting properties to offer. The effects of gravitation can also be described by another observable, namely the *(gravitational) potential* φ. We then have the simple relation that the acceleration is given by the *gradient* of the potential

$$\boldsymbol{a} = -\nabla\varphi \qquad \text{or} \qquad \boldsymbol{a} = -\mathrm{grad}\,\varphi\ . \tag{36}$$

The gradient is just a learned term for 'slope along the steepest direction'. It is defined for any point on a slope, is large for a steep one and small for a shallow one and it points in the direction of steepest ascent, as shown in Figure 106. The gradient is abbreviated ∇, pronounced 'nabla' and is mathematically defined as the vector $\nabla\varphi = (\partial\varphi/\partial x, \partial\varphi/\partial y, \partial\varphi/\partial z) = \mathrm{grad}\,\varphi$. The minus sign in (36) is introduced by convention, in order to have higher potential values at larger heights.** For a point-like or a spherical body of mass M, the potential φ is

$$\varphi = -G\frac{M}{r}\ . \tag{37}$$

A potential considerably simplifies the description of motion, since a potential is additive:

* Henry Cavendish (1731–1810) was one of the great geniuses of physics; rich but solitary, he found many rules of nature, but never published them. Had he done so, his name would be much more well known. John Michell (1724–1793) was church minister, geologist and amateur astronomer.

** In two or more dimensions slopes are written $\partial\varphi/\partial z$ – where ∂ is still pronounced 'd' – because in those cases the expression $d\varphi/dz$ has a slightly different meaning. The details lie outside the scope of this walk.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

given the potential of a point particle, one can calculate the potential and then the motion around any other irregularly shaped object.*

The potential φ is an interesting quantity; with a single number at every position in space we can describe the vector aspects of gravitational acceleration. It automatically gives that gravity in New Zealand acts in the opposite direction to gravity in Paris. In addition, the potential suggests the introduction of the so-called *potential energy* U by setting

$$U = m\varphi \tag{39}$$

and thus allowing us to determine the change of *kinetic* energy T of a body falling from a point 1 to a point 2 via

$$T_1 - T_2 = U_2 - U_1 \qquad \text{or} \qquad \frac{1}{2}m_1 \boldsymbol{v}_1^2 - \frac{1}{2}m_2 \boldsymbol{v}_2^2 = m\varphi_2 - m\varphi_1 \,. \tag{40}$$

In other words, the total energy, defined as the sum of kinetic and potential energy, is *conserved* in motion due to gravity. This is a characteristic property of gravitation. Not all accelerations can be derived from a potential; systems with this property are called *conservative*. The accelerations due to friction are not conservative, but those due to electromagnetism are.

Challenge 271 s Interestingly, the number of dimensions of space d is coded into the potential of a spherical mass: its dependence on the radius r is in fact $1/r^{d-2}$. The exponent $d-2$ has been checked experimentally to high precision; no deviation of d from 3 has ever been found.

Ref. 115

Ref. 116 The concept of potential helps in understanding the *shape* of the Earth. Since most of the Earth is still liquid when seen on a large scale, its surface is always horizontal with respect to the direction determined by the combination of the accelerations of gravity and rotation. In short, the Earth is *not* a sphere. It is not an ellipsoid either. The mathematical

Ref. 117 shape defined by the equilibrium requirement is called a *geoid*. The geoid shape differs from a suitably chosen ellipsoid by at most 50 m. Can you describe the geoid mathematically?

Challenge 272 ny The geoid is an excellent approximation to the actual shape of the Earth; sea level

* Alternatively, for a general, extended body, the potential is found by requiring that the *divergence* of its gradient is given by the mass (or charge) density times some proportionality constant. More precisely, one has

$$\Delta\varphi = 4\pi G\rho \tag{38}$$

where $\rho = \rho(\boldsymbol{x}, t)$ is the mass volume density of the body and the operator Δ, pronounced 'delta', is defined as $\Delta f = \nabla\nabla f = \partial^2 f/\partial x^2 + \partial^2 f/\partial y^2 + \partial^2 f/\partial z^2$. Equation (38) is called the *Poisson equation* for the potential φ. It is named after Siméon-Denis Poisson (1781–1840), eminent French mathematician and physicist. The positions at which ρ is not zero are called the *sources* of the potential. The so-called source term $\Delta\varphi$ of a function is a measure for how much the function $\varphi(x)$ at a point x differs from the average value in a

Challenge 270 ny region around that point. (Can you show this, by showing that $\Delta\varphi \approx \bar{\varphi} - \varphi(x)$?) In other words, the Poisson equation (38) implies that the actual value of the potential at a point is the same as the average value around that point minus the mass density multiplied by $4\pi G$. In particular, in the case of empty space the potential at a point is equal to the average of the potential around that point.

Often the concept of *gravitational field* is introduced, defined as $\boldsymbol{g} = -\nabla\varphi$. We avoid this in our walk, because we will discover that, following the theory of relativity, gravity is not due to a field at all; in fact even the concept of gravitational potential turns out to be only an approximation.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 107 The shape of the Earth, with exaggerated height scale (© GeoForschungsZentrum Potsdam)

differs from it by less than 20 metres. The differences can be measured with satellite radar and are of great interest to geologists and geographers. For example, it turns out that the South Pole is nearer to the equatorial plane than the North Pole by about 30 m. This is probably due to the large land masses in the northern hemisphere.

Page 117

Above we saw how the inertia of matter, through the so-called 'centrifugal force', increases the radius of the Earth at the Equator. In other words, the Earth is *flattened* at the poles. The Equator has a radius a of 6.38 Mm, whereas the distance b from the poles to the centre of the Earth is 6.36 Mm. The precise flattening $(a - b)/a$ has the value

Appendix C

$1/298.3 = 0.0034$. As a result, the top of Mount Chimborazo in Ecuador, even though its height is only 6267 m above sea level, is about 20 km farther away from the centre of the Earth than the top of Mount Sagarmatha* in Nepal, whose height above sea level is 8850 m. The top of Mount Chimborazo is in fact the point on the surface most distant from the centre of the Earth.

As a consequence, if the Earth stopped rotating (but kept its shape), the water of the oceans would flow north; all of Europe would be under water, except for the few mountains of the Alps that are higher than about 4 km. The northern parts of Europe would be covered by between 6 km and 10 km of water. Mount Sagarmatha would be over 11 km above sea level. If one takes into account the resulting change of shape of the Earth, the numbers come out smaller. In addition, the change in shape would produce extremely strong earthquakes and storms. As long as there are none of these effects, we can be *sure* that the Sun will indeed rise tomorrow, despite what some philosophers might pretend.

Page 133

Dynamics – how do things move in various dimensions?

Let us give a short summary. If a body can move only along a (possibly curved) line, the concepts of kinetic and potential energy are sufficient to determine the way it moves. In short, motion in *one dimension* follows directly from energy conservation.

* Mount Sagarmatha is sometimes also called Mount Everest.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 108 The four satellites of Jupiter discovered by Galileo and their motion (© Robin Scagell)

If more than *two spatial dimensions* are involved, energy conservation is insufficient to determine how a body moves. If a body can move in *two dimensions*, *and* if the forces involved are internal (which is always the case in theory, but not in practice), the conservation of angular momentum can be used. The full motion in two dimensions thus follows from energy and angular momentum conservation. For example, all properties of free fall follow from energy and angular momentum conservation. (Are you able to show this?) Challenge 273 s

In the case of motion in *three dimensions*, a more general rule for determining motion is necessary. It turns out that all motion follows from a simple principle: the time average of the difference between kinetic and potential energy must be as small as possible. This is called the *least action principle*. We will explain the details of this calculation method later. Page 194

For simple gravitational motions, motion is two-dimensional, in a plane. Most three-dimensional problems are outside the scope of this text; in fact, some of these problems are still subjects of research. In this adventure, we will explore three-dimensional motion only for selected cases that provide important insights.

Gravitation in the sky

The expression for the acceleration due to gravity $a = GM/r^2$ also describes the motion of all the planets around the Sun. Anyone can check that the planets always stay within the *zodiac*, a narrow stripe across the sky. The centre line of the zodiac gives the path of the Sun and is called the *ecliptic*, since the Moon must be located on it to produce an eclipse. But the detailed motion of the planets is not easy to describe.* A few generations before Hooke, the Swabian astronomer Johannes Kepler, in his painstaking research Page 176

* The apparent height of the ecliptic changes with the time of the year and is the reason for the changing seasons. Therefore seasons are a gravitational effect as well.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 109 The motion of a planet around the Sun, showing its semimajor axis d, which is also the spatial average of its distance from the Sun

about the movements of the planets in the zodiac, had deduced several 'laws'. The three main ones are as follows:

1. Planets move on ellipses with the Sun located at one focus (1609).
2. Planets sweep out equal areas in equal times (1609).
3. All planets have the same ratio T^2/d^3 between the orbit duration T and the semimajor axis d (1619).

The results are illustrated in Figure 109. The sheer work required to deduce the three 'laws' was enormous. Kepler had no calculating machine available, not even a slide rule. The calculation technology he used was the recently discovered logarithms. Anyone who has used tables of logarithms to perform calculations can get a feeling for the amount of work behind these three discoveries.

The second 'law' about equal swept areas implies that planets move faster when they are near the Sun. It is a way to state the conservation of angular momentum. But now comes the central point. The huge volume of work by Brahe and Kepler can be summarized in the expression $a = GM/r^2$. Can you confirm that all three 'laws' follow from Challenge 274 s Hooke's expression of universal gravity? Publishing this result was the main achievement of Newton. Try to repeat his achievement; it will show you not only the difficulties, but also the possibilities of physics, and the joy that puzzles give.

Newton solved the puzzle with geometric drawing. Newton was not able to write down, let alone handle, differential equations at the time he published his results on Ref. 26 gravitation. In fact, it is well known that Newton's notation and calculation methods were poor. (Much poorer than yours!) The English mathematician Godfrey Hardy* used to say that the insistence on using Newton's integral and differential notation, rather than the earlier and better method, still common today, due to his rival Leibniz – threw back English mathematics by 100 years.

Kepler, Hooke and Newton became famous because they brought order to the description of planetary motion. This achievement, though of small practical significance, was widely publicized because of the age-old prejudices linked with astrology.

However, there is more to gravitation. Universal gravity explains the motion and shape of the Milky Way and of the other galaxies, the motion of many weather phenomena and explains why the Earth has an atmosphere but the Moon does not. (Can you

* Godfrey Harold Hardy (1877–1947) was an important English number theorist, and the author of the well-known *A Mathematician's Apology*. He also 'discovered' the famous Indian mathematician Srinivasa Ramanujan, bringing him to Britain.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 110 The change of the moon during the month, showing its libration (QuickTime film © Martin Elsässer)



FIGURE 111 High resolution maps (not photographs) of the near side (left) and far side (right) of the moon, showing how often the latter saved the Earth from meteorite impacts (courtesy USGS)

Challenge 275 s explain this?) In fact, universal gravity explains much more about the Moon.

The Moon

How long is a day on the Moon? The answer is roughly 29 Earth-days. That is the time that it takes for an observer on the Moon to see the Sun again in the same position in the sky.

One often hears that the Moon always shows the same side to the Earth. But this is wrong. As one can check with the naked eye, a given feature in the centre of the face of the Moon at full Moon is not at the centre one week later. The various motions leading to this change are called *librations*; they are shown in the film in Figure 110. The motions appear mainly because the Moon does not describe a circular, but an elliptical orbit around the Earth and because the axis of the Moon is slightly inclined, compared with that of its rotation around the Earth. As a result, only around 45 % of the Moon's surface is permanently hidden from Earth.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The first photographs of the hidden area were taken in the 1960s by a Soviet artificial satellite; modern satellites provided exact maps, as shown in Figure 111. (Just zoom into the figure for fun.) The hidden surface is much more irregular than the visible one, as the hidden side is the one that intercepts most asteroids attracted by the Earth. Thus the gravitation of the Moon helps to deflect asteroids from the Earth. The number of animal life extinctions is thus reduced to a small, but not negligible number. In other words, the gravitational attraction of the Moon has saved the human race from extinction many times over.*

Challenge 276 e

The trips to the Moon in the 1970s also showed that the Moon originated from the Earth itself: long ago, an object hit the Earth almost tangentially and threw a sizeable fraction of material up into the sky. This is the only mechanism able to explain the large size of the Moon, its low iron content, as well as its general material composition.

Ref. 118

The Moon is receding from the Earth at 3.8 cm a year. This result confirms the old deduction that the tides slow down the Earth's rotation. Can you imagine how this measurement was performed? Since the Moon slows down the Earth, the Earth also changes shape due to this effect. (Remember that the shape of the Earth depends on its speed of rotation.) These changes in shape influence the tectonic activity of the Earth, and maybe also the drift of the continents.

Ref. 119

Challenge 277 s

The Moon has many effects on animal life. A famous example is the midge *Clunio*, which lives on coasts with pronounced tides. Clunio spends between six and twelve weeks as a larva, then hatches and lives for only one or two hours as an adult flying insect, during which time it reproduces. The midges will only reproduce if they hatch during the low tide phase of a spring tide. Spring tides are the especially strong tides during the full and new moons, when the solar and lunar effects combine, and occur only every 14.8 days. In 1995, Dietrich Neumann showed that the larvae have two built-in clocks, a circadian and a circalunar one, which together control the hatching to precisely those few hours when the insect can reproduce. He also showed that the circalunar clock is synchronized by the brightness of the Moon at night. In other words, the larvae monitor the Moon at night and then decide when to hatch: they are the smallest known astronomers.

Ref. 120

If insects can have circalunar cycles, it should come as no surprise that women also have such a cycle; however, in this case the precise origin of the cycle length is still unknown and a topic of research.

Ref. 121

The Moon also helps to stabilize the tilt of the Earth's axis, keeping it more or less fixed relative to the plane of motion around the Sun. Without the Moon, the axis would change its direction irregularly, we would not have a regular day and night rhythm, we would have extremely large climate changes, and the evolution of life would have been impossible. Without the Moon, the Earth would also rotate much faster and we would have much less clement weather. The Moon's main remaining effect on the Earth, the precession of its axis, is responsible for the ice ages.

Ref. 122

Ref. 123

Page 123

* The web pages cfa-www.harvard.edu/iau/lists/Closest.html and InnerPlot.html give an impression of the number of objects that almost hit the Earth every year. Without the Moon, we would have many additional catastrophes.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 112 The possible orbits due to universal gravity around a large mass and a few examples of measured orbits

Orbits

The path of a body orbiting another under the influence of gravity is an ellipse with the central body at one focus. A circular orbit is also possible, a circle being a special case of an ellipse. Single encounters of two objects can also be parabolas or hyperbolas, as shown in Figure 112. Circles, ellipses, parabolas and hyperbolas are collectively known as *conic sections*. Indeed each of these curves can be produced by cutting a cone with a knife. Are you able to confirm this?

Challenge 278 e

If orbits are mostly ellipses, it follows that comets return. The English astronomer Edmund Halley (1656–1742) was the first to draw this conclusion and to predict the return of a comet. It arrived at the predicted date in 1756, and is now named after him. The period of Halley's comet is between 74 and 80 years; the first recorded sighting was 22 centuries ago, and it has been seen at every one of its 30 passages since, the last time in 1986.

Depending on the initial energy and the initial angular momentum of the body with respect to the central planet, there are two additional possibilities: *parabolic* paths and *hyperbolic* paths. Can you determine the conditions of the energy and the angular momentum needed for these paths to appear?

Challenge 279 ny

In practice, parabolic paths do not exist in nature. (Though some comets seem to approach this case when moving around the Sun; almost all comets follow elliptical paths). Hyperbolic paths do exist; artificial satellites follow them when they are shot towards a planet, usually with the aim of changing the direction of the satellite's journey across the solar system.

Why does the inverse square 'law' lead to conic sections? First, for two bodies, the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 113 The phases of the Moon and of Venus, as observed from Athens in summer 2007 (© Anthony Ayiomamitis)

total angular momentum L is a constant:

$$L = mr^2\dot{\varphi} \tag{41}$$

and therefore the motion lies in a plane. Also the energy E is a constant

$$E = \frac{1}{2}m\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}r}{\mathrm{d}t}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{2}m\left(r\frac{\mathrm{d}\varphi}{\mathrm{d}t}\right)^2 - G\frac{mM}{r} \,. \tag{42}$$

Challenge 280 ny Together, the two equations imply that

$$r = \frac{L^2}{Gm^2M}\,\frac{1}{1+\sqrt{1+\dfrac{2EL^2}{G^2m^3M^2}}\,\cos\varphi} \,. \tag{43}$$

Now, any curve defined by the general expression

$$r = \frac{C}{1+e\cos\varphi} \quad \text{or} \quad r = \frac{C}{1-e\cos\varphi} \tag{44}$$

is an ellipse for $0 < e < 1$, a parabola for $e = 1$ and a hyperbola for $e > 1$, one focus being at the origin. The quantity e, called the *eccentricity*, describes how squeezed the curve is. In other words, a body in orbit around a central mass follows a conic section.

In all orbits, also the heavy mass moves. In fact, both bodies orbit around the common centre of mass. Both bodies follow the same type of curve (ellipsis, parabola or hyperbola), but the sizes of the two curves differ.

Challenge 281 e

If more than two objects move under mutual gravitation, many additional possibilities for motions appear. The classification and the motions are quite complex. In fact, this so-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 114 Geostationary satellites (left) and the main stable Lagrangian points (right)

called *many-body problem* is still a topic of research, and the results are mathematically fascinating. Let us look at a few examples.

When several planets circle a star, they also attract each other. Planets thus do not move in perfect ellipses. The largest deviation is a perihelion shift, as shown in Figure 90. It is observed for Mercury and a few other planets, including the Earth. Other deviations from elliptical paths appear during a single orbit. In 1846, the observed deviations of the motion of the planet Uranus from the path predicted by universal gravity were used to predict the existence of another planet, Neptune, which was discovered shortly afterwards.

Page 95 We have seen that mass is always positive and that gravitation is thus always attractive; there is no *antigravity*. Can gravity be used for *levitation* nevertheless, maybe using more than two bodies? Yes; there are two examples.* The first are the geostationary satellites, which are used for easy transmission of television and other signals from and towards Earth.

The *Lagrangian libration points* are the second example. Named after their discoverer, these are points in space near a two-body system, such as Moon–Earth or Earth–Sun, in which small objects have a stable equilibrium position. An overview is given in Figure 114.

Challenge 282 s Can you find their precise position, remembering to take rotation into account? There are three additional Lagrangian points on the Earth–Moon line (or Sun–planet line). How

Challenge 283 d many of them are stable?

There are thousands of asteroids, called *Trojan asteroids*, at and around the Lagrangian points of the Sun–Jupiter system. In 1990, a Trojan asteroid for the Mars–Sun system was discovered. Finally, in 1997, an 'almost Trojan' asteroid was found that follows the Earth on its way around the Sun (it is only transitionary and follows a somewhat more

Ref. 124 complex orbit). This 'second companion' of the Earth has a diameter of 5 km. Similarly, on the main Lagrangian points of the Earth–Moon system a high concentration of dust has been observed.

* Levitation is discussed in detail on page 782.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 115 Tides at Saint-Valéry en Caux on September 20, 2005 (© Gilles Régnier)

To sum up, the single equation $\boldsymbol{a} = -GM\boldsymbol{r}/r^3$ correctly describes a large number of phenomena in the sky. The first person to make clear that this expression describes *everything* happening in the sky was Pierre Simon Laplace* in his famous treatise *Traité de mécanique céleste*. When Napoleon told him that he found no mention about the creator in the book, Laplace gave a famous, one sentence summary of his book: *Je n'ai pas eu besoin de cette hypothèse.* 'I had no need for this hypothesis.' In particular, Laplace studied the stability of the solar system, the eccentricity of the lunar orbit, and the eccentricities of the planetary orbits, always getting full agreement between calculation and measurement.

These results are quite a feat for the simple expression of universal gravitation; they also explain why it is called 'universal'. But how precise is the formula? Since astronomy allows the most precise measurements of gravitational motion, it also provides the most stringent tests. In 1849, Urbain Le Verrier concluded after intensive study that there was only one known example of a discrepancy between observation and universal gravity, namely one observation for the planet Mercury. (Nowadays a few more are known.) The point of least distance to the Sun of the orbit of planet Mercury, its *perihelion*, changes at a rate that is slightly less than that predicted: he found a tiny difference, around 38″ per century. (This was corrected to 43″ per century in 1882 by Simon Newcomb.) Le Verrier thought that the difference was due to a planet between Mercury and the Sun, *Vulcan*, which he chased for many years without success. The study of motion had to wait for Albert Einstein to find the correct explanation of the difference.

Ref. 125

Tides

Ref. 126 Why do physics texts always talk about tides? Because, as general relativity will show,

* Pierre Simon Laplace (b. 1749 Beaumont-en-Auge, d. 1827 Paris), important French mathematician. His treatise appeared in five volumes between 1798 and 1825. He was the first to propose that the solar system was formed from a rotating gas cloud, and one of the first people to imagine and explore black holes.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 116 Tidal deformations due to gravity



FIGURE 117 The origin of tides

tides prove that space is curved! It is thus useful to study them in a bit more detail. Gravitation explains the sea tides as results of the attraction of the ocean water by the Moon and the Sun. Tides are interesting; even though the amplitude of the tides is only about 0.5 m on the open sea, it can be up to 20 m at special places near the coast. Can you imagine why? The *soil* is also lifted and lowered by the Sun and the Moon, by about 0.3 m, as satellite measurements show. Even the *atmosphere* is subject to tides, and the corresponding pressure variations can be filtered out from the weather pressure measurements.

Challenge 284 s
Ref. 47
Ref. 127

Tides appear for any *extended* body moving in the gravitational field of another. To understand the origin of tides, picture a body in orbit, like the Earth, and imagine its components, such as the segments of Figure 116, as being held together by springs. Universal gravity implies that orbits are slower the more distant they are from a central body. As a result, the segment on the outside of the orbit would like to be slower than the central one; but it is *pulled* by the rest of the body through the springs. In contrast, the inside segment would like to orbit more rapidly but is *retained* by the others. Being slowed down, the inside segments want to fall towards the Sun. In sum, both segments feel a pull away from the centre of the body, limited by the springs that stop the deformation. Therefore, *extended bodies are deformed in the direction of the field inhomogeneity.*

For example, as a result of tidal forces, the Moon always has (roughly) the same face to the Earth. In addition, its radius in direction of the Earth is larger by about 5 m than the radius perpendicular to it. If the inner springs are too weak, the body is torn into pieces; in this way a *ring* of fragments can form, such as the asteroid ring between Mars and Jupiter or the rings around Saturn.

Let us return to the Earth. If a body is surrounded by water, it will form bulges in the direction of the applied gravitational field. In order to measure and compare the strength of the tides from the Sun and the Moon, we reduce tidal effects to their bare minimum. As shown in Figure 117, we can study the deformation of a body due to gravity by studying the deformation of four pieces. We can study it in free fall, because orbital motion and free fall are equivalent. Now, gravity makes some of the pieces approach and others diverge, depending on their relative positions. The figure makes clear that the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

strength of the deformation – water has no built-in springs – depends on the change of gravitational acceleration with distance; in other words, the *relative* acceleration that leads to the tides is proportional to the derivative of the gravitational acceleration.

Using the numbers from Appendix C, the gravitational accelerations from the Sun and the Moon measured on Earth are

$$a_{\text{Sun}} = \frac{GM_{\text{Sun}}}{d_{\text{Sun}}^2} = 5.9\,\text{mm/s}^2$$
$$a_{\text{Moon}} = \frac{GM_{\text{Moon}}}{d_{\text{Moon}}^2} = 0.033\,\text{mm/s}^2 \tag{45}$$

and thus the attraction from the Moon is about 178 times weaker than that from the Sun.

When two nearby bodies fall near a large mass, the relative acceleration is proportional to their distance, and follows $da = da/dr\, dr$. The proportionality factor $da/dr = \nabla a$, called the *tidal acceleration* (gradient), is the true measure of tidal effects. Near a large spherical mass M, it is given by

Challenge 285 e

$$\frac{da}{dr} = -\frac{2GM}{r^3} \tag{46}$$

which yields the values

$$\frac{da_{\text{Sun}}}{dr} = -\frac{2GM_{\text{Sun}}}{d_{\text{Sun}}^3} = -0.8 \cdot 10^{-13}\,/\text{s}^2$$
$$\frac{da_{\text{Moon}}}{dr} = -\frac{2GM_{\text{Moon}}}{d_{\text{Moon}}^3} = -1.7 \cdot 10^{-13}\,/\text{s}^2\ . \tag{47}$$

In other words, despite the much weaker pull of the Moon, its tides are predicted to be over *twice as strong* as the tides from the Sun; this is indeed observed. When Sun, Moon and Earth are aligned, the two tides add up; these so-called *spring tides* are especially strong and happen every 14.8 days, at full and new moon.

Tides lead to a pretty puzzle. Moon tides are much stronger than Sun tides. This implies that the Moon is much denser than the Sun. Why?

Challenge 286 s

Tides also produce *friction*. The friction leads to a slowing of the Earth's rotation. Nowadays, the slowdown can be measured by precise clocks (even though short time variations due to other effects, such as the weather, are often larger). The results fit well with fossil results showing that 400 million years ago, in the Devonian period, a year had 400 days, and a day about 22 hours. It is also estimated that 900 million years ago, each of the 481 days of a year were 18.2 hours long. The friction at the basis of this slowdown also results in an increase in the distance of the Moon from the Earth by about 3.8 cm per year. Are you able to explain why?

Ref. 90
Page 577
Challenge 287 s

As mentioned above, the tidal motion of the soil is also responsible for the triggering of *earthquakes*. Thus the Moon can have also dangerous effects on Earth. (Unfortunately, knowing the mechanism does not allow the prediction of earthquakes.) The most fascinating example of tidal effects is seen on Jupiter's satellite Io. Its tides are so strong that

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 118 A spectacular result of tides: volcanism on Io (NASA)

they induce intense volcanic activity, as shown in Figure 118, with eruption plumes as high as 500 km. If tides are even stronger, they can destroy the body altogether, as happened to the body between Mars and Jupiter that formed the planetoids, or (possibly) to the moons that led to Saturn's rings.

In summary, tides are due to relative accelerations of nearby mass points. This has an important consequence. In the chapter on general relativity we will find that time multiplied by the speed of light plays the same role as length. Time then becomes an additional dimension, as shown in Figure 119. Using this similarity, two free particles moving in the same direction correspond to parallel lines in space-time. Two particles falling side-by-side also correspond to parallel lines. Tides show that such particles approach each other. In other words, tides imply that parallel lines approach each other. But parallel lines can approach each other *only* if space-time is curved. In short, tides imply *curved* space-time and space. This simple reasoning could have been performed in the eighteenth century; however, it took another 200 years and Albert Einstein's genius to uncover it.

Page 498
Page 544

Can light fall?

> Die Maxime, jederzeit selbst zu denken, ist die Aufklärung.
>
> Immanuel Kant*

Towards the end of the seventeenth century people discovered that light has a finite velocity – a story which we will tell in detail later. An entity that moves with infinite velocity cannot be affected by gravity, as there is no time to produce an effect. An entity with a finite speed, however, should feel gravity and thus fall.

Page 401

Does its speed increase when light reaches the surface of the Earth? For almost three centuries people had no means of detecting any such effect; so the question was not in-

* The maxim to think at all times for oneself is the enlightenment.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 119 Particles falling side-by-side approach over time



FIGURE 120 Masses bend light

vestigated. Then, in 1801, the Prussian astronomer Johann Soldner (1776–1833) was the Ref. 128 first to put the question in a different way. Being an astronomer, he was used to measuring stars and their observation angles. He realized that light passing near a massive body would be *deflected* due to gravity.

Soldner studied a body on a hyperbolic path, moving with velocity c past a spherical mass M at distance b (measured from the centre), as shown in Figure 120. Soldner Challenge 288 ny deduced the deflection angle

$$\alpha_{\text{univ. grav.}} = \frac{2}{b}\frac{GM}{c^2} \,. \tag{48}$$

One sees that the angle is largest when the motion is just grazing the mass M. For light deflected by the mass of the Sun, the angle turns out to be at most a tiny $0.88'' = 4.3\,\mu\text{rad}$. In Soldner's time, this angle was too small to be measured. Thus the issue was forgotten. Had it been pursued, general relativity would have begun as an experimental science, and Page 533 not as the theoretical effort of Albert Einstein! Why? The value just calculated is *different* from the measured value. The first measurement took place in 1919;* it found the correct dependence on the distance, but found a deflection of up to $1.75''$, exactly double that of expression (48). The reason is not easy to find; in fact, it is due to the curvature of space, as we will see. In summary, light can fall, but the issue hides some surprises.

What is mass? – Again

Mass describes how an object interacts with others. In our walk, we have encountered two of its aspects. *Inertial mass* is the property that keeps objects moving and that offers resistance to a change in their motion. *Gravitational mass* is the property responsible for the acceleration of bodies nearby (the active aspect) or of being accelerated by objects nearby (the passive aspect). For example, the active aspect of the mass of the Earth determines the surface acceleration of bodies; the passive aspect of the bodies allows us to weigh them in order to measure their mass using distances only, e.g. on a scale or a

Challenge 289 ny * By the way, how would you measure the deflection of light near the bright Sun?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

balance. The gravitational mass is the basis of *weight*, the difficulty of lifting things.*

Is the gravitational mass of a body equal to its inertial mass? A rough answer is given by the experience that an object that is difficult to move is also difficult to lift. The simplest experiment is to take two bodies of different masses and let them fall. If the acceleration is the same for all bodies, inertial mass is equal to (passive) gravitational mass, because in the relation $ma = \nabla(GMm/r)$ the left-hand m is actually the inertial mass, and the right-hand m is actually the gravitational mass.

But in the seventeenth century Galileo had made widely known an even older argument showing without a single experiment that the acceleration is indeed the same for all bodies. If larger masses fell more rapidly than smaller ones, then the following paradox would appear. Any body can be seen as being composed of a large fragment attached to a small fragment. If small bodies really fell less rapidly, the small fragment would slow the large fragment down, so that the complete body would have to fall *less* rapidly than the larger fragment (or break into pieces). At the same time, the body being larger than its fragment, it should fall *more* rapidly than that fragment. This is obviously impossible: all masses must fall with the same acceleration.

Many accurate experiments have been performed since Galileo's original discussion. In all of them the independence of the acceleration of free fall from mass and material composition has been confirmed with the precision they allowed. In other words, as far as we can tell, gravitational mass and inertial mass are *identical*. What is the origin of this mysterious equality?

Ref. 129

This so-called 'mystery' is a typical example of disinformation, now common across the whole world of physics education. Let us go back to the definition of mass as a negative inverse acceleration ratio. We mentioned that the physical origins of the accelerations do not play a role in the definition because the origin does not appear in the expression. In other words, the value of the mass is by definition independent of the interaction. That means in particular that inertial mass, based on electromagnetic interaction, and gravitational mass are identical *by definition*.

Page 91

We also note that we have never defined a separate concept of 'passive gravitational mass'. The mass being accelerated by gravitation is the inertial mass. Worse, there is no way to define a 'passive gravitational mass'. Try it! All methods, such as weighing an object, cannot be distinguished from those that determine inertial mass from its reaction to acceleration. Indeed, all methods of measuring mass use non-gravitational mechanisms. Scales are a good example.

Challenge 291 ny

If the 'passive gravitational mass' were different from the inertial mass, we would have strange consequences. For those bodies for which it were different we would get into trouble with energy conservation. Also assuming that 'active gravitational mass' differs from inertial mass gets us into trouble.

Another way of looking at the issue is as follows. How could 'gravitational mass' differ from inertial mass? Would the difference depend on relative velocity, time, position, composition or on mass itself? Each of these possibilities contradicts either energy or momentum conservation.

No wonder that all measurements confirm the equality of all mass types. The issue is usually resurrected in general relativity, with no new results. 'Both' masses remain equal;

Page 518

Challenge 290 ny

* What are the values shown by a balance for a person of 85 kg juggling three balls of 0.3 kg each?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 121 Brooms fall more rapidly than stones (© Luca Gastaldi)

mass is a unique property of bodies. Another issue remains, though. What is the *origin* of mass? Why does it exist? This simple but deep question cannot be answered by classical physics. We will need some patience to find out.

Curiosities and fun challenges about gravitation

> Fallen ist weder gefährlich noch eine Schande;
> Liegen bleiben ist beides.*
>
> Konrad Adenauer

Gravity on the Moon is only one sixth of that on the Earth. Why does this imply that it is difficult to walk quickly and to run on the Moon (as can be seen in the TV images recorded there)?

* *

Several humans have survived free falls from aeroplanes for a thousand metres or more, even though they had no parachute. A minority of them even did so without any harm a all. How was this possible?

Challenge 292 s

* *

Imagine that you have twelve coins of identical appearance, of which one is a forgery. The forged one has a different mass from the eleven genuine ones. How can you decide which is the forged one and whether it is lighter or heavier, using a simple balance only three times?

Challenge 293 e

* *

For a physicist, *antigravity* is repulsive gravity; it does not exist in nature. Nevertheless, the term 'antigravity' is used incorrectly by many people, as a short search on the internet shows. Some people call any effect that *overcomes* gravity, 'antigravity'. However, this definition implies that tables and chairs are antigravity devices. Following the definition, most of the wood, steel and concrete producers are in the antigravity business. The internet definition makes absolutely no sense.

* 'Falling is neither dangerous nor a shame; to keep lying is both.' Konrad Adenauer (b. 1876 Köln, d. 1967 Rhöndorf), West German Chancellor.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 122 The starting situation for a bungee jumper



FIGURE 123 An honest balance?

* *

Challenge 294 s What is the cheapest way to switch gravity off for 25 seconds?

* *

Do all objects on Earth fall with the same acceleration of $9.8\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$, assuming that air resistance can be neglected? No; every housekeeper knows that. You can check this by yourself. A broom angled at around 35° hits the floor before a stone, as the sounds of Challenge 295 s impact confirm. Are you able to explain why?

* *

Also bungee jumpers are accelerated more strongly than g. For a bungee cord of mass m and a jumper of mass M, the maximum acceleration a is

$$a = g\left(1 + \frac{1}{8}\frac{m}{M}\left(4 + \frac{m}{M}\right)\right) . \tag{49}$$

Challenge 296 s Can you deduce the relation from Figure 122?

* *

Challenge 297 s Guess: What is the weight of a ball of cork with a radius of 1 m?

* *

Challenge 298 s Guess: One thousand 1 mm diameter steel balls are collected. What is the mass?

* *

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 124 Reducing air resistance increases the terminal speed: left, the 2007 speed skiing world record holder Simone Origone with 69.83 m/s and right, the 2007 speed world record holder for bicycles on snow Éric Barone with 61.73 m/s (© Simone Origone, Éric Barone)

What is the fastest speed that a human can achieve making use of gravitational acceleration? There are various methods that try this; a few are shown in Figure 124. Terminal speed of free falling skydivers can be even higher, but no reliable record speed value exists. The last word is not spoken yet, as all these records will be surpassed in the coming years. It is important to require normal altitude; at stratospheric altitudes, speed values can be four times the speed values at low altitude.

Page 498

* *

How can you use your observations made during your travels with a bathroom scale to show that the Earth is not flat?

Challenge 299 s

* *

Is the acceleration due to gravity constant? Not really. Every day, it is estimated that 10^8 kg of material fall onto the Earth in the form of meteorites.

* *

Both the Earth and the Moon attract bodies. The centre of mass of the Earth–Moon system is 4800 km away from the centre of the Earth, quite near its surface. Why do bodies on Earth still fall towards the centre of the Earth?

Challenge 300 s

* *

Does every spherical body fall with the same acceleration? No. If the weight of the object is comparable to that of the Earth, the distance decreases in a different way. Can you confirm this statement? What then is wrong about Galileo's argument about the constancy

Challenge 301 ny

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 125 The man in orbit feels no weight, the blue atmosphere, which is not, does (NASA)

of acceleration of free fall?

* *

It is easy to lift a mass of a kilogram from the floor on a table. Twenty kilograms is harder.
Challenge 302 s A thousand is impossible. However, $6 \cdot 10^{24}$ kg is easy. Why?

* *

The friction between the Earth and the Moon slows down the rotation of both. The Moon stopped rotating millions of years ago, and the Earth is on its way to doing so as well. When the Earth stops rotating, the Moon will stop moving away from Earth. How far will
Challenge 303 ny the Moon be from the Earth at that time? Afterwards however, even further in the future, the Moon will move back towards the Earth, due to the friction between the Earth–Moon system and the Sun. Even though this effect would only take place if the Sun burned for
Challenge 304 s ever, which is known to be false, can you explain it?

* *

When you run towards the east, you *lose weight*. There are two different reasons for this: the 'centrifugal' acceleration increases so that the force with which you are pulled down diminishes, and the Coriolis force appears, with a similar result. Can you estimate the
Challenge 305 ny size of the two effects?

* *

What is the relation between the time a stone takes falling through a distance l and the
Challenge 306 s time a pendulum takes swinging though half a circle of radius l? (This problem is due to Galileo.) How many digits of the number π can one expect to determine in this way?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

Why can a spacecraft accelerate through the *slingshot effect* when going round a planet, despite momentum conservation? It is speculated that the same effect is also the reason for the few exceptionally fast stars that are observed in the galaxy. For example, the star HE0457-5439 moves with 720 km/s, which is much higher than the 100 to 200 km/s of most stars in the Milky way. It seems that the role of the accelerating centre was taken by a black hole.

Challenge 307 s

Ref. 130

* *

The orbit of a planet around the Sun has many interesting properties. What is the hodograph of the orbit? What is the hodograph for parabolic and hyperbolic orbits?

Ref. 131

Challenge 308 s

* *

The *Galilean satellites* of Jupiter, shown in Figure 108 on page 151, can be seen with small amateur telescopes. Galileo discovered them in 1610 and called them the *Medicean satellites*. (Today, they are named, in order of increasing distance from Jupiter, as Io, Europa, Ganymede and Callisto.) They are almost mythical objects. They were the first bodies found that obviously did not orbit the Earth; thus Galileo used them to deduce that the Earth is not at the centre of the universe. The satellites have also been candidates to be the first *standard clock*, as their motion can be predicted to high accuracy, so that the 'standard time' could be read off from their position. Finally, due to this high accuracy, in 1676, the speed of light was first measured with their help, as told in the section on special relativity.

Page 402

* *

A simple, but difficult question: if all bodies attract each other, why don't or didn't all stars fall towards each other? Indeed, the inverse square expression of universal gravity has a limitation: it does not allow one to make sensible statements about the matter in the universe. Universal gravity predicts that a homogeneous mass distribution is unstable; indeed, an inhomogeneous distribution is observed. However, universal gravity does not predict the average mass density, the darkness at night, the observed speeds of the distant galaxies, etc. In fact, 'universal' gravity does not explain or predict a single property of the universe. To do this, we need general relativity.

Challenge 309 s

Page 564

* *

The acceleration g due to gravity at a depth of 3000 km is 10.05 m/s^2, over 2 % more than at the surface of the Earth. How is this possible? Also, on the Tibetan plateau, g is higher than the sea level value of 9.81 m/s^2, even though the plateau is more distant from the centre of the Earth than sea level is. How is this possible?

Ref. 132

Challenge 310 s

* *

When the Moon circles the Sun, does its path have sections *concave* towards the Sun, as shown at the right of Figure 126, or not, as shown on the left? (Independent of this issue, both paths in the diagram disguise that the Moon path does *not* lie in the same plane as the path of the Earth around the Sun.)

Challenge 311 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 126 Which of the two Moon paths is correct?

* *

You can prove that objects *attract each other* (and that they are not only attracted by the Earth) with a simple experiment that anybody can perform at home, as described on the www.fourmilab.ch/gravitation/foobar website.

* *

It is instructive to calculate the *escape velocity* of the Earth, i.e., that velocity with which a body must be thrown so that it never falls back. It turns out to be 11 km/s. What is the escape velocity for the solar system? By the way, the escape velocity of our galaxy is 129 km/s. What would happen if a planet or a system were so heavy that its escape velocity would be larger than the speed of light?

Challenge 312 s

* *

For bodies of irregular shape, the centre of gravity of a body is *not* the same as the centre of mass. Are you able to confirm this? (Hint: Find and use the simplest example possible.)

Challenge 313 s

* *

Can gravity produce repulsion? What happens to a small test body on the inside of a large C-shaped mass? Is it pushed towards the centre of mass?

Challenge 314 ny

* *

The *shape* of the Earth is not a sphere. As a consequence, a plumb line usually does not point to the centre of the Earth. What is the largest deviation in degrees?

Ref. 133
Challenge 315 ny

* *

What is the largest asteroid one can escape from by jumping?

Challenge 316 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 127 The analemma over Delphi, between January and December 2002 (© Anthony Ayiomamitis)

* *

If you look at the sky every day at 6 a.m., the Sun's position varies during the year. The result of photographing the Sun on the same film is shown in Figure 127. The curve, called the analemma, is due to two combined effects: the inclination of the Earth's axis and the elliptical shape of the Earth's orbit around the Sun. The top and the (hidden) bottom points of the analemma correspond to the solstices. How does the analemma look if photographed every day at local noon? Why is it not a straight line pointing exactly south?

Challenge 317 s

* *

The constellation in which the Sun stands at noon (at the centre of the time zone) is supposedly called the 'zodiacal sign' of that day. Astrologers say there are twelve of them, namely Aries, Taurus, Gemini, Cancer, Leo, Virgo, Libra, Scorpius, Sagittarius, Capricornus, Aquarius and Pisces and that each takes (quite precisely) a twelfth of a year or a twelfth of the ecliptic. Any check with a calendar shows that at present, the midday Sun is never in the zodiacal sign during the days usually connected to it. The relation has shifted by about a month since it was defined, due to the precession of the Earth's axis. A check with a map of the star sky shows that the twelve constellations do not have the same length and that on the ecliptic there are fourteen of them, not twelve. There is *Ophiuchus*, the snake constellation, between Scorpius and Sagittarius, and *Cetus*, the whale, between Aquarius and Pisces. In fact, not a single astronomical statement about zodiacal signs is correct. To put it clearly, astrology, in contrast to its name, is *not* about stars. (In some languages, the term for 'crook' is derived from the word 'astrologer'.)

Page 129

Ref. 134

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

For a long time, it was thought that there is no additional planet in our solar system outside Neptune and Pluto, because their orbits show no disturbances from another body. Today, the view has changed. It is known that there are only eight planets: Pluto is not a planet, but the first of a set of smaller objects in the so-called Kuiper belt. Kuiper belt objects are regularly discovered; around 80 are known today.

Ref. 135

In 2003, two major Kuiper objects were discovered; one, called *Sedna*, is almost as large as Pluto, the other, called *Eris*, is even larger than Pluto and has a moon. Both have strongly elliptical orbits. (Since Pluto and Eris, like the asteroid Ceres, have cleaned their orbit from debris, these three objects are now classified as *dwarf planets*.)

Ref. 136

* *

In astronomy new examples of motion are regularly discovered even in the present century. Sometimes there are also false alarms. One example was the alleged fall of *mini comets* on the Earth. They were supposedly made of a few dozen kilograms of ice and hitting the Earth every few seconds. It is now known not to happen. On the other hand, it is known that many tons of asteroids fall on the Earth every day, in the form of tiny particles. Incidentally, discovering objects hitting the Earth is not at all easy. Astronomers like to point out that an asteroid as large as the one that led to the extinction of the dinosaurs could hit the Earth without any astronomer noticing in advance, if the direction is slightly unusual, such as from the south, where few telescopes are located.

Ref. 137

* *

Universal gravity allows only elliptical, parabolic or hyperbolic orbits. It is impossible for a small object approaching a large one to be captured. At least, that is what we have learned so far. Nevertheless, all astronomy books tell stories of capture in our solar system; for example, several outer satellites of Saturn have been captured. How is this possible?

Challenge 318 s

* *

How would a tunnel have to be shaped in order that a stone would fall through it without touching the walls? (Assume constant density.) If the Earth did not rotate, the tunnel would be a straight line through its centre, and the stone would fall down and up again, in a oscillating motion. For a rotating Earth, the problem is much more difficult. What is the shape when the tunnel starts at the Equator?

Challenge 319 s

* *

The International Space Station circles the Earth every 90 minutes at an altitude of about 380 km. You can see where it is from the website www.heavens-above.com. By the way, whenever it is just above the horizon, the station is the third brightest object in the night sky, superseded only by the Moon and Venus. Have a look at it.

Challenge 320 e

* *

Is it true that the centre of mass of the solar system, its barycentre, is always inside the Sun? Even though a star or the Sun move very little when planets move around them, this motion can be detected with precision measurements making use of the Doppler

Challenge 321 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 128 The vanishing of gravitational force inside a spherical shell of matter

Page 412 effect for light or radio waves. Jupiter, for example, produces a speed change of 13 m/s in the Sun, the Earth 1 m/s. The first planets outside the solar system, around the pulsar PSR1257+12 and the star Pegasi 51, was discovered in this way, in 1992 and 1995. In the meantime, over 150 planets have been discovered with this method. So far, the smallest planet discovered has 7 times the mass of the Earth.

* *

Challenge 322 d Not all points on the Earth receive the same number of daylight hours during a year. The effects are difficult to spot, though. Can you find one?

* *

Challenge 323 s Can the phase of the Moon have a measurable effect on the human body, for example through tidal effects?

* *

Challenge 324 s There is an important difference between the heliocentric system and the old idea that all planets turn around the Earth. The heliocentric system states that certain planets, such as Mercury and Venus, can be *between* the Earth and the Sun at certain times, and *behind* the Sun at other times. In contrast, the geocentric system states that they are always in between. Why did such an important difference not immediately invalidate the geocentric system?

* *

Ref. 138 The strangest reformulation of the description of motion given by $m\boldsymbol{a} = \nabla U$ is the almost absurd looking equation

$$\nabla v = \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{v}/\mathrm{d}s \tag{50}$$

Challenge 325 s where s is the motion path length. It is called the *ray form* of Newton's equation of motion. Can you find an example of its application?

* *

Challenge 326 s Seen from Neptune, the size of the Sun is the same as that of Jupiter seen from the Earth at the time of its closest approach. True?

* *

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Ref. 139 The gravitational acceleration for a particle inside a spherical shell is zero. The vanishing of gravity in this case is independent of the particle shape and its position, and independent of the thickness of the shell.Can you find the argument using Figure 128? This works only because of the $1/r^2$ dependence of gravity. Can you show that the result does not hold for non-spherical shells? Note that the vanishing of gravity inside a spherical shell usually does not hold if other matter is found outside the shell. How could one eliminate the effects of outside matter?

Challenge 327 s

Challenge 328 s

* *

What is gravity? This is not a simple question. In 1690, Nicolas Fatio de Duillier and in 1747, Georges-Louis Lesage proposed an explanation for the $1/r^2$ dependence. Lesage argued that the world is full of small particles – he called them 'corpuscules ultra-mondains' – flying around randomly and hitting all objects. Single objects do not feel the hits, since they are hit continuously and randomly from all directions. But when two objects are near to each other, they produce shadows for part of the flux to the other body, resulting in an attraction. Can you show that such an attraction has a $1/r^2$ dependence?

Ref. 140

Challenge 329 ny

However, Lesage's proposal has a number of problems. The argument only works if the collisions are inelastic. (Why?) However, that would mean that all bodies would heat up with time, as Jean-Marc Lévy-Leblond explains.

Ref. 2

There are two additional problems with the idea of Lesage. First, a moving body in free space would be hit by more or faster particles in the front than in the back; as a result, the body should be decelerated. Second, gravity would depend on size, but in a strange way. In particular, three bodies lying on a line should *not* produce shadows, as no such shadows are observed; but the naive model predicts such shadows.

Despite all the criticisms, this famous idea has regularly resurfaced in physics ever since, even though such particles have never been found. Only in the final part of our mountain ascent will we settle the issue.

* *

Challenge 330 ny For which bodies does gravity decrease as you approach them?

* *

Could one put a satellite into orbit using a cannon? Does the answer depend on the direction in which one shoots?

Challenge 331 s

* *

Two computer users share experiences. 'I threw my Pentium III and Pentium IV out of the window.' 'And?' 'The Pentium III was faster.'

* *

Challenge 332 s How often does the Earth rise and fall when seen from the Moon? Does the Earth show phases?

* *

Challenge 333 ny What is the weight of the Moon? How does it compare with the weight of the Alps?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

Owing to the slightly flattened shape of the Earth, the source of the Mississippi is about 20 km nearer to the centre of the Earth than its mouth; the water effectively runs uphill. Challenge 334 s How can this be?

* *

If a star is made of high density material, the speed of a planet orbiting near to it could Challenge 335 s be greater than the speed of light. How does nature avoid this strange possibility?

* *

What will happen to the solar system in the future? This question is surprisingly hard to answer. The main expert of this topic, French planetary scientist Jacques Laskar, simu- Ref. 141 lated a few hundred million years of evolution using computer-aided calculus. He found Page 307 that the planetary orbits are stable, but that there is clear evidence of chaos in the evolution of the solar system, at a small level. The various planets influence each other in subtle and still poorly understood ways. Effects in the past are also being studied, such as the energy change of Jupiter due to its ejection of smaller asteroids from the solar system, or energy gains of Neptune. There is still a lot of research to be done in this field.

* *

One of the open problems of the solar system is the description of planet distances discovered in 1766 by Johann Daniel Titius (1729–1796) and publicized by Johann Elert Bode (1747–1826). Titius discovered that planetary distances d from the Sun can be approximated by

$$d = a + 2^n b \quad \text{with} \quad a = 0.4\,\text{AU}\,,\ b = 0.3\,\text{AU} \tag{51}$$

where distances are measured in astronomical units and n is the number of the planet. The resulting approximation is compared with observations in Table 25.

Interestingly, the last three planets, as well as the planetoids, were discovered *after* Bode's and Titius' deaths; the rule had successfully predicted Uranus' distance, as well as that of the planetoids. Despite these successes – and the failure for the last two planets – nobody has yet found a model for the formation of the planets that explains Titius' rule. The large satellites of Jupiter and of Uranus have regular spacing, but not according to the Titius–Bode rule.

Explaining or disproving the rule is one of the challenges that remains in classical Ref. 142 mechanics. Some researchers maintain that the rule is a consequence of scale invariance, Ref. 143 others maintain that it is a accident or even a red herring. The last interpretation is also suggested by the non-Titius–Bode behaviour of practically all extrasolar planets. The issue is not closed.

* *

Around 3000 years ago, the Babylonians had measured the orbital times of the seven celestial bodies. Ordered from longest to shortest, they wrote them down in Table 26.

The Babylonians also introduced the week and the division of the day into 24 hours. The Babylonians dedicated every one of the 168 hours of the week to a celestial body, following the order of Table 26. They also dedicated the whole day to that celestial body that

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 25 An unexplained property of nature: planet distances and the values resulting from the Titius–Bode rule

PLANET	n	PREDICTED DISTANCE IN AU	MEASURED DISTANCE IN AU
Mercury	$-\infty$	0.4	0.4
Venus	0	0.7	0.7
Earth	1	1.0	1.0
Mars	2	1.6	1.5
Planetoids	3	2.8	2.2 to 3.2
Jupiter	4	5.2	5.2
Saturn	5	10.0	9.5
Uranus	6	19.6	19.2
Neptune	7	38.8	30.1
Pluto	8	77.2	39.5

TABLE 26 The orbital periods known to the Babylonians

BODY	PERIOD
Saturn	29 a
Jupiter	12 a
Mars	687 d
Sun	365 d
Venus	224 d
Mercury	88 d
Moon	29 d

corresponds to the first hour of that day. The first day of the week was dedicated to Saturn; the present ordering of the other days of the week then follows from Table 26. This story was told by Cassius Dio (*c.* 160 to *c.* 230). Towards the end of Antiquity, the ordering was taken up by the Roman empire. In Germanic languages, including English, the Latin names of the celestial bodies were replaced by the corresponding Germanic gods. The order Saturday, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday is thus a consequence of both the astronomical measurements and the astrological superstitions of the ancients.

Challenge 336 e

Ref. 144

* *

In 1722, the great mathematician Leonhard Euler made a mistake in his calculation that led him to conclude that if a tunnel were built from one pole of the Earth to the other, a stone falling into it would arrive at the Earth's centre and then immediately turn and go back up. Voltaire made fun of this conclusion for many years. Can you correct Euler

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 129 The solar eclipse of 11 August 1999, photographed by Jean-Pierre Haigneré, member of the Mir 27 crew, and the (enhanced) solar eclipse of 29 March 2006 (© CNES and Laurent Laveder/PixHeaven.net)

and show that the real motion is an oscillation from one pole to the other, and can you Challenge 337 s calculate the time a pole-to-pole fall would take (assuming homogeneous density)?

What would be the oscillation time for an arbitrary straight surface-to-surface tunnel Challenge 338 s of length l, thus *not* going from pole to pole?

* *

Figure 129 shows a photograph of a solar eclipse taken from the Russian space station *Mir* and a photograph taken at the centre of the shadow from the Earth. Indeed, a global view of a phenomenon can be quite different from a local one. What is the speed of the Challenge 339 s shadow?

* *

In 2005, satellite measurements have shown that the water in the Amazon river presses down the land up to 75 mm more in the season when it is full of water than in the season Ref. 145 when it is almost empty.

* *

Assume that wires existed that do not break. How long would such a wire have to be so Challenge 340 s that, attached to the equator, it would stand upright in the air?

* *

Everybody know that there are roughly two tides per day. But there are places, such as on the coast of Vietnam, where there is only one tide per day. See www.jason.oceanobs.com/html/applications/marees/marees_m2k1_fr.html. Why? Challenge 341 ny

* *

It is sufficient to use the concept of centrifugal force to show that the rings of Saturn cannot be made of massive material, but must be made of separate pieces. Can you find Challenge 342 s out how?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

A painting is hanging on the wall of Dr. Dolittle's waiting room. He hung up the painting using two nails, and wound the picture wire around the nails in such a way that the painting would fall if either nail were pulled out. How did Dr. Dolittle do it?

Challenge 343 e

* *

Why did Mars lose its atmosphere? Nobody knows. It has recently been shown that the solar wind is too weak for this to happen. This is one of the many riddles of the solar system.

Challenge 344 r

* *

The observed motion due to gravity can be shown to be the simplest possible, in the following sense. If we measure change of a falling object with $\int mv^2/2 - mgh\mathrm{d}t$, then a constant acceleration due to gravity *minimizes* the change in every example of fall. Can you confirm this?

Page 198

Challenge 345 ny

Summary on gravitation

Spherical bodies of mass m attract others at a distance r by inducing an acceleration towards them given by $a = Gm/r^2$. This expression, *universal gravity*, describes snowboarders, skiers, paragliders, athletes, couch potatoes, pendula, stones, canons, rockets, tides, eclipses, planets and much more. It is the first example of a unified description, in this case, of *everything falling*.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 7

CLASSICAL MECHANICS AND THE PREDICTABILITY OF MOTION

All those types of motion that can be described when the only permanent property of a body is mass, form the mass of a body is its only permanent property form what is called *mechanics*. The same name is also given to the experts studying the field. We can think of mechanics as the athletic part of physics;* both in athletics and in mechanics only lengths, times and masses are measured.

More specifically, our topic of investigation so far is called *classical* mechanics, to distinguish it from *quantum* mechanics. The main difference is that in classical physics arbitrary small values are assumed to exist, whereas this is not the case in quantum physics. Classical mechanics is often also called *Galilean physics* or *Newtonian physics*.**

Classical mechanics states that motion is *predictable*: it thus states that there are no surprises in motion. Is this correct in all cases? Let us start with the exploration of this issue.

We know that there is more to the world than gravity. A simple observation makes the point: *friction*. Friction cannot be due to gravity, because friction is not observed in the skies, where motion follows gravity rules only.*** Moreover, on Earth, friction is independent of gravity, as you might want to check. There must be another interaction responsible for friction. We shall study it shortly. But one issue merits a discussion right away.

Challenge 346 e

Should one use force? Power?

> The direct use of force is such a poor solution to any problem, it is generally employed only by small children and large nations.
>
> David Friedman

* This is in contrast to the actual origin of the term 'mechanics', which means 'machine science'. It derives from the Greek μηκανή, which means 'machine' and even lies at the origin of the English word 'machine' itself. Sometimes the term 'mechanics' is used for the study of motion of *solid* bodies only, excluding, e.g., hydrodynamics. This use fell out of favour in physics in the twentieth century.

** The basis of classical mechanics, the description of motion using only space and time, is called *kinematics*. An example is the description of free fall by $z(t) = z_0 + v_0(t - t_0) - \frac{1}{2}g(t - t_0)^2$. The other, main part of classical mechanics is the description of motion as a consequence of interactions between bodies; it is called *dynamics*. An example of dynamics is the formula of universal gravity. The distinction between kinematics and dynamics can also be made in relativity, thermodynamics and electrodynamics.

*** This is not completely correct: in the 1980s, the first case of gravitational friction was discovered: the emission of gravity waves. We discuss it in detail in the part on general relativity.

Page 525

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 27 Some force values in nature

OBSERVATION	FORCE
Value measured in a magnetic resonance force microscope	820 zN
Force needed to rip a DNA molecule apart by pulling at its two ends	600 pN
Maximum force exerted by teeth	1.6 kN
Typical peak force exerted by sledgehammer	2 kN
Force exerted by quadriceps	up to 3 kN
Force sustained by $1\,\mathrm{cm}^2$ of a good adhesive	up to 10 kN
Force needed to tear a good rope used in rock climbing	30 kN
Maximum force measurable in nature	$3.0 \cdot 10^{43}$ N

Everybody has to take a stand on this question, even students of physics. Indeed, many types of forces are used and observed in daily life. One speaks of muscular, gravitational, psychic, sexual, satanic, supernatural, social, political, economic and many others. Physicists see things in a simpler way. They call the different types of forces observed between objects *interactions*. The study of the details of all these interactions will show that, in everyday life, they are of electrical origin.

For physicists, all change is due to motion. The term force then also takes on a more restrictive definition. *(Physical) force* is defined as the *change of momentum*, i.e., as

$$\boldsymbol{F} = \frac{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{p}}{\mathrm{d}t} \,. \tag{52}$$

Force is the change or flow of momentum. If a force acts on a body, momentum flows into it. Indeed, momentum can be imagined to be some invisible and intangible liquid. Force measures how much of this liquid flows from one body to another per unit time.

Using the Galilean definition of linear momentum $\boldsymbol{p} = m\boldsymbol{v}$, we can rewrite the definition of force (for constant mass) as

$$\boldsymbol{F} = m\boldsymbol{a} \,, \tag{53}$$

where $\boldsymbol{F} = \boldsymbol{F}(t, \boldsymbol{x})$ is the force acting on an object of mass m and where $\boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{a}(t, \boldsymbol{x}) = \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{v}/\mathrm{d}t = \mathrm{d}^2\boldsymbol{x}/\mathrm{d}t^2$ is the acceleration of the same object, that is to say its change of velocity.* The expression states in precise terms that force is what changes the *velocity* of masses. The quantity is called 'force' because it corresponds in many, but *not* all aspects to muscular force. For example, the more force is used, the further a stone can be thrown.

However, whenever the concept of force is used, it should be remembered that *physical force is different from everyday force or everyday effort*. Effort is probably best approximated by the concept of *(physical) power*, usually abbreviated P, and defined (for constant

* This equation was first written down by the Swiss mathematician and physicist Leonhard Euler (1707–1783) in 1747, 20 years after the death of Newton, to whom it is usually and falsely ascribed. It was Euler, one of the greatest mathematicians of all time, not Newton, who first understood that this definition of force is useful in *every* case of motion, whatever the appearance, be it for point particles or extended objects, and be it rigid, deformable or fluid bodies. Surprisingly and in contrast to frequently-made statements, equation (53) is even correct in relativity, as shown on page 452.

Ref. 26

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

force) as

$$P = \frac{\mathrm{d}W}{\mathrm{d}t} = \boldsymbol{F} \cdot \boldsymbol{v} \tag{54}$$

in which *(physical) work* W is defined as $W = \boldsymbol{F} \cdot \boldsymbol{s}$. Physical work is a form of energy, as you might want to check. Work, as a form of energy, has to be taken into account when the conservation of energy is checked. Note that a man who walks carrying a heavy rucksack is hardly doing any work; why then does he get tired?

Challenge 347 s

Challenge 348 s

With the definition of work just given you can solve the following puzzles. What happens to the electricity consumption of an escalator if you walk on it instead of standing still? What is the effect of the definition of power for the salary of scientists?

Challenge 349 d

Ref. 146

When students in exams say that the force acting on a thrown stone is least at the highest point of the trajectory, it is customary to say that they are using an incorrect view, namely the so-called *Aristotelian view*, in which force is proportional to velocity. Sometimes it is even said that they are using a different concept of *state* of motion. Critics then add, with a tone of superiority, how wrong all this is. This is an example of intellectual disinformation. Every student knows from riding a bicycle, from throwing a stone or from pulling an object that increased effort results in increased speed. The student is right; those theoreticians who deduce that the student has a mistaken concept of *force* are wrong. In fact, instead of the *physical* concept of force, the student is just using the *everyday* version, namely effort. Indeed, the effort exerted by gravity on a flying stone is least at the highest point of the trajectory. Understanding the difference between physical force and everyday effort is the main hurdle in learning mechanics.*

Often the flow of momentum, equation (52), is not recognized as the definition of force. This is mainly due to an everyday observation: there seem to be forces without any associated acceleration or change in momentum, such as in a string under tension or in water at high pressure. When one pushes against a tree, there is no motion, yet a force is applied. If force is momentum flow, where does the momentum go? It flows into the slight deformations of the arms and the tree. In fact, when one starts pushing and thus deforming, the associated momentum change of the molecules, the atoms, or the electrons of the two bodies can be observed. After the deformation is established, and looking at even higher magnification, one can indeed find that a continuous and equal flow of momentum is going on in both directions. The nature of this flow will be clarified in the part on quantum theory.

As force is net momentum flow, it is only needed as a separate concept in everyday life, where it is useful in situations where net momentum flows are less than the total flows. At the microscopic level, momentum alone suffices for the description of motion. For example, the concept of *weight* describes the flow of momentum due to gravity. Thus we will hardly ever use the term 'weight' in the microscopic part of our adventure.

Before we can answer the question in the title, on the usefulness of force and power, we need more arguments. Through its definition, the concept of force is distinguished clearly from 'mass', 'momentum', 'energy' and 'power'. But where do forces originate? In

* This stepping stone is so high that many professional physicists do not really take it themselves; this is confirmed by the innumerable comments in papers that state that physical force is defined using mass, and, at the same time, that mass is defined using force (the latter part of the sentence being a fundamental mistake).

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

other words, which effects in nature have the capacity to accelerate bodies by pumping momentum into objects? Table 28 gives an overview.

Friction and motion

Every example of motion, from the one that lets us choose the direction of our gaze to the one that carries a butterfly through the landscape, can be put into one of the two leftmost columns of Table 28. Physically, the two columns are separated by the following criterion: in the first class, the acceleration of a body can be in a different direction from its velocity. The second class of examples produces only accelerations that are exactly *opposed* to the velocity of the moving body, as seen from the frame of reference of the braking medium. Such a resisting force is called *friction*, *drag* or a *damping*. All examples in the second class are types of friction. Just check.

Challenge 350 e

Friction can be so strong that all motion of a body against its environment is made impossible. This type of friction, called *static friction* or *sticking friction*, is common and important: without it, turning the wheels of bicycles, trains or cars would have no effect. Without static friction, wheels driven by a motor would have no grip. Similarly, not a single screw would stay tightened and no hair clip would work. We could neither run nor walk in a forest, as the soil would be more slippery than polished ice. In fact not only our own motion, but all *voluntary motion* of living beings is *based* on friction. The same is the case for self-moving machines. Without static friction, the propellers in ships, aeroplanes and helicopters would not have any effect and the wings of aeroplanes would produce no lift to keep them in the air. (Why?) In short, static friction is required whenever we or an engine want to move relative to our environment.

Challenge 351 s

Friction, sport, machines and predictability

Once an object moves through its environment, it is hindered by another type of friction; it is called *dynamic friction* and acts between bodies in relative motion. Without it, falling bodies would always rebound to the same height, without ever coming to a stop; neither parachutes nor brakes would work; worse, we would have no memory, as we will see later.*

Ref. 147

All motion examples in the second column of Table 28 include friction. In these examples, macroscopic energy is not conserved: the systems are *dissipative*. In the first column, macroscopic energy is constant: the systems are *conservative*.

The first two columns can also be distinguished using a more abstract, mathematical criterion: on the left are accelerations that can be derived from a potential, on the right, decelerations that can not. As in the case of gravitation, the description of any kind of motion is much simplified by the use of a potential: at every position in space, one needs only the single value of the potential to calculate the trajectory of an object, instead of the three values of the acceleration or the force. Moreover, the magnitude of the velocity of an object at any point can be calculated directly from energy conservation.

The processes from the second column *cannot* be described by a potential. These are

* Recent research suggest that maybe in certain crystalline systems, such as tungsten bodies on silicon, under ideal conditions gliding friction can be extremely small and possibly even vanish in certain directions of motion. This so-called *superlubrication* is presently a topic of research.

Ref. 148

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 28 Selected processes and devices changing the motion of bodies

SITUATIONS THAT CAN LEAD TO ACCELERATION	SITUATIONS THAT ONLY LEAD TO DECELERATION	MOTORS AND ACTUATORS
piezoelectricity		
quartz under applied voltage	thermoluminescence	walking piezo tripod
collisions		
satellite in planet encounter	car crash	rocket motor
growth of mountains	meteorite crash	swimming of larvae
magnetic effects		
compass needle near magnet	electromagnetic braking	electromagnetic gun
magnetostriction	transformer losses	linear motor
current in wire near magnet	electric heating	galvanometer
electric effects		
rubbed comb near hair	friction between solids	electrostatic motor
bombs	fire	muscles, sperm flagella
television tube	electron microscope	Brownian motor
light		
levitating objects by light	light bath stopping atoms	(true) light mill
solar sail for satellites	light pressure inside stars	solar cell
elasticity		
bow and arrow	trouser suspenders	ultrasound motor
bent trees standing up again	pillow, air bag	bimorphs
osmosis		
water rising in trees	salt conservation of food	osmotic pendulum
electro-osmosis		tunable X-ray screening
heat & pressure		
freezing champagne bottle	surfboard water resistance	hydraulic engines
tea kettle	quicksand	steam engine
barometer	parachute	air gun, sail
earthquakes	sliding resistance	seismometer
attraction of passing trains	shock absorbers	water turbine
nuclei		
radioactivity	plunging into the Sun	supernova explosion
biology		
bamboo growth	decreasing blood vessel diameter	molecular motors
gravitation		
falling	emission of gravity waves	pulley

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 130 Shapes and air/water resistance

the cases where we necessarily have to use force if we want to describe the motion of the system. For example, the *friction* or *drag* force F due to wind resistance of a body is *roughly* given by

$$F = \frac{1}{2} c_w \rho A v^2 \tag{55}$$

where A is the area of its cross-section and v its velocity relative to the air, ρ is the density of air; the *drag coefficient* c_w is a pure number that depends on the shape of the moving object. (A few examples are given in Figure 130. The formula is valid for all fluids, not only for air, below the speed of sound, as long as the drag is due to turbulence. This is usually the case in air and in water. At low velocities, when the fluid motion is not turbulent but laminar, drag is called *viscous* and follows an (almost) linear relation with speed.) You may check that aerodynamic resistance cannot be derived from a potential.*

Challenge 352 ny

The drag coefficient c_w is a measured quantity.** An aerodynamic car has a value between 0.25 and 0.3; many sports cars share with vans values of 0.44 and higher, and racing car values can be as high as 1, depending on the amount of the force that is used to keep the car fastened to the ground. The lowest known values are for dolphins and penguins.

* Such a statement about friction is correct only in three dimensions, as is the case in nature; in the case of a single dimension, a potential can *always* be found.

Challenge 353 s

** Calculating drag coefficients in computers, given the shape of the body and the properties of the fluid, is one of the most difficult tasks of science; the problem is still not solved.

The topic of aerodynamic shapes is even more interesting for fluid bodies. They are kept together by *surface tension*. For example, surface tension keeps the hairs of a wet brush together. Surface tension also determines the shape of rain drops. Experiments show that it is spherical for drops smaller than 2 mm diameter, and that larger rain drops are *lens* shaped, with the flat part towards the bottom. The usual tear shape is *not* encountered in nature; something vaguely similar to it appears during drop detachment, but *never* during drop fall.

Page 1329
Ref. 149

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Ref. 150 Wind resistance is also of importance to humans, in particular in athletics. It is estimated that 100 m sprinters spend between 3 % and 6 % of their power overcoming drag. This leads to varying sprint times t_w when wind of speed w is involved, related by the expression

$$\frac{t_0}{t_w} = 1.03 - 0.03\left(1 - \frac{w\,t_w}{100\,\mathrm{m}}\right)^2 , \tag{56}$$

where the more conservative estimate of 3 % is used. An opposing wind speed of −2 m/s gives an increase in time of 0.13 s, enough to change a potential world record into an 'only' excellent result. (Are you able to deduce the c_w value for running humans from the formula?) Challenge 354 ny

Likewise, parachuting exists due to wind resistance. Can you determine how the speed of a falling body changes with time, assuming *constant* shape and drag coefficient? Challenge 355 s

In contrast, static friction has different properties. It is proportional to the force pressing the two bodies together. Why? Studying the situation in more detail, sticking friction is found to be proportional to the actual contact area. It turns out that putting two solids into contact is rather like turning Switzerland upside down and putting it onto Austria; the area of contact is much smaller than that estimated macroscopically. The important point is that the area of actual contact is proportional to the *normal* force. The study of what happens in that contact area is still a topic of research; researchers are investigating the issues using instruments such as atomic force microscopes, lateral force microscopes and triboscopes. These efforts resulted in computer hard discs which last longer, as the friction between disc and the reading head is a central quantity in determining the lifetime. Ref. 151

All forms of friction are accompanied by an increase in the temperature of the moving body. The reason became clear after the discovery of atoms. Friction is not observed in few – e.g. 2, 3, or 4 – particle systems. Friction only appears in systems with many particles, usually millions or more. Such systems are called *dissipative*. Both the temperature changes and friction itself are due to the motion of large numbers of microscopic particles against each other. This motion is not included in the Galilean description. When it is included, friction and energy loss disappear, and potentials can then be used throughout. Positive accelerations – of microscopic magnitude – then also appear, and motion is found to be conserved. As a result, all motion is conservative on a microscopic scale. Therefore, on a microscopic scale it is possible to describe *all* motion without the concept of force.*

The moral of the story is twofold: First, one should use force and power only in one situation: in the case of friction, and only when one does not want to go into the micro-

* The first scientist who eliminated force from the description of nature was Heinrich Rudolf Hertz (b. 1857 Hamburg, d. 1894 Bonn), the famous discoverer of electromagnetic waves, in his textbook on mechanics, *Die Prinzipien der Mechanik*, Barth, 1894, republished by Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt, 1963. His idea was strongly criticized at that time; only a generation later, when quantum mechanics quietly got rid of the concept for good, did the idea become commonly accepted. (Many have speculated about the role Hertz would have played in the development of quantum mechanics and general relativity, had he not died so young.) In his book, Hertz also formulated the principle of the straightest path: particles follow geodesics. This same description is one of the pillars of general relativity, as we will see later on.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

scopic details.* Secondly, friction is not an obstacle to predictability.

> Et qu'avons-nous besoin de ce moteur, quand l'étude réfléchie de la nature nous prouve que le mouvement perpétuel est la première de ses lois ?**
>
> Donatien de Sade *Justine, ou les malheurs de la vertu*.

Complete states – initial conditions

> Quid sit futurum cras, fuge quaerere ...***
>
> Horace, *Odi*, lib. I, ode 9, v. 13.

Let us continue our exploration of the predictability of motion. We often describe the motion of a body by specifying the time dependence of its position, for example as

$$\boldsymbol{x}(t) = \boldsymbol{x}_0 + \boldsymbol{v}_0(t - t_0) + \tfrac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{a}_0(t - t_0)^2 + \tfrac{1}{6}\boldsymbol{j}_0(t - t_0)^3 + \dots \,. \tag{57}$$

The quantities with an index 0, such as the starting position $\boldsymbol{x}_0$, the starting velocity $\boldsymbol{v}_0$, etc., are called *initial conditions*. Initial conditions are necessary for any description of motion. Different physical systems have different initial conditions. Initial conditions thus specify the *individuality* of a given system. Initial conditions also allow us to distinguish the present situation of a system from that at any previous time: initial conditions specify the *changing aspects* of a system. In other words, they summarize the past of a system.

Page 34 Initial conditions are thus precisely the properties we have been seeking for a description of the *state* of a system. To find a complete description of states we thus need only a complete description of initial conditions, which we can thus righty call also *initial states*. It turns out that for gravitation, as for all other microscopic interactions, there is *no* need for initial acceleration $\boldsymbol{a}_0$, initial jerk $\boldsymbol{j}_0$, or higher-order initial quantities. In nature, acceleration and jerk depend only on the properties of objects and their environment; they do not depend on the past. For example, the expression $a = GM/r^2$ of universal gravity, giving the acceleration of a small body near a large one, does not depend on the past, but only on the environment. The same happens for the other fundamental interactions, as we will find out shortly.

Page 83 The *complete state* of a moving mass point is thus described by specifying its position and its momentum at all instants of time. Thus we have achieved a complete description of the intrinsic properties of point objects, namely by their mass, and of their states of motion, namely by their momentum, energy, position and time. For *extended rigid* objects we also need orientation, angular velocity and angular momentum. Can you specify the necessary quantities in the cases of extended elastic bodies and of fluids? Challenge 356 ny

---

* In the case of human relations the evaluation should be somewhat more discerning, as the research by James Gilligan shows. Ref. 152

** 'And whatfor do we need this motor, when the reasoned study of nature proves to us that perpetual motion is the first of its laws?'

*** 'What future will be tomorrow, never ask ...' Horace is Quintus Horatius Flaccus (65–8 BCE), the great Roman poet. Ref. 68

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The set of all possible states of a system is given a special name: it is called the *phase space*. We will use the concept repeatedly. Like any space, it has a number of dimensions. Challenge 357 s Can you specify it for a system consisting of N point particles?

Given that we have a description of both properties and states of point objects, extended rigid objects and deformable bodies, can we predict all motion? Not yet. There are situations in nature where the motion of an object depends on characteristics other Challenge 358 s than its mass; motion can depend on its colour (can you find an example?), on its temperature, and on a few other properties that we will soon discover. Can you give an example Challenge 359 s of an intrinsic property that we have so far missed? And for each intrinsic property there are state variables to discover. These new properties are the basis of the field of physical enquiry beyond mechanics. We must therefore conclude that as yet we do not have a complete description of motion.

It is interesting to recall an older challenge and ask again: does the universe have initial Challenge 360 s conditions? Does it have a phase space? As a hint, recall that when a stone is thrown, the initial conditions summarize the effects of the thrower, his history, the way he got there etc.; in other words, initial conditions summarize the effects that the environment had during the history of a system.

> An optimist is somebody who thinks that the future is uncertain.
>
> Anonymous

Do surprises exist? Is the future determined?

> Die Ereignisse der Zukunft *können* wir nicht aus den gegenwärtigen erschließen. Der Glaube an den Kausalnexus ist ein Aberglaube.*
>
> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 5.1361

> Freedom is the recognition of necessity.
>
> Friedrich Engels (1820–1895)

If, after climbing a tree, we jump down, we cannot halt the jump in the middle of the trajectory; once the jump has begun, it is unavoidable and determined, like all passive motion. However, when we begin to move an arm, we can stop or change its motion from a hit to a caress. Voluntary motion does not seem unavoidable or predetermined. Which Challenge 361 e of these two cases is the general one?

Let us start with the example that we can describe most precisely so far: the fall of a body. Once the potential φ acting on a particle is given and taken into account, using

$$\boldsymbol{a}(x) = -\nabla\varphi = -GM\boldsymbol{r}/r^3 \,, \tag{58}$$

and once the state at a given time is given by initial conditions such as

$$\boldsymbol{x}(t_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{v}(t_0) \,, \tag{59}$$

* 'We cannot infer the events of the future from those of the present. Belief in the causal nexus is superstition.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

we then can determine the motion of the particle in advance. The complete trajectory $\boldsymbol{x}(t)$ can be calculated with these two pieces of information.

An equation that has the potential to predict the course of events is called an *evolution equation*. Equation (58), for example, is an evolution equation for the motion of the object. (Note that the term 'evolution' has different meanings in physics and in biology.) An evolution equation embraces the observation that not all types of change are observed in nature, but only certain specific cases. Not all imaginable sequences of events are observed, but only a limited number of them. In particular, equation (58) embraces the idea that from one instant to the next, objects change their motion based on the potential acting on them. Given an evolution equation and initial state, the whole motion of a system is *uniquely fixed*, a property of motion often called *determinism*.

Let us carefully distinguish determinism from several similar concepts, to avoid misunderstandings. Motion can be deterministic and at the same time be *unpredictable in practice*. The unpredictability of motion can have four origins:

1. an impracticably large number of particles involved,
2. the mathematical complexity of the evolution equations,
3. insufficient information about initial conditions, and
4. strange shapes of space-time.

For example, in case of the weather the first three conditions are fulfilled at the same time. Nevertheless, weather change is still deterministic. As another example, near black holes all four origins apply together. We will discuss black holes in the section on general relativity. Despite being unpredictable, motion is deterministic near black holes.

Motion can be both deterministic and time *random*, i.e., with different outcomes in similar experiments. A roulette ball's motion is deterministic, but it is also random.* As we will see later, quantum-mechanical situations fall into this category, as do all examples of irreversible motion, such as a drop of ink spreading out in clear water. In all such cases the randomness and the irreproducibility are only apparent; they disappear when the description of states and initial conditions in the microscopic domain are included. In short, determinism does not contradict *(macroscopic) irreversibility*. However, on the microscopic scale, deterministic motion is always reversible.

A final concept to be distinguished from determinism is *acausality*. Causality is the requirement that a cause must precede the effect. This is trivial in Galilean physics, but becomes of importance in special relativity, where causality implies that the speed of light is a limit for the spreading of effects. Indeed, it seems impossible to have deterministic motion (of matter and energy) which is *acausal*, in other words, faster than light. Can you confirm this? This topic will be looked at more deeply in the section on special relativity. Challenge 362 s

Saying that motion is 'deterministic' means that it is fixed in the future *and also in the past*. It is sometimes stated that predictions of *future* observations are the crucial test for a successful description of nature. Owing to our often impressive ability to influence the future, this is not necessarily a good test. Any theory must, first of all, describe *past*

* Mathematicians have developed a large number of tests to determine whether a collection of numbers may be called *random*; roulette results pass all these tests – in honest casinos only, however. Such tests typically check the equal distribution of numbers, of pairs of numbers, of triples of numbers, etc. Other tests are the χ^2 test, the Monte Carlo test(s), and the gorilla test. Ref. 153

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

observations correctly. It is our lack of freedom to change the past that results in our lack of choice in the description of nature that is so central to physics. In this sense, the term 'initial condition' is an unfortunate choice, because it automatically leads us to search for the initial condition of the universe and to look there for answers to questions that can be answered without that knowledge. The central ingredient of a deterministic description is that all motion can be reduced to an evolution equation plus one specific state. This state can be either initial, intermediate, or final. Deterministic motion is uniquely specified into the past and into the future.

To get a clear concept of determinism, it is useful to remind ourselves why the concept of 'time' is introduced in our description of the world. We introduce time because we observe first that we are able to define sequences in observations, and second, that unrestricted change is impossible. This is in contrast to films, where one person can walk through a door and exit into another continent or another century. In nature we do not observe metamorphoses, such as people changing into toasters or dogs into toothbrushes. We are able to introduce 'time' only because the sequential changes we observe are extremely restricted. If nature were not reproducible, time could not be used. In short, determinism expresses the observation that *sequential changes are restricted to a single possibility*.

Challenge 363 s

Since determinism is connected to the use of the concept of time, new questions arise whenever the concept of time changes, as happens in special relativity, in general relativity and in theoretical high energy physics. There is a lot of fun ahead.

In summary, every description of nature that uses the concept of time, such as that of everyday life, that of classical physics and that of quantum mechanics, is intrinsically and inescapably deterministic, since it connects observations of the past and the future, *eliminating* alternatives. In short, *the use of time implies determinism, and vice versa.* When drawing metaphysical conclusions, as is so popular nowadays when discussing quantum theory, one should never forget this connection. Whoever uses clocks but denies determinism is nurturing a split personality![*]

Page 1138

Free will

> "You do have the ability to surprise yourself."
> Richard Bandler and John Grinder

The idea that motion is determined often produces fear, because we are taught to associate determinism with lack of freedom. On the other hand, we do experience freedom in our actions and call it *free will*. We know that it is necessary for our creativity and for our happiness. Therefore it seems that determinism is opposed to happiness.

But what precisely is free will? Much ink has been consumed trying to find a precise definition. One can try to define free will as the arbitrariness of the choice of initial conditions. However, initial conditions must themselves result from the evolution equations, so that there is in fact no freedom in their choice. One can try to define free will from the idea of unpredictability, or from similar properties, such as uncomputability. But these definitions face the same simple problem: whatever the definition, there is *no way* to prove experimentally that an action was performed freely. The possible definitions are

* That can be a lot of fun though.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

useless. In short, free will *cannot* be observed. (Psychologists also have a lot of their own data to support this, but that is another topic.)

No process that is *gradual* – in contrast to *sudden* – can be due to free will; gradual processes are described by time and are deterministic. In this sense, the question about free will becomes one about the existence of sudden changes in nature. This will be a recurring topic in the rest of this walk. Can nature surprise us? In everyday life, nature does not. Sudden changes are not observed. Of course, we still have to investigate this question in other domains, in the very small and in the very large. Indeed, we will change our opinion several times. The lack of surprises in everyday life is built deep into our body: the concept of curiosity is based on the idea that everything discovered is useful afterwards. If nature continually surprised us, curiosity would make no sense.

Many observations contradict the existence of surprises: in the beginning of our walk we defined time using the continuity of motion; later on we expressed this by saying that time is a consequence of the conservation of energy. Conservation is the opposite of surprise. By the way, a challenge remains: can you show that time would not be definable even if surprises existed only *rarely*?

Challenge 364 s

In summary, so far we have no evidence that surprises exist in nature. Time exists because nature is deterministic. Free will cannot be defined with the precision required by physics. Given that there are no sudden changes, there is only one consistent definition of free will: it is a *feeling*, in particular of independence of others, of independence from fear and of accepting the consequences of one's actions. Free will is a feeling of satisfaction. This solves the apparent paradox; free will, being a feeling, exists as a human experience, even though all objects move without any possibility of choice. There is no contradiction.*

Ref. 154

Even if human action is determined, it is still authentic. So why is determinism so frightening? That is a question everybody has to ask themselves. What difference does determinism imply for your life, for the actions, the choices, the responsibilities and the pleasures you encounter?** If you conclude that being determined is different from being free, you should change your life! Fear of determinism usually stems from refusal to take the world the way it is. Paradoxically, it is precisely he who insists on the existence of free will who is running away from responsibility.

Ref. 155

Challenge 366 e

Summary on predictability

Despite difficulties to predict specific cases, all motion we encountered so far is deterministic and predictable. In fact, this is the case for all motion in nature, even in the domain

* That free will is a feeling can also be confirmed by careful introspection. The idea of free will always appears *after* an action has been started. It is a beautiful experiment to sit down in a quiet environment, with the intention to make, within an unspecified number of minutes, a small gesture, such as closing a hand. If you carefully observe, in all detail, what happens inside yourself around the very moment of decision, you find either a mechanism that led to the decision, or a diffuse, unclear mist. You never find free will. Such an experiment is a beautiful way to experience deeply the wonders of the self. Experiences of this kind might also be one of the origins of human spirituality, as they show the connection everybody has with the rest of nature.

Challenge 365 e

** If nature's 'laws' are deterministic, are they in contrast with moral or ethical 'laws'? Can people still be held responsible for their actions?

Challenge 367 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 131 What shape of rail allows the black stone to glide most rapidly from point A to the lower point B?



FIGURE 132 Can motion be described in a manner common to all observers?

of quantum theory. If motion were not predictable, we could not have introduced the concept of 'motion' in the first place.

Global descriptions of motion

> Πλεῖν ἀνάγκε, ζῆν οὐκ ἀνάγκη.*
>
> Pompeius

All over the Earth – even in Australia – people observe that stones fall 'down'. This ancient observation led to the discovery of the universal 'law' of gravity. To find it, all that was necessary was to look for a description of gravity that was valid globally. The only additional observation that needs to be recognized in order to deduce the result $a = GM/r^2$ is the variation of gravity with height.

In short, thinking *globally* helps us to make our description of motion more precise and our predictions more useful. How can we describe motion as globally as possible? It turns out that there are six approaches to this question, each of which will be helpful on our way to the top of Motion Mountain. We first give an overview, and then explore the details of each approach.

1. *Variational principles*, the first global approach to motion, arises when we overcome a limitation of what we have learned so far. When we predict the motion of a particle from its current acceleration with an evolution equation, we are using the most *local* description of motion possible. We use the acceleration of a particle at a certain place and time to determine its position and motion *just after* that moment and *in the immediate neighbourhood* of that place. Evolution equations thus have a mental 'horizon' of radius zero.

Page 186

The contrast to evolution equations are variational principles. A famous example is illustrated in Figure 131. The challenge is to find the path that allows the fastest possible gliding motion from a high point to a distant low point. The sought path is the *brachistochrone*, from ancient Greek for 'shortest time'. This puzzle asks about a property of motion as a whole, for all times and positions. The global approach

Challenge 368 d

* Navigare necesse, vivere non necesse. 'To navigate is necessary, to live is not.' Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus (106–48 BCE) is cited in this way by Plutarchus (*c.* 45 to *c.* 125).

Ref. 156

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 133 What happens when one rope is cut?



FIGURE 134 A famous mechanism that allows to draw a straight line with a compass: fix point F, put a pencil into joint P and move C with a compass along a circle

required by questions such as this one will lead us to a description of motion which is simple, precise and fascinating: the so-called principle of cosmic laziness, also known as the principle of least action.

2. *Relativity*, the second global approach to motion, emerges when we compare the various descriptions of the same system produced by different observers. For example, the observations by somebody falling from a cliff, a passenger in a roller coaster, and an observer on the ground will usually differ. The relationships between these observations lead us to a global description, valid for everybody. Later, this approach will lead us to Einstein's special theory of relativity.

3. *Mechanics of extended and rigid* bodies, rather than mass points, is required to understand many objects, plants and animals. As an example, the counter-intuitive result of the experiment in Figure 133 shows why this topic is worthwhile.

   In order to design machines, it is essential to understand how a group of rigid bodies interact with one another. For example, take the mechanism in Figure 134. A joint F is fixed on a wall. Two movable rods lead to two opposite corners of a movable rhombus, whose rods connect to the other two corners C and P. This mechanism has several astonishing properties. First of all, it implicitly defines a circle of radius R so that one always has the relation $r_C = R^2/r_P$ between the distances of joints C and P from the centre of this circle. Can you find this special circle? Secondly, if you put a pencil in joint P, and let joint C follow a certain circle, the pencil P draws a straight line. Can you find that circle? The mechanism thus allows to draw a straight line with a compass.

Challenge 369 ny

Challenge 370 ny

Ref. 157

Another famous machine challenge is to devise a wooden carriage, with gearwheels that connect the wheels to an arrow, with the property that, whatever path the carriage takes, the arrow always points south (see Figure 135). The solution to this puzzle will even be useful in helping us to understand general relativity, as we will see. Such a wagon allows to measure the curvature of a surface and of space.

Challenge 371 d

Page 561

Another interesting example of rigid motion is the way that human movements, such as the general motions of an arm, are composed from a small number of basic motions. All these examples are from the fascinating field of engineering; unfortu-

Ref. 158

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 135 A south-pointing carriage: whatever the path it follows, the arrow on it always points south



FIGURE 136 How and where does a falling brick chimney break?



FIGURE 137 Why do hot-air balloons stay inflated? How can you measure the weight of a bicycle rider using only a ruler?

nately, we will have little time to explore this topic in our hike.

4. The next global approach to motion is the description of *non-rigid extended bodies*. For example, *fluid mechanics* studies the flow of fluids (like honey, water or air) around solid bodies (like spoons, ships, sails or wings). Fluid mechanics thus describes how insects, birds and aeroplanes fly,* why sailing-boats can sail against the wind, what happens when a hard-boiled egg is made to spin on a thin layer of water, or how a bottle full of wine can be emptied in the fastest way possible.

Ref. 159

Challenge 372 s

As well as fluids, we can study the behaviour of deformable *solids*. This area of research is called *continuum mechanics*. It deals with deformations and oscillations of extended structures. It seeks to explain, for example, why bells are made in particular shapes; how large bodies – such as falling chimneys – or small bodies – such as dia-

Challenge 373 s

* The mechanisms of insect flight are still a subject of active research. Traditionally, fluid dynamics has concentrated on large systems, like boats, ships and aeroplanes. Indeed, the smallest human-made object that can fly in a controlled way – say, a radio-controlled plane or helicopter – is much larger and heavier than many flying objects that evolution has engineered. It turns out that controlling the flight of small things requires more knowledge and more tricks than controlling the flight of large things. There is more about this topic on page 1303.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 138 Why do marguerites – or ox-eye daisies, *Leucanthemum vulgare* – usually have around 21 (left and centre) or around 34 (right) petals? (© Anonymous, Giorgio Di Iorio and Thomas Lüthi)

monds – break when under stress; and how cats can turn themselves the right way up as they fall. During the course of our journey we will repeatedly encounter issues from this field, which impinges even upon general relativity and the world of elementary particles.

5. *Statistical mechanics* is the study of the motion of huge numbers of particles. Statistical mechanics is yet another global approach to the study of motion. The concepts needed to describe gases, such as temperature, entropy and pressure (see Figure 137), are essential tools of this discipline. These concepts will also help us take our first steps towards the understanding of black holes.

6. The last global approach to motion, *self-organization*, involves all of the above-mentioned viewpoints *at the same time*. Such an approach is needed to understand everyday experience, and *life* itself. Why does a flower form a specific number of petals? How does an embryo differentiate in the womb? What makes our hearts beat? How do mountains ridges and cloud patterns emerge? How do stars and galaxies evolve? How are sea waves formed by the wind?

   All these are examples of *self-organization* processes; life scientists simply speak of *growth* processes. Whatever we call them, all these processes are characterized by the spontaneous appearance of patterns, shapes and cycles. Such processes are a common research theme across many disciplines, including biology, chemistry, medicine, geology and engineering.

We will now explore to these six global approaches to motion. We will begin with the first approach, namely, the global description of moving point-like objects with a variational principle. This beautiful method was the result of several centuries of collective effort, and is the highlight of point particle dynamics. It also provides the basis for the other global approaches and for all the further descriptions of motion that we will explore afterwards.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 8

MEASURING CHANGE WITH ACTION

Motion can be described by numbers. For a single particle, the relations between the spatial and temporal coordinates describe the motion. The realization that expressions like $(x(t), y(t), z(t))$ could be used to describe the path of a moving particle was a milestone in the development of modern physics.

We can go further. Motion is a type of *change*. And this change can itself be usefully described by numbers. In fact, change can be measured by a single number. This realization was the next important milestone. Physicists took almost two centuries of attempts to uncover the way to describe change. As a result, the quantity that measures change has a strange name: it is called *(physical) action*.* To remember the connection of 'action' with change, just think about a Hollywood film: a lot of action means a large amount of change.

Imagine taking two snapshots of a system at different times. How could you define the amount of change that occurred in between? When do things change a lot, and when do they change only a little? First of all, a system with many moving parts shows a lot of change. So it makes sense that the action of a system composed of independent subsystems should be the sum of the actions of these subsystems. And systems with large speeds, such as the explosions shown in Figure 140, show larger change than systems at lower speed.

Secondly, change often – but not always – builds up over time; in other cases, recent change can compensate for previous change, as in a pendulum. Change can thus increase or decrease with time.

Thirdly, for a system in which motion is stored, transformed or shifted from one subsystem to another, especially when kinetic energy is stored or changed to potential energy,

* Note that this 'action' is not the same as the 'action' appearing in statements such as 'every action has an equal and opposite reaction'. This last usage, coined by Newton for certain forces, has not stuck; therefore the term has been recycled. After Newton, the term 'action' was first used with an intermediate meaning, before it was finally given the modern meaning used here. This last meaning is the only meaning used in this text.

Another term that has been recycled is the 'principle of least action'. In old books it used to have a different meaning from the one in this chapter. Nowadays, it refers to what used to be called *Hamilton's principle* in the Anglo-Saxon world, even though it is (mostly) due to others, especially Leibniz. The old names and meanings are falling into disuse and are not continued here.

Behind these shifts in terminology is the story of an intense two-centuries-long attempt to describe motion with so-called *extremal* or *variational principles*: the objective was to complete and improve the work initiated by Leibniz. These principles are only of historical interest today, because all are special cases of the principle of least action described here. Ref. 160

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 139 Giuseppe/Joseph Lagrangia/Lagrange

FIGURE 140 Physical action measures change: an example of process with large action value (© Christophe Blanc)

change is smaller than for a system where all systems move freely.

The mentioned properties imply that the natural measure of change is the average difference between kinetic and potential energy multiplied by the elapsed time. This quantity has all the right properties: it is the sum of the corresponding quantities for all subsystems if these are independent; it generally increases with time (unless the evolution compensates for something that happened earlier); and it decreases if the system transforms motion into potential energy.

Challenge 374 e

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 29 Some action values for changes either observed or imagined

CHANGE	APPROXIMATE ACTION VALUE
Smallest measurable change in nature	$0.5 \cdot 10^{-34}$ Js
Exposure of photographic film	$1.1 \cdot 10^{-34}$ Js to 10^{-9} Js
Wing beat of a fruit fly	*c.* 1 pJs
Flower opening in the morning	*c.* 1 nJs
Getting a red face	*c.* 10 mJs
Held versus dropped glass	*c.* 0.8 Js
Tree bent by the wind from one side to the other	*c.* 500 Js
Making a white rabbit vanish by 'real' magic	*c.* 100 PJs
Hiding a white rabbit	*c.* 0.1 Js
Maximum brain change in a minute	*c.* 5 Js
Levitating yourself within a minute by 1 m	*c.* 40 kJs
Car crash	*c.* 2 kJs
Birth	*c.* 2 kJs
Change due to a human life	*c.* 1 EJs
Driving car stops within the blink of an eye	*c.* 20 kJs
Large earthquake	*c.* 1 PJs
Driving car disappears within the blink of an eye	*c.* 1 ZJs
Sunrise	*c.* 0.1 ZJs
Gamma ray burster before and after explosion	*c.* 10^{46} Js
Universe after one second has elapsed	undefined and undefinable



FIGURE 141 Defining a total change or action as an accumulation (addition, or integral) of small changes or actions over time

Thus the (physical) *action* S, measuring the change in a system, is defined as

$$S = \overline{L} \cdot (t_f - t_i) = \overline{T - U} \cdot (t_f - t_i) = \int_{t_i}^{t_f} (T - U)\, \mathrm{d}t = \int_{t_i}^{t_f} L\, \mathrm{d}t\,, \qquad (60)$$



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Page 148 where T is the kinetic energy, U the potential energy we already know, L is the difference between these, and the overbar indicates a time average. The quantity L is called the *Lagrangian (function)* of the system,* describes what is being added over time, whenever things change. The sign $\int$ is a stretched 'S', for 'sum', and is pronounced 'integral of'. In intuitive terms it designates the operation (called *integration*) of adding up the values of a varying quantity in infinitesimal time steps $\mathrm{d}t$. The initial and the final times are written below and above the integration sign, respectively. Figure 141 illustrates the idea: the integral is simply the size of the dark area below the curve $L(t)$.

Challenge 375 e Mathematically, the integral of the curve $L(t)$ is defined as

$$\int_{t_\mathrm{i}}^{t_\mathrm{f}} L(t)\,\mathrm{d}t = \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \sum_{\mathrm{m=i}}^{\mathrm{f}} L(t_\mathrm{m})\Delta t = \overline{L} \cdot (t_\mathrm{f} - t_\mathrm{i}) \,. \tag{61}$$

In other words, the integral is the limit, as the time slices get smaller, of the sum of the areas of the individual rectangular strips that approximate the function.** Since the $\sum$ sign also means a sum, and since an infinitesimal Δt is written $\mathrm{d}t$, we can understand the notation used for integration. Integration is a sum over slices. The notation was developed by Gottfried Leibniz to make exactly this point. Physically speaking, the integral of the Lagrangian measures the *effect* that L builds up over time. Indeed, action is called 'effect' in some languages, such as German.

In short, then, action is the integral of the Lagrangian over time. The unit of action, and thus of physical change, is the unit of energy (the Joule) times the unit of time (the second). Thus change is measured in Js. A large value means a big change. Table 29 shows some values of actions.

To understand the definition of action in more detail, we will start with the simplest case: a system for which the potential energy is zero, such as a particle moving freely. Obviously, the higher the kinetic energy is, the more change there is. Also, if we observe the particle at two instants, the more distant they are the larger the change. This is not surprising.

Next, we explore a single particle moving in a potential. For example, a falling stone loses potential energy in exchange for a gain in kinetic energy. The more energy is exchanged, the more change there is. Hence the minus sign in the definition of L. If we explore a particle that is first thrown up in the air and then falls, the curve for $L(t)$ first is below the times axis, then above. We note that the definition of integration makes us count the grey surface *below* the time axis *negatively*. Change can thus be negative, and be compensated by subsequent change, as expected.

To measure change for a system made of several independent components, we simply add all the kinetic energies and subtract all the potential energies. This technique allows

* It is named after Giuseppe Lodovico Lagrangia (b. 1736 Torino, d. 1813 Paris), better known as Joseph Louis Lagrange. He was the most important mathematician of his time; he started his career in Turin, then worked for 20 years in Berlin, and finally for 26 years in Paris. Among other things he worked on number theory and analytical mechanics, where he developed most of the mathematical tools used nowadays for calculations in classical mechanics and classical gravitation. He applied them successfully to many motions in the solar system.

** For more details on integration see Appendix B.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 142 The minimum of a curve has vanishing slope

us to define actions for gases, liquids and solid matter. Even if the components interact, we still get a sensible result. In short, action is an *additive* quantity.

Physical action thus measures, in a single number, the change observed in a system between two instants of time. The observation may be anything at all: an explosion, a caress or a colour change. We will discover later that describing change with a single number is also possible in relativity and quantum theory. Any change going on in any system of nature can be measured with a single number.

The principle of least action

We now have a precise measure of change, which, as it turns out, allows a simple and powerful description of motion. In nature, the change happening between two instants is always the *smallest* possible. *In nature, action is minimal.** Of all possible motions, nature always chooses for which the change is *minimal*. Let us study a few examples.

In the simple case of a free particle, when no potentials are involved, the principle of minimal action implies that the particle moves in a *straight* line with *constant* velocity.

Challenge 376 e All other paths would lead to larger actions. Can you verify this?

When gravity is present, a thrown stone flies along a parabola (or more precisely, along an ellipse) because any other path, say one in which the stone makes a loop in the air,

Challenge 377 e would imply a *larger* action. Again you might want to verify this for yourself.

All observations support this simple and basic statement: things always move in a way that produces the smallest possible value for the action. This statement applies to the full path and to any of its segments. Betrand Russell called it the 'law of cosmic laziness'.

It is customary to express the idea of minimal change in a different way. The action varies when the path is varied. The actual path is the one with the smallest action. You will recall from school that at a minimum the derivative of a quantity vanishes: a minimum has a horizontal slope. In the present case, we do not vary a quantity, but a complete path; hence we do not speak of a derivative or slope, but of a variation. It is customary to write the variation of action as δS. The *principle of least action* thus states:

$$\triangleright \textit{ The actual trajectory between specified end points satisfies } \delta S = 0. \qquad (62)$$

Mathematicians call this a *variational principle*. Note that the end points have to be spec-

* In fact, in some macroscopic situations the action can be a saddle point, so that the snobbish form of the

Ref. 161 principle is that the action is 'stationary'. In contrast to what is often heard, the action is *never* a maximum. Moreover, for motion on small (infinitesimal) scales, the action is always a minimum. The mathematical condition of vanishing variation, given below, encompasses all these details.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

ified: we have to compare motions with the *same* initial and final situations.

Before discussing the principle further, we can check that it is equivalent to the evolution equation.* To do this, we can use a standard procedure, part of the so-called *calculus of variations*. The condition $\delta S = 0$ implies that the action, i.e., the area under the curve in Figure 141, is a minimum. A little bit of thinking shows that if the Lagrangian is of the form $L(x_n, v_n) = T(v_n) - U(x_n)$, then

Challenge 379 ny

---

* For those interested, here are a few comments on the equivalence of Lagrangians and evolution equations. First of all, Lagrangians do not exist for non-conservative, or *dissipative* systems. We saw that there is no potential for any motion involving *friction* (and more than one dimension); therefore there is no action in these cases. One approach to overcome this limitation is to use a generalized formulation of the principle of least action. Whenever there is no potential, we can express the *work* variation δW between different trajectories x_i as

Page 181

$$\delta W = \sum_i m_i \ddot{x}_i \delta x_i \,. \tag{63}$$

Motion is then described in the following way:

$$\triangleright \textit{ The actual trajectory satifies } \int_{t_i}^{t_f} (\delta T + \delta W) \mathrm{d}t = 0 \quad \textit{provided} \quad \delta x(t_i) = \delta x(t_f) = 0 \,. \tag{64}$$

The quantity being varied has no name; it represents a generalized notion of change. You might want to check that it leads to the correct evolution equations. Thus, although *proper* Lagrangian descriptions exist only for *conservative* systems, for dissipative systems the principle can be generalized and remains useful.

Challenge 378 ny

Many physicists will prefer another approach. What a mathematician calls a generalization is a special case for a physicist: the principle (64) hides the fact that *all* friction results from the usual principle of minimal action, if we include the complete microscopic details. There is no friction in the microscopic domain. Friction is an approximate, macroscopic concept.

Nevertheless, more mathematical viewpoints are useful. For example, they lead to interesting limitations for the use of Lagrangians. These limitations, which apply only if the world is viewed as purely classical – which it isn't – were discovered about a hundred years ago. In those times computers where not available, and the exploration of new calculation techniques was important. Here is a summary.

The coordinates used in connection with Lagrangians are not necessarily the Cartesian ones. *Generalized* coordinates are especially useful when there are *constraints* on the motion. This is the case for a pendulum, where the weight always has to be at the same distance from the suspension, or for an ice skater, where the skate has to move in the direction in which it is pointing. Generalized coordinates may even be mixtures of positions and momenta. They can be divided into a few general types.

Ref. 162

Generalized coordinates are called *holonomic–scleronomic* if they are related to Cartesian coordinates in a fixed way, independently of time: physical systems described by such coordinates include the pendulum and a particle in a potential. Coordinates are called *holonomic–rheonomic* if the dependence involves time. An example of a rheonomic systems would be a pendulum whose length depends on time. The two terms rheonomic and scleronomic are due to Ludwig Boltzmann. These two cases, which concern systems that are only described by their geometry, are grouped together as *holonomic systems*. The term is due to Heinrich Hertz.

Page 287

Page 724

The more general situation is called *anholonomic*, or *nonholonomic*. Lagrangians work well only for holonomic systems. Unfortunately, the meaning of the term 'nonholonomic' has changed. Nowadays, the term is also used for certain rheonomic systems. The modern use calls nonholonomic any system which involves velocities. Therefore, an ice skater or a rolling disc is often called a nonholonomic system. Care is thus necessary to decide what is meant by nonholonomic in any particular context.

Even though the use of Lagrangians, and of action, has its limitations, these need not bother us at microscopic level, since microscopic systems are always conservative, holonomic and scleronomic. At the fundamental level, evolution equations and Lagrangians are indeed equivalent.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left(\frac{\partial T}{\partial v_\mathrm{n}}\right) = -\frac{\partial U}{\partial x_\mathrm{n}} \tag{65}$$

where n counts all coordinates of all particles.* For a single particle, these *Lagrange's equations of motion* reduce to

Challenge 380 e

$$m\boldsymbol{a} = -\nabla U \,. \tag{67}$$

This is the evolution equation: it says that the force acting on a particle is the gradient of the potential energy U. The principle of least action thus implies the equation of motion. (Can you show the converse, which is also correct?)

Challenge 381 s

In other words, *all systems evolve in such a way that the change or action is as small as possible.* Nature is economical. Nature is thus the opposite of a Hollywood thriller, in which the action is maximized; nature is more like a wise old man who keeps his actions to a minimum.

The principle of minimal action states that the actual trajectory is the one for which the *average* of the Lagrangian over the whole trajectory is minimal (see Figure 141). Nature is a Dr. Dolittle. Can you verify this? This viewpoint allows one to deduce Lagrange's equations (65) directly.

Challenge 382 ny

The principle of least action distinguishes the actual trajectory from all other imaginable ones. This observation lead Leibniz to his famous interpretation that the actual world is the 'best of all possible worlds.'** We may dismiss this as metaphysical speculation, but we should still be able to feel the fascination of the issue. Leibniz was so excited about the principle of least action because it was the first time that actual observations were distinguished from all other imaginable possibilities. For the first time, the search for reasons why things are the way they are became a part of physical investigation. Could the world be different from what it is? In the principle of least action, we have a hint of a negative answer. (What do you think?) The final answer will emerge only in the last part of our adventure.

Challenge 383 s

Lagrangians and motion

> Never confuse movement with action.
> Ernest Hemingway

Ref. 165

* The most general form for a Lagrangian $L(q_\mathrm{n}, \dot{q}_\mathrm{n}, t)$, using generalized holonomic coordinates q_n, leads to Lagrange equations of the form

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}_\mathrm{n}}\right) = \frac{\partial L}{\partial q_\mathrm{n}} \,. \tag{66}$$

In order to deduce these equations, we also need the relation $\delta\dot{q} = \mathrm{d}/\mathrm{d}t(\delta q)$. This relation is valid only for *holonomic* coordinates introduced in the previous footnote and explains their importance.

It should also be noted that the Lagrangian for a moving system is not unique; however, the study of how the various Lagrangians for a given moving system are related is not part of this walk.

Ref. 163

By the way, the letter q for position and p for momentum were introduced in physics by the mathematician Carl Jacobi (b. 1804 Potsdam, d. 1851 Berlin).

** This idea was ridiculed by the French philosopher Voltaire (1694–1778) in his lucid writings, notably in the brilliant book *Candide*, written in 1759, and still widely available.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 30 Some Lagrangians

System	Lagrangian	Variables
Free, non-relativistic mass point	$L = \frac{1}{2}mv^2$	mass m, speed $v = \mathrm{d}x/\mathrm{d}t$
Particle in potential	$L = \frac{1}{2}mv^2 - m\varphi(x)$	gravitational potential φ
Mass on spring	$L = \frac{1}{2}mv^2 - kx^2$	elongation x, spring constant k
Mass on frictionless table attached to spring	$L = \frac{1}{2}mv^2 - k(x^2 + y^2)$	spring constant k, coordinates x, y
Chain of masses and springs (simple model of atoms in a linear crystal)	$L = \frac{1}{2}m\sum v_i^2 + \frac{1}{2}m\omega^2 \sum_{i,j}(x_i - x_j)^2$	coordinates x_i, lattice frequency ω
Free, relativistic mass point	$L = -mc^2\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$	mass m, speed v, speed of light c

Systems evolve by minimizing change. Change, or action, is the time integral of the Lagrangian. As a way to describe motion, the Lagrangian has several advantages over the evolution equation. First of all, the Lagrangian is usually more *compact* than writing the corresponding evolution equations. For example, only *one* Lagrangian is needed for one system, however many particles it includes. One makes fewer mistakes, especially sign mistakes, as one rapidly learns when performing calculations. Just try to write down the evolution equations for a chain of masses connected by springs; then compare the effort with a derivation using a Lagrangian. (The system is often studied because it behaves like a chain of atoms.) We will encounter another example shortly: David Hilbert took only a few weeks to deduce the equations of motion of general relativity using a Lagrangian, whereas Albert Einstein had worked for ten years searching for them directly.

Challenge 384 ny

In addition, the description with a Lagrangian is valid with *any* set of coordinates describing the objects of investigation. The coordinates do not have to be Cartesian; they can be chosen as one prefers: cylindrical, spherical, hyperbolic, etc. These so-called *generalized coordinates* allow one to rapidly calculate the behaviour of many mechanical systems that are in practice too complicated to be described with Cartesian coordinates. For example, for programming the motion of robot arms, the angles of the joints provide a clearer description than Cartesian coordinates of the ends of the arms. Angles are non-Cartesian coordinates. They simplify calculations considerably: the task of finding the most economical way to move the hand of a robot from one point to another can be solved much more easily with angular variables.

More importantly, the Lagrangian allows one to quickly deduce the essential properties of a system, namely, its *symmetries* and its *conserved quantities*. We will develop this important idea shortly, and use it regularly throughout our walk.

Page 216

Finally, the Lagrangian formulation can be generalized to encompass *all types of interactions*. Since the concepts of kinetic and potential energy are general, the principle of least action can be used in electricity, magnetism and optics as well as mechanics. The principle of least action is central to general relativity and to quantum theory, and allows one to easily relate both fields to classical mechanics.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

As the principle of least action became well known, people applied it to an ever-increasing number of problems. Today, Lagrangians are used in everything from the study of elementary particle collisions to the programming of robot motion in artificial intelligence. However, we should not forget that despite its remarkable simplicity and usefulness, the Lagrangian formulation is *equivalent* to the evolution equations. It is neither more general nor more specific. In particular, it is *not an explanation* for any type of motion, but only a different view of it. In fact, the search of a new physical 'law' of motion is *just* the search for a new Lagrangian. This makes sense, as the description of nature always requires the description of change. Change in nature is always described by actions and Lagrangians.

Ref. 160

Challenge 385 s

The principle of least action states that the action is minimal when the end point of the motion, and in particular the time between them, are fixed. It is less well known that the reciprocal principle also holds: if the action is kept fixed, the elapsed time is maximal. Can you show this?

Ref. 164

Challenge 386 ny

Even though the principle of least action is not an explanation of motion, it somehow calls for one. We need some patience, though. *Why* nature follows the principle of least action, and *how* it does so, will become clear when we explore quantum theory.

Why is motion so often bounded?

> The optimist thinks this is the best of all possible worlds, and the pessimist knows it.
> Robert Oppenheimer

Looking around ourselves on Earth or in the sky, we find that matter is not evenly distributed. Matter tends to be near other matter: it is lumped together in *aggregates*. Some major examples of aggregates are listed in Figure 143 and Table 31. All aggregates have mass and size. In the mass–size diagram of Figure 143, both scales are logarithmic. One notes three straight lines: a line $m \sim l$ extending from the Planck mass* upwards, via black holes, to the universe itself; a line $m \sim 1/l$ extending from the Planck mass downwards, to the lightest possible aggregate; and the usual matter line with $m \sim l^3$, extending from atoms upwards, via everyday objects, the Earth to the Sun. The first of the lines, the black hole limit, is explained by general relativity; the last two, the aggregate limit and the common matter line, by quantum theory.**

Ref. 166

The aggregates outside the common matter line also show that the stronger the interaction that keeps the components together, the smaller the aggregate. But why is matter mainly found in lumps?

First of all, aggregates form because of the existence of *attractive* interactions between objects. Secondly, they form because of *friction*: when two components approach, an aggregate can only be formed if the released energy can be changed into heat. Thirdly, aggregates have a finite size because of *repulsive* effects that prevent the components from collapsing completely. Together, these three factors ensure that bound motion is much more common than unbound, 'free' motion.

Page 912

* The Planck mass is given by $m_{\text{Pl}} = \sqrt{\hbar c/G} = 21.767(16)\,\mu\text{g}$.

** Figure 143 suggests that domains beyond physics exist; we will discover later on that this is not the case, as mass and size are not definable in those domains.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 143 Elementary particles and aggregates found in nature

Only three types of attraction lead to aggregates: gravity, the attraction of electric charges, and the strong nuclear interaction. Similarly, only three types of repulsion are observed: rotation, pressure, and the Pauli exclusion principle (which we will encounter later on). Of the nine possible combinations of attraction and repulsion, not all appear in nature. Can you find out which ones are missing from Figure 143 and Table 31, and why?

Page 1069

Challenge 387 s

Together, attraction, friction and repulsion imply that change and action are minimized when objects come and stay together. The principle of least action thus implies the stability of aggregates. By the way, formation history also explains why so many aggregates *rotate*. Can you tell why?

Challenge 388 ny

But why does friction exist at all? And why do attractive and repulsive interactions exist? And why is it – as it would appear from the above – that in some distant past matter was *not* found in lumps? In order to answer these questions, we must first study



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

another global property of motion: symmetry.

TABLE 31 Some major aggregates observed in nature

AGGREGATE	SIZE (DIAMETER)	OBS. NUM.	CONSTITUENTS
gravitationally bound aggregates			
matter across universe	*c.* 100 Ym	1	superclusters of galaxies, hydrogen and helium atoms
quasar	10^{12} to 10^{14} m	$20 \cdot 10^6$	baryons and leptons
supercluster of galaxies	*c.* 3 Ym	10^7	galaxy groups and clusters
galaxy cluster	*c.* 60 Zm	$25 \cdot 10^9$	10 to 50 galaxies
galaxy group or cluster	*c.* 240 Zm		50 to over 2000 galaxies
our local galaxy group	50 Zm	1	*c.* 40 galaxies
general galaxy	0.5 to 2 Zm	$3.5 \cdot 10^{12}$	10^{10} to $3 \cdot 10^{11}$ stars, dust and gas clouds, probably solar systems
our galaxy	1.0(0.1) Zm	1	10^{11} stars, dust and gas clouds, solar systems
interstellar clouds	up to 15 Em	$\gg 10^5$	hydrogen, ice and dust
solar system [a]	unknown	> 100	star, planets
our solar system	30 Pm	1	Sun, planets (Pluto's orbit's diameter: 11.8 Tm), moons, planetoids, comets, asteroids, dust, gas
Oort cloud	6 to 30 Pm	1	comets, dust
Kuiper belt	60 Tm	1	planetoids, comets, dust
star [b]	10 km to 100 Gm	$10^{22\pm1}$	ionized gas: protons, neutrons, electrons, neutrinos, photons
our star	1.39 Gm		
planet [a] (Jupiter, Earth)	143 Mm, 12.8 Mm	9+*c.* 100	solids, liquids, gases; in particular, heavy atoms
planetoids (Varuna, etc)	50 to 1 000 km	*c.* 10 (est. 10^9)	solids
moons	10 to 1 000 km	*c.* 50	solids
neutron stars	10 km	*c.* 1000	mainly neutrons
electromagnetically bound aggregates [c]			
asteroids, mountains [d]	1 m to 930 km	>26 000	(10^9 estimated) solids, usually monolithic
comets	10 cm to 50 km	$> 10^6$	ice and dust
planetoids, solids, liquids, gases, cheese	1 nm to > 100 km	n.a.	molecules, atoms
animals, plants, kefir	5 µm to 1 km	$10^{26\pm2}$	organs, cells
brain	0.15 m	10^{10}	neurons and other cell types
cells:		$10^{31\pm1}$	organelles, membranes, molecules

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



AGGREGATE	SIZE (DIAMETER)	OBS. NUM.	CONSTITUENTS
smallest (*Nanoarchaeum equitans*)	*c.* 400 nm		molecules
amoeba	600 µm		molecules
largest (whale nerve, single-celled plants)	*c.* 30 m		molecules
molecules:		$c.\ 10^{78\pm2}$	atoms
H_2	*c.* 50 pm	$10^{72\pm2}$	atoms
DNA (human)	2 m (total per cell)	10^{21}	atoms
atoms, ions	30 pm to 300 pm	$10^{80\pm2}$	electrons and nuclei
aggregates bound by the weak interaction [c]			
none			
aggregates bound by the strong interaction [c]			
nucleus	$> 10^{-15}$ m	$10^{79\pm2}$	nucleons
nucleon (proton, neutron)	*c.* 10^{-15} m	$10^{80\pm2}$	quarks
mesons	*c.* 10^{-15} m	n.a.	quarks
neutron stars: see above			

a. Only in 1994 was the first evidence found for objects circling stars other than our Sun; of over 200 *extrasolar planets* found so far, most are found around F, G and K stars, including neutron stars. For example, three objects circle the pulsar PSR 1257+12, and a matter ring circles the star β Pictoris. The objects seem to be dark stars, brown dwarfs or large gas planets like Jupiter. Due to the limitations of observation systems, none of the systems found so far form solar systems of the type we live in. In fact, only a few Earth-like planets have been found so far.

Ref. 167

b. The Sun is among the brightest 7 % of stars. Of all stars, 80 %, are red M dwarfs, 8 % are orange K dwarfs, and 5 % are white D dwarfs: these are all faint. Almost all stars visible in the night sky belong to the bright 7 %. Some of these are from the rare blue O class or blue B class (such as Spica, Regulus and Rigel); 0.7 % consist of the bright, white A class (such as Sirius, Vega and Altair); 2 % are of the yellow–white F class (such as Canopus, Procyon and Polaris); 3.5 % are of the yellow G class (like Alpha Centauri, Capella or the Sun). Exceptions include the few visible K giants, such as Arcturus and Aldebaran, and the rare M supergiants, such as Betelgeuse and Antares. More on stars later on.

Page 593

c. For more details on *microscopic* aggregates, see the table of composites in Appendix E.

d. It is estimated that there are about 10^9 asteroids (or planetoids) larger than 1 km and about 10^{20} that are heavier than 100 kg. By the way, no asteroids between Mercury and the Sun – the hypothetical *Vulcanoids* – have been found so far.

Ref. 168

CURIOSITIES AND FUN CHALLENGES ABOUT LAGRANGIANS

When Lagrange published his book *Mécanique analytique*, in 1788, it formed one of the high points in the history of mechanics. He was proud of having written a systematic exposition of mechanics without a single figure. Obviously the book was difficult to read and was not a sales success. Therefore his methods took another generation to come into general use.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

Given that action is the basic quantity describing motion, we can define energy as action per unit time, and momentum as action per unit distance. The *energy* of a system thus describes how much it changes over time, and the *momentum* how much it changes over distance. What are angular momentum and rotational energy?

Challenge 389 s

* *

'In nature, effects of telekinesis or prayer are impossible, as in most cases the change inside the brain is much smaller than the change claimed in the outside world.' Is this argument correct?

Challenge 390 s

* *

In Galilean physics, the Lagrangian is the difference between kinetic and potential energy. Later on, this definition will be generalized in a way that sharpens our understanding of this distinction: the Lagrangian becomes the difference between a term for free particles and a term due to their interactions. In other words, particle motion is a continuous compromise between what the particle would do if it were free and what other particles want it to do. In this respect, particles behave a lot like humans beings.

* *

Challenge 391 ny Explain: why is $T + U$ constant, whereas $T - U$ is minimal?

* *

In nature, the sum $T + U$ of kinetic and potential energy is *constant* during motion (for closed systems), whereas the average of the difference $T - U$ is *minimal*. Is it possible to deduce, by combining these two facts, that systems tend to a state with minimum potential energy?

Challenge 392 ny

* *

Another minimization principle can be used to understand the construction of animal bodies, especially their size and the proportions of their inner structures. For example, the heart pulse and breathing frequency both vary with animal mass m as $m^{-1/4}$, and the dissipated power varies as $m^{3/4}$. It turns out that such exponents result from three properties of living beings. First, they transport energy and material through the organism via a branched network of vessels: a few large ones, and increasingly many smaller ones. Secondly, the vessels all have the same minimum size. And thirdly, the networks are optimized in order to minimize the energy needed for transport. Together, these relations explain many additional scaling rules; they might also explain why animal lifespan scales as $m^{-1/4}$, or why most mammals have roughly the same number of heart beats in a lifetime.

Ref. 169

A competing explanation, using a different minimization principle, states that quarter powers arise in any network built in order that the flow arrives to the destination by the most direct path.

Ref. 170

* *

The minimization principle for the motion of light is even more beautiful: light always



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 144 Refraction of light is due to travel-time optimization

takes the path that requires the shortest travel time. It was known long ago that this idea describes exactly how light changes direction when it moves from air to water. In water, light moves more slowly; the speed ratio between air and water is called the *refractive index* of water. The refractive index, usually abbreviated n, is material-dependent. The value for water is about 1.3. This speed ratio, together with the minimum-time principle, leads to the 'law' of refraction, a simple relation between the sines of the two angles. Challenge 393 s Can you deduce it? (In fact, the exact definition of the refractive index is with respect to Challenge 394 s vacuum, not to air. But the difference is negligible: can you imagine why?)

For diamond, the refractive index is 2.4. The high value is one reason for the sparkle Challenge 395 s of diamonds cut with the 57-face *brilliant* cut. Can you think of some other reasons?

* *

Can you confirm that all the mentioned minimization principles – that for the growth of trees, that for the networks inside animals, that for the motion of light – are special Challenge 396 s cases of the principle of least action? In fact, this is the case for *all* known minimization principles in nature. Each of them, like the principle of least action, is a principle of least change.

* *

In Galilean physics, the value of the action depends on the speed of the observer, but not on his position or orientation. But the action, when properly defined, should *not* depend on the observer. All observers should agree on the value of the observed change. Only special relativity will fulfil the requirement that action be independent of the observer's Challenge 397 s speed. How will the relativistic action be defined?

* *

Measuring all the change that is going on in the universe presupposes that the universe Challenge 398 s is a physical system. Is this the case?

* *

One motion for which action is particularly well minimized in nature is dear to us: walk- Ref. 171 ing. Extensive research efforts try to design robots which copy the energy saving functioning and control of human legs. For an example, see the website by Tao Geng at www.cn.stir.ac.uk/~tgeng/research.html.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

Challenge 399 d Can you prove the following integration challenge?

$$\int_0^{\varphi} \sec t \, dt = \ln \tan\left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{\varphi}{2}\right) \tag{68}$$

Summary on action

Systems move by minimizing change. Change, or action, is the time average of kinetic energy minus potential energy. The statement 'motion minimizes change' contains motion's predictability, its continuity, and its simplicity.

In the next sections we show that change minimization also implies observer-invariance, conservation, mirror-invariance, reversibility and relativity of motion.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009





Chapter 9

MOTION AND SYMMETRY

The second way to describe motion globally is to describe it in such a way that *all* observers agree. Now, whenever an observation stays the same when changing from one observer to another, we call the observation *symmetric*.

Symmetry is invariance after change. Change of observer or point of view is one such possible change, as can be some change operated on the observation itself. For example, a forget-me-not flower, shown in Figure 145, is symmetrical because it looks the same after turning it, or after turning around it, by 72 degrees; many fruit tree flowers have the same symmetry. One also says that under certain changes of viewpoint the flower has an *invariant property*, namely its shape. If many such viewpoints are possible, one talks about a *high* symmetry, otherwise a *low* symmetry. For example, a four-leaf clover has a higher symmetry than a usual, three-leaf one. In physics, the viewpoints are often called *frames of reference*.

When we speak about symmetry in everyday life, in architecture or in the arts we usually mean mirror symmetry, rotational symmetry or some combination. These are *geometric symmetries*. Like all symmetries, geometric symmetries imply invariance under specific change operations. The complete list of geometric symmetries is known since a long time. Ref. 177 Table 32 gives an overview of the basic types. Additional geometric symmetries include *colour symmetries*, where colours are exchanged, and *spin groups*, where symmetrical objects do not contain only points but also spins, with their special behaviour under rotations. Also combinations with scale symmetry, as they appear in fractals, and variations on curved backgrounds are extension of the basic table.

A *high* symmetry means that *many* possible changes leave an observation invariant. At first sight, not many objects or observations in nature seem to be symmetrical: after all, geometric symmetry is more the exception than the rule. But this is a fallacy. On the contrary, we can deduce that nature as a whole is symmetric from the simple fact that we have the ability to talk about it! Challenge 400 s Moreover, the symmetry of nature is considerably higher than that of a forget-me-not or of any other symmetry from Table 32. A consequence of this high symmetry is, among others, the famous expression $E_0 = mc^2$.

Why can we think and talk about the world?

> The hidden harmony is stronger than the apparent.
>
> Heraclitus of Ephesus, about 500 BCE Ref. 172

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 145 Forget-me-not, also called *Myosotis* (Boraginaceae) (© Markku Savela)

TABLE 32 The classification and the number of simple geometric symmetries

Dimension	Repetition types	Translations			
		0 point groups	1 line groups	2 plane groups	3 space groups
1	1 row	2	2	n.a.	n.a.
2	5 nets	10 crystal groups	7 friezes	17 wall-papers	n.a.
3	14 lattices	32 crystal groups	75 rods	80 layers	230 crystal structures

Why can we understand somebody when he is talking about the world, even though we are not in his shoes? We can for two reasons: because most things look *similar* from different viewpoints, and because most of us have already had similar experiences *beforehand*.

'Similar' means that what *we* and what *others* observe somehow correspond. In other words, many aspects of observations do not depend on viewpoint. For example, the number of petals of a flower has the same value for all observers. We can therefore say that this quantity has the highest possible symmetry. We will see below that mass is another such example. Observables with the highest possible symmetry are called *scalars* in physics. Other aspects change from observer to observer. For example, the apparent size varies with the distance of observation. However, the actual size is observer-independent. In general terms, any type of *viewpoint-independence* is a form of symmetry, and the observation that two people looking at the same thing from different viewpoints can understand each other proves that nature is symmetric. We start to explore the details of this symmetry in this section and we will continue during most of the rest of our hike.

In the world around us, we note another general property: not only does the same phenomenon look similar to different observers, but *different* phenomena look similar



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

to the *same* observer. For example, we know that if fire burns the finger in the kitchen, it will do so outside the house as well, and also in other places and at other times. Nature shows *reproducibility*. Nature shows no surprises. In fact, our memory and our thinking are only possible because of this basic property of nature. (Can you confirm this?) As we will see, reproducibility leads to additional strong restrictions on the description of nature.

Challenge 401 s

Without viewpoint-independence and reproducibility, talking to others or to oneself would be impossible. Even more importantly, we will discover that viewpoint-independence and reproducibility do more than determine the possibility of talking to each other: they also fix the *content* of what we can say to each other. In other words, we will see that our description of nature follows logically, almost without choice, from the simple fact that we can talk about nature to our friends.

Viewpoints

> Toleranz ... ist der Verdacht der andere könnte Recht haben.*
>
> Kurt Tucholski (1890–1935), German writer

> Toleranz – eine Stärke, die man vor allem dem politischen Gegner wünscht.**
>
> Wolfram Weidner (b. 1925) German journalist

When a young human starts to meet other people in childhood, he quickly finds out that certain experiences are shared, while others, such as dreams, are not. Learning to make this distinction is one of the adventures of human life. In these pages, we concentrate on a section of the first type of experiences: *physical* observations. However, even among these, distinctions are to be made. In daily life we are used to assuming that weights, volumes, lengths and time intervals are independent of the viewpoint of the observer. We can talk about these observed quantities to anybody, and there are no disagreements over their values, provided they have been measured correctly. However, other quantities do depend on the observer. Imagine talking to a friend after he jumped from one of the trees along our path, while he is still falling downwards. He will say that the forest floor is approaching with high speed, whereas the observer below will maintain that the floor is stationary. Obviously, the difference between the statements is due to their different viewpoints. The velocity of an object (in this example that of the forest floor or of the friend himself) is thus a less symmetric property than weight or size. Not all observers agree on its value.

In the case of viewpoint-dependent observations, understanding is still possible with the help of a little effort: each observer can *imagine* observing from the point of view of the other, and *check* whether the imagined result agrees with the statement of the other.*** If the statement thus imagined and the actual statement of the other observer agree, the observations are consistent, and the difference in statements is due only to the

* 'Tolerance ... is the suspicion that the other might be right.'

** 'Tolerance – a strength one mainly wishes to political opponents.'

*** Humans develop the ability to imagine that others can be in situations *different* from their own at the age of about four years. Therefore, before the age of four, humans are unable to conceive special relativity; afterwards, they can.

Ref. 173



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

different viewpoints; otherwise, the difference is fundamental, and they cannot agree or talk. Using this approach, you can even argue whether human feelings, judgements, or tastes arise from fundamental differences or not. Challenge 402 s

The distinction between viewpoint-independent (invariant) and viewpoint-dependent quantities is an essential one. Invariant quantities, such as mass or shape, describe *intrinsic* properties, and quantities depending on the observer make up the *state* of the system. Therefore, we must answer the following questions in order to find a *complete* description of the state of a physical system:

— Which viewpoints are possible?
— How are descriptions transformed from one viewpoint to another?
— Which observables do these symmetries admit?
— What do these results tell us about motion?

In the discussion so far, we have studied viewpoints differing in location, in orientation, in time and, most importantly, in motion. With respect to each other, observers can be at rest, move with constant speed, or accelerate. These 'concrete' changes of viewpoint are those we will study first. In this case the requirement of consistency of observations made by different observers is called the *principle of relativity*. The symmetries associated with this type of invariance are also called *external* symmetries. They are listed in Table 34. Page 132 Page 220

A second class of fundamental changes of viewpoint concerns 'abstract' changes. Viewpoints can differ by the mathematical description used: such changes are called *changes of gauge*. They will be introduced first in the section on electrodynamics. Again, it is required that all statements be consistent across different mathematical descriptions. This requirement of consistency is called the *principle of gauge invariance*. The associated symmetries are called *internal* symmetries. Page 712

The third class of changes, whose importance may not be evident from everyday life, is that of the behaviour of a system under exchange of its parts. The associated invariance is called *permutation symmetry*. It is a *discrete* symmetry, and we will encounter it in the part of our adventure that deals with quantum theory. Page 1052

The three consistency requirements described above are called 'principles' because these basic statements are so strong that they almost completely determine the 'laws' of physics, as we will see shortly. Later on we will discover that looking for a complete description of the state of objects will also yield a complete description of their *intrinsic* properties. But enough of introduction: let us come to the heart of the topic.

Symmetries and groups

Since we are looking for a complete description of motion, we need to understand and describe the full set of symmetries of nature. A system is said to be symmetric or to possess a *symmetry* if it appears identical when observed from different viewpoints. We also say that the system possesses an *invariance* under change from one viewpoint to the other. Viewpoint changes are called *symmetry operations* or *transformations*. A symmetry is thus a transformation, or more generally, a set of transformations. However, it is more than that: the successive application of two symmetry operations is another symmetry operation. To be more precise, a symmetry is a set $G = \{a, b, c, \ldots\}$ of elements, the transformations, together with a binary operation $\circ$ called *concatenation* or *multiplication* and



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

pronounced 'after' or 'times', in which the following properties hold for all elements a, b and c:

$$\begin{aligned} \textit{associativity}, \text{ i.e.,} \quad & (a \circ b) \circ c = a \circ (b \circ c) \\ \text{a } \textit{neutral element } e \text{ exists such that} \quad & e \circ a = a \circ e = a \\ \text{an } \textit{inverse element } a^{-1} \text{ exists such that} \quad & a^{-1} \circ a = a \circ a^{-1} = e \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

Any set that fulfils these three defining properties, or axioms, is called a *(mathematical) group*. Historically, the notion of group was the first example of a mathematical structure which was defined in a completely abstract manner.* Can you give an example of a group taken from daily life? Groups appear frequently in physics and mathematics, because symmetries are almost everywhere, as we will see.** Can you list the symmetry operations of the pattern of Figure 146?

Challenge 403 s
Ref. 174
Challenge 404 s

Representations

Looking at a symmetric and composed system such as the one shown in Figure 146, we notice that each of its parts, for example each red patch, belongs to a set of similar objects, usually called a *multiplet*. Taken as a whole, the multiplet has (at least) the symmetry properties of the whole system. For some of the coloured patches in Figure 146 we need four objects to make up a full multiplet, whereas for others we need two, or only one, as in the case of the central star. In fact, in any symmetric system each part can be classified according to what type of multiplet it belongs to. Throughout our mountain ascent we will perform the same classification with every part of nature, with ever-increasing precision.

Challenge 405 e

A *multiplet* is a set of parts that transform into each other under all symmetry transformations. Mathematicians often call abstract multiplets *representations*. By specifying to which multiplet a component belongs, we describe in which way the component is part of the whole system. Let us see how this classification is achieved.

In mathematical language, symmetry transformations are often described by matrices. For example, in the plane, a reflection along the first diagonal is represented by the matrix

$$D(\text{refl}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} , \tag{70}$$

since every point (x, y) becomes transformed to (y, x) when multiplied by the matrix

* The term is due to Evariste Galois (1811–1832), the structure to Augustin-Louis Cauchy (1789–1857) and the axiomatic definition to Arthur Cayley (1821–1895).

** In principle, mathematical groups need not be symmetry groups; but it can be proven that all groups can be seen as transformation groups on some suitably defined mathematical space, so that in mathematics we can use the terms 'symmetry group' and 'group' interchangeably.

A group is called *Abelian* if its concatenation operation is commutative, i.e., if $a \circ b = b \circ a$ for all pairs of elements a and b. In this case the concatenation is sometimes called *addition*. Do rotations form an Abelian group?

A subset $G_1 \subset G$ of a group G can itself be a group; one then calls it a *subgroup* and often says sloppily that G is *larger* than G_1 or that G is a *higher* symmetry group than G_1.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 146 A Hispano–Arabic ornament from the Governor's Palace in Sevilla (© Christoph Schiller)

Challenge 406 e

$D(\text{refl})$. Therefore, for a mathematician a *representation* of a symmetry group G is an assignment of a matrix $D(a)$ to each group element a such that the representation of the concatenation of two elements a and b is the product of the representations D of the elements:

$$D(a \circ b) = D(a)D(b) \ . \tag{71}$$

For example, the matrix of equation (70), together with the corresponding matrices for all the other symmetry operations, have this property.*

* There are some obvious, but important, side conditions for a representation: the matrices $D(a)$ must be invertible, or non-singular, and the identity operation of G must be mapped to the unit matrix. In even more compact language one says that a representation is a *homomorphism* from G into the group of non-singular or invertible matrices. A matrix D is invertible if its determinant $\det D$ is not zero.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



For every symmetry group, the construction and classification of all possible representations is an important task. It corresponds to the classification of all possible multiplets a symmetric system can be made of. In this way, understanding the classification of all multiplets and parts which can appear in Figure 146 will teach us how to classify all possible parts of which an object or an example of motion can be composed!

A representation D is called *unitary* if all matrices $D(a)$ are unitary.* Almost all representations appearing in physics, with only a handful of exceptions, are unitary: this term is the most restrictive, since it specifies that the corresponding transformations are one-to-one and invertible, which means that one observer never sees more or less than another. Obviously, if an observer can talk to a second one, the second one can also talk to the first.

The final important property of a multiplet, or representation, concerns its structure. If a multiplet can be seen as composed of sub-multiplets, it is called *reducible*, else *irreducible*; the same is said about representations. The irreducible representations obviously cannot be decomposed any further. For example, the (approximate) symmetry group of Figure 146, commonly called D_4, has eight elements. It has the general, faithful, unitary and irreducible matrix representation

Challenge 407 e

$$\begin{pmatrix} \cos n\pi/2 & -\sin n\pi/2 \\ \sin n\pi/2 & \cos n\pi/2 \end{pmatrix} \; n = 0..3, \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{73}$$

The representation is an *octet*. The complete list of possible irreducible representations of the group D_4 is given by *singlets*, *doublets* and *quartets*. Can you find them all? These representations allow the classification of all the white and black ribbons that appear in the figure, as well as all the coloured patches. The most symmetric elements are singlets, the least symmetric ones are members of the quartets. The complete system is always a singlet as well.

Challenge 408 ny

With these concepts we are ready to talk about motion with improved precision.

In general, if a mapping f from a group G to another G' satisfies

$$f(a \circ_G b) = f(a) \circ_{G'} f(b) \,, \tag{72}$$

the mapping f is called an *homomorphism*. A homomorphism f that is one-to-one (injective) and onto (surjective) is called a *isomorphism*. If a representation is also injective, it is called *faithful*, *true* or *proper*.

In the same way as groups, more complex mathematical structures such as rings, fields and associative algebras may also be represented by suitable classes of matrices. A representation of the field of complex numbers is given in Appendix B.

* The *transpose* A^T of a matrix A is defined element-by-element by $(A^T)_{ik} = A_{ki}$. The *complex conjugate* A^* of a matrix A is defined by $(A^*)_{ik} = (A_{ik})^*$. The *adjoint* $A^\dagger$ of a matrix A is defined by $A^\dagger = (A^T)^*$. A matrix is called *symmetric* if $A^T = A$, *orthogonal* if $A^T = A^{-1}$, *Hermitean* or *self-adjoint* (the two are synonymous in all physical applications) if $A^\dagger = A$ (Hermitean matrices have real eigenvalues), and *unitary* if $A^\dagger = A^{-1}$. Unitary matrices have eigenvalues of norm one. Multiplication by a unitary matrix is a one-to-one mapping; since the time evolution of physical systems is a mapping from one time to another, evolution is always described by a unitary matrix. A *real* matrix obeys $A^* = A$, an *antisymmetric* or *skew-symmetric* matrix is defined by $A^T = -A$, an *anti-Hermitean* matrix by $A^\dagger = -A$ and an *anti-unitary* matrix by $A^\dagger = -A^{-1}$. All the mappings described by these special types of matrices are one-to-one. A matrix is *singular*, i.e., not one-to-one, if $\det A = 0$.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 33 Correspondences between the symmetries of an ornament, a flower and nature as a whole

System	Hispano–Arabic pattern	Flower	Motion
Structure and components	set of ribbons and patches	set of petals, stem	motion path and observables
System symmetry	pattern symmetry	flower symmetry	symmetry of Lagrangian
Mathematical description of the symmetry group	D_4	C_5	in Galilean relativity: position, orientation, instant and velocity changes
Invariants	number of multiplet elements	petal number	number of coordinates, magnitude of scalars, vectors and tensors
Representations of the components	multiplet types of elements	multiplet types of components	tensors, including scalars and vectors
Most symmetric representation	singlet	part with circular symmetry	scalar
Simplest faithful representation	quartet	quintet	vector
Least symmetric representation	quartet	quintet	no limit (tensor of infinite rank)

Symmetries, motion and Galilean physics

Every day we experience that we are able to talk to each other about motion. It must therefore be possible to find an *invariant* quantity describing it. We already know it: it is the *action*, the measure of change. For example, lighting a match is a change. The magnitude of the change is the same whether the match is lit here or there, in one direction or another, today or tomorrow. Indeed, the (Galilean) action is a number whose value is the same for each observer *at rest*, independent of his orientation or the time at which he makes his observation.

In the case of the Arabic pattern of Figure 146, the symmetry allows us to deduce the list of multiplets, or representations, that can be its building blocks. This approach must be possible for motion as well. In the case of the Arabic pattern, from the various possible observation viewpoints, we deduced the classification of the ribbons into singlets, doublets, etc. For a moving system, the building blocks, corresponding to the ribbons, are the *observables*. Since we observe that nature is symmetric under many different changes of viewpoint, we can classify all observables. To do so, we first need to take the list of all viewpoint transformations and then deduce the list of all their representations.

Our everyday life shows that the world stays unchanged after changes in position,



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

orientation and instant of observation. One also speaks of space translation invariance, rotation invariance and time translation invariance. These transformations are different from those of the Arabic pattern in two respects: they are *continuous* and they are *unbounded*. As a result, their representations will generally be continuously variable and without bounds: they will be *quantities* or *magnitudes*. In other words, observables will be constructed with *numbers*. In this way we have deduced why numbers are *necessary* for any description of motion.*

Since observers can differ in orientation, most representations will be objects possessing a direction. To cut a long story short, the symmetry under change of observation position, orientation or instant leads to the result that all observables are either 'scalars', 'vectors' or higher-order 'tensors.'**

A *scalar* is an observable quantity which stays the same for all observers: it corresponds to a singlet. Examples are the mass or the charge of an object, the distance between two points, the distance of the horizon, and many others. Their possible values are (usually) continuous, unbounded and without direction. Other examples of scalars are the potential at a point and the temperature at a point. Velocity is obviously not a scalar; nor is the coordinate of a point. Can you find more examples and counter-examples?

Challenge 410 s

Energy is a puzzling observable. It is a scalar if only changes of place, orientation and instant of observation are considered. But energy is not a scalar if changes of observer speed are included. Nobody ever searched for a generalization of energy that is a scalar also for moving observers. Only Albert Einstein discovered it, completely by accident. More about this issue shortly.

Any quantity which has a magnitude and a direction and which 'stays the same' with respect to the environment when changing viewpoint is a *vector*. For example, the arrow between two fixed points on the floor is a vector. Its length is the same for all observers; its direction changes from observer to observer, but not with respect to its environment. On the other hand, the arrow between a tree and the place where a rainbow touches the Earth is *not* a vector, since that place does not stay fixed with respect to the environment, when the observer changes.

Mathematicians say that vectors are directed entities staying invariant under coordinate transformations. Velocities of objects, accelerations and field strength are examples of vectors. (Can you confirm this?) The magnitude of a vector is a scalar: it is the same for any observer. By the way, a famous and baffling result of nineteenth-century experiments is that the velocity of a light beam is *not* a vector like the velocity of a car; the velocity of a light beam is not a vector for Galilean transformations, . This mystery will be solved shortly.

Challenge 411 e

Tensors are generalized vectors. As an example, take the moment of inertia of an object. It specifies the dependence of the angular momentum on the angular velocity. For any object, doubling the magnitude of angular velocity doubles the magnitude of angular momentum; however, the two vectors are not parallel to each other if the object is not a sphere. In general, if any two vector quantities are proportional, in the sense that doubling the magnitude of one vector doubles the magnitude of the other, but without

Page 104

Page 136

* Only scalars, in contrast to vectors and higher-order tensors, may also be quantities which only take a discrete set of values, such as +1 or −1 only. In short, only scalars may be *discrete* observables.

Challenge 409 e

** Later on, *spinors* will be added to, and complete, this list.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

the two vectors being parallel to each other, then the proportionality 'factor' is a (second order) *tensor*. Like all proportionality factors, tensors have a magnitude. In addition, tensors have a direction and a *shape*: they describe the connection between the vectors they relate. Just as vectors are the simplest quantities with a magnitude and a direction, so tensors are the simplest quantities with a magnitude and with a direction depending on a second, chosen direction. Vectors can be visualized as oriented arrows; tensors can be visualized as oriented ellipsoids.* Can you name another example of tensor?

Challenge 413 s

Let us get back to the description of motion. Table 33 shows that in physical systems we always have to distinguish between the symmetry of the whole Lagrangian – corresponding to the symmetry of the complete pattern – and the representation of the observables – corresponding to the ribbon multiplets. Since the action must be a scalar, and since all observables must be tensors, Lagrangians contain sums and products of tensors only in combinations forming scalars. Lagrangians thus contain only scalar products or generalizations thereof. In short, Lagrangians always look like

$$L = \alpha\, a_i b^i + \beta\, c_{jk} d^{jk} + \gamma\, e_{lmn} f^{lmn} + \dots \tag{74}$$

where the indices attached to the variables a, b, c etc. always come in matching pairs to be summed over. (Therefore summation signs are usually simply left out.) The Greek letters represent constants. For example, the action of a free point particle in Galilean physics was given as

$$S = \int L \,\mathrm{d}t = \frac{m}{2} \int v^2 \,\mathrm{d}t \tag{75}$$

which is indeed of the form just mentioned. We will encounter many other cases during our study of motion.**

Galileo already understood that motion is also invariant under change of viewpoints with different velocity. However, the action just given does not reflect this. It took some

Page 132

* A rank-n tensor is the proportionality factor between a rank-1 tensor, i.e., between a vector, and an rank-$(n-1)$ tensor. Vectors and scalars are rank 1 and rank 0 tensors. Scalars can be pictured as spheres, vectors as arrows, and rank-2 tensors as ellipsoids. Tensors of higher rank correspond to more and more complex shapes.

A vector has the same length and direction for every observer; a tensor (of rank 2) has the same determinant, the same trace, and the same sum of diagonal subdeterminants for all observers.

A vector is described mathematically by a *list* of components; a tensor (of rank 2) is described by a *matrix* of components. The rank or order of a tensor thus gives the number of indices the observable has. Can you show this?

Challenge 412 e

** By the way, is the usual list of possible observation viewpoints – namely different positions, different observation instants, different orientations, and different velocities – also *complete* for the action (75)? Surprisingly, the answer is no. One of the first who noted this fact was Niederer, in 1972. Studying the quantum theory of point particles, he found that even the action of a Galilean free point particle is invariant under some additional transformations. If the two observers use the coordinates $(t, \boldsymbol{x})$ and $(\tau, \boldsymbol{\xi})$, the action (75) is invariant under the transformations

Ref. 175

Challenge 414 ny

$$\boldsymbol{\xi} = \frac{\boldsymbol{r}\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{x}_0 + \boldsymbol{v}t}{\gamma t + \delta} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau = \frac{\alpha t + \beta}{\gamma t + \delta} \quad \text{with} \quad \boldsymbol{r}^T \boldsymbol{r} = \mathbf{1} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha\delta - \beta\gamma = 1\,. \tag{76}$$

where $\boldsymbol{r}$ describes the rotation from the orientation of one observer to the other, $\boldsymbol{v}$ the velocity between the two observers, and $\boldsymbol{x}_0$ the vector between the two origins at time zero. This group contains two important



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

years to find out the correct generalization: it is given by the theory of special relativity. But before we study it, we need to finish the present topic.

Reproducibility, conservation and Noether's theorem

> I will leave my mass, charge and momentum to science.
>
> Graffito

The reproducibility of observations, i.e., the symmetry under change of instant of time or 'time translation invariance', is a case of viewpoint-independence. (That is not obvious; can you find its irreducible representations?) The connection has several important consequences. We have seen that symmetry implies invariance. It turns out that for *continuous* symmetries, such as time translation symmetry, this statement can be made more precise: for any continuous symmetry of the Lagrangian there is an associated conserved constant of motion and vice versa. The exact formulation of this connection is the theorem of Emmy Noether.* She found the result in 1915 when helping Albert Einstein and David Hilbert, who were both struggling and competing at constructing general relativity. However, the result applies to any type of Lagrangian.

Challenge 415 ny

Ref. 176

Noether investigated continuous symmetries depending on a continuous parameter b. A viewpoint transformation is a symmetry if the action S does not depend on the value of b. For example, changing position as

$$x \mapsto x + b \tag{78}$$

leaves the action

$$S_0 = \int T(v) - U(x)\,\mathrm{d}t \tag{79}$$

invariant, since $S(b) = S_0$. This situation implies that

$$\frac{\partial T}{\partial v} = p = \text{const} \quad ; \tag{80}$$

in short, symmetry under change of position implies conservation of momentum. The

special cases of transformations:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{The connected, static Galilei group } \boldsymbol{\xi} = \boldsymbol{r}\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{x}_0 + \boldsymbol{v}t \quad \text{and} \quad \tau = t \\ &\text{The transformation group SL(2,R) } \boldsymbol{\xi} = \frac{\boldsymbol{x}}{\gamma t + \delta} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau = \frac{\alpha t + \beta}{\gamma t + \delta} \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

The latter, three-parameter group includes *spatial inversion*, *dilations*, *time translation* and a set of time-dependent transformations such as $\boldsymbol{\xi} = \boldsymbol{x}/t$, $\tau = 1/t$ called *expansions*. Dilations and expansions are rarely mentioned, as they are symmetries of point particles only, and do not apply to everyday objects and systems. They will return to be of importance later on, however.

* Emmy Noether (b. 1882 Erlangen, d. 1935 Bryn Mayr), German mathematician. The theorem is only a sideline in her career which she dedicated mostly to number theory. The theorem also applies to gauge symmetries, where it states that to every gauge symmetry corresponds an identity of the equation of motion, and vice versa.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

converse is also true.

Challenge 416 ny In the case of symmetry under shift of observation instant, we find

$$T + U = \text{const} \quad ; \tag{81}$$

in other words, time translation invariance implies constant energy. Again, the converse is also correct. One also says that energy and momentum are the *generators* of time and space translations.

The conserved quantity for a continuous symmetry is sometimes called the *Noether charge*, because the term *charge* is used in theoretical physics to designate conserved extensive observables. So, energy and momentum are Noether charges. 'Electric charge', 'gravitational charge' (i.e., mass) and 'topological charge' are other common examples.

Challenge 417 s What is the conserved charge for rotation invariance?

We note that the expression 'energy is conserved' has several meanings. First of all, it means that the energy of a *single* free particle is constant in time. Secondly, it means that the total energy of any number of independent particles is constant. Finally, it means that the energy of a *system* of particles, i.e., including their interactions, is constant in time. Collisions are examples of the latter case. Noether's theorem makes all of these points at

Challenge 418 e the same time, as you can verify using the corresponding Lagrangians.

But Noether's theorem also makes, or rather repeats, an even stronger statement: if energy were not conserved, time could not be defined. The whole description of nature requires the existence of conserved quantities, as we noticed when we introduced the

Page 34 concepts of object, state and environment. For example, we defined objects as *permanent* entities, that is, as entities characterized by conserved quantities. We also saw that the

Page 186 introduction of time is possible only because in nature there are 'no surprises'. Noether's theorem describes exactly what such a 'surprise' would have to be: the non-conservation of energy. However, energy jumps have never been observed – not even at the quantum level.

Since symmetries are so important for the description of nature, Table 34 gives an overview of all the symmetries of nature we will encounter. Their main properties are also listed. Except for those marked as 'approximate' or 'speculative', an experimental proof of incorrectness of any of them would be a big surprise indeed.

TABLE 34 The symmetries of relativity and quantum theory with their properties; also the complete list of logical *inductions* used in the two fields

Symmetry	Type [number of parameters]	Space of action	Group topology	Possible representations	Conserved quantity	Vacuum/matter is symmetric	Main effect
Geometric or space-time, external, symmetries							
Time and space translation	$R \times R^3$ [4 par.]	space, time	not compact	scalars, vectors,	momentum and energy	yes/yes	allow everyday

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.net Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Symmetry	Type [number of parameters]	Space of action	Group topology	Possible representations	Conserved quantity	Vacuum/matter is symmetric	Main effect
Rotation	SO(3) [3 par.]	space	S^2	tensors	angular momentum	yes/yes	communication
Galilei boost	R^3 [3 par.]	space, time	not compact	scalars, vectors, tensors	velocity of centre of mass	yes/for low speeds	relativity of motion
Lorentz	homogeneous Lie SO(3,1) [6 par.]	space-time	not compact	tensors, spinors	energy-momentum $T^{\mu\nu}$	yes/yes	constant light speed
Poincaré ISL(2,C)	inhomogeneous Lie [10 par.]	space-time	not compact	tensors, spinors	energy-momentum $T^{\mu\nu}$	yes/yes	
Dilation invariance	R^+ [1 par.]	space-time	ray	n-dimen. continuum	none	yes/no	massless particles
Special conformal invariance	R^4 [4 par.]	space-time	R^4	n-dimen. continuum	none	yes/no	massless particles
Conformal invariance	[15 par.]	space-time	involved	massless tensors, spinors	none	yes/no	light cone invariance
Dynamic, interaction-dependent symmetries: gravity							
$1/r^2$ gravity	SO(4) [6 par.]	config. space	as SO(4)	vector pair	perihelion direction	yes/yes	closed orbits
Diffeomorphism invariance	[∞ par.]	space-time	involved	space-times	local energy–momentum	yes/no	perihelion shift
Dynamic, classical and quantum-mechanical motion symmetries							
Motion('time') inversion T	discrete	Hilbert or phase space	discrete	even, odd	T-parity	yes/no	reversibility
Parity('spatial') inversion P	discrete	Hilbert or phase space	discrete	even, odd	P-parity	yes/no	mirror world exists

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Symmetry	Type [number of parameters]	Space of action	Group topology	Possible representations	Conserved quantity	Vacuum/matter is symmetric	Main effect
Charge conjugation C	global, antilinear, anti-Hermitean	Hilbert or phase space	discrete	even, odd	C-parity	yes/no	antiparticles exist
CPT	discrete	Hilbert or phase space	discrete	even	CPT-parity	yes/yes	makes field theory possible
Dynamic, interaction-dependent, gauge symmetries							
Electromagnetic classical gauge invariance	[∞ par.]	space of fields	un- important	un-important	electric charge	yes/yes	massless light
Electromagnetic q.m. gauge inv.	Abelian Lie U(1) [1 par.]	Hilbert space	circle S^1	fields	electric charge	yes/yes	massless photon
Electromagnetic duality	Abelian Lie U(1) [1 par.]	space of fields	circle S^1	abstract	abstract	yes/no	none
Weak gauge	non-Abelian Lie SU(2) [3 par.]	Hilbert space	as $SU(3)$	particles	weak charge	no/approx.	
Colour gauge	non-Abelian Lie SU(3) [8 par.]	Hilbert space	as $SU(3)$	coloured quarks	colour	yes/yes	massless gluons
Chiral symmetry	discrete	fermions	discrete	left, right	helicity	approximately	'massless' fermions[a]
Permutation symmetries							
Particle exchange	discrete	Fock space etc.	discrete	fermions and bosons	none	n.a./yes	Gibbs' paradox
Selected *speculative* symmetries of nature							
GUT	E_8, SO(10)	Hilbert	from Lie group	particles	from Lie group	yes/no	coupling constant convergence

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Symmetry	Type [number of parameters]	Space of action	Group topology	Possible representations	Conserved quantity	Vacuum/matter is symmetric	Main effect
N-supersymmetry[b]	global	Hilbert		particles, sparticles	T_{mn} and N spinors[c] Q_{imn}	no/no	'massless'[a] particles
R-parity	discrete	Hilbert	discrete	+1, -1	R-parity	yes/yes sfermions, gauginos	
Braid symmetry	discrete	own space	discrete	unclear	unclear	yes/maybe	unclear
Space-time duality	discrete	all	discrete	vacuum	unclear	yes/maybe	fixes particle masses
Event symmetry	discrete	space-time	discrete	nature	none	yes/no	unclear

For details about the connection between symmetry and induction, see page 853. The explanation of the terms in the table will be completed in the rest of the walk. The real numbers are denoted as R.

a. Only approximate; 'massless' means that $m \ll m_{Pl}$, i.e., that $m \ll 22\,\mu g$.

b. $N = 1$ supersymmetry, but not $N = 1$ supergravity, is probably a good approximation for nature at everyday energies.

c. $i = 1..N$.

Curiosities and fun challenges about symmetry

Challenge 419 ny What is the path followed by four turtles starting on the four angles of a square, if each of them continuously walks at the same speed towards the next one?

* *

Challenge 420 s What is the symmetry of a simple oscillation? And of a wave?

* *

Challenge 421 s For what systems is motion reversal a symmetry transformation?

* *

Challenge 422 ny What is the symmetry of a continuous rotation?

* *

A sphere has a tensor for the moment of inertia that is diagonal with three equal numbers.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The same is true for a cube. Can you distinguish spheres and cubes by their rotation behaviour? Challenge 423 ny

* *

Is there a motion in nature whose symmetry is perfect? Challenge 424 ny

* *

Can you show that in two dimensions, *finite* objects can have only rotation and reflection symmetry, in contrast to *infinite* objects, which can have also translation and glide-reflection symmetry? Can you prove that for finite objects in two dimensions, if no rotation symmetry is present, there is only one reflection symmetry? And that all possible rotations are always about the same centre? Can you deduce from this that at least one point is unchanged in all symmetrical finite two-dimensionsal objects? Challenge 425 e

* *

Can you show that in three dimensions, *finite* objects can have only rotation, reflection, inversion and rotatory inversion symmetry, in contrast to *infinite* objects, which can have also translation, glide-reflection, and screw rotation symmetry? Can you prove that for finite objects in three dimensions, if no rotation symmetry is present, there is only one reflection plane? And that for all inversions or rotatory inversions the centre must lie on a rotation axis or on a reflection plane? Can you deduce from this that at least one point is unchanged in all symmetrical finite three-dimensional objects? Challenge 426 e

Parity and time invariance

The table of symmetries also list two so-called *discrete* symmetries that are important for the discussion of motion.

How far can you throw a stone with your other hand? Most people have a preferred hand, and the differences are quite pronounced. Does nature have such a preference? In everyday life, the answer is clear: everything that happens can also happen the other way round. This has also been tested in precision experiments; it was found that everything happening through gravitation, electricity and magnetism can also happen in a mirrored way. There are no exceptions. For example, there are people with the heart on the right side; there are snails with left-handed houses; there are planets that rotate the other way. Astronomy and everyday life are *mirror-invariant*. One also says that gravitation and electromagnetism are *parity invariant*. (Later we will discover an exception to this statement.) Page 1277

Can things happen backwards? This question is not easy. A study of motion due to gravitation shows that such motion can always also happen in the reverse direction. In case of motion due to electricity and magnetism, such as the behaviour of atoms in gases and liquids, the question is more involved; we will discuss it in the section of thermodynamics.

Summary on symmetry

Symmetry is partial invariance to change. All possible changes, i.e., all possible symmetry transformations form a mathematical group.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Since we can *talk* about nature we can deduce that above all, nature is symmetrical under time and space translations. Motion is universal. In addition, everyday observations are observed to be mirror symmetric and simple motions are symmetric under motion reversal.

From nature's symmetries, using Noether's theorem, we can deduce conserved 'charges'. These are energy, linear momentum and angular momentum. In other words, the definition of mass, space and time, together with their symmetry properties, is *equivalent* to the conservation of energy and momenta. Conservation and symmetry are two ways to express the same property of nature. To put it simply, our ability to talk about nature means that energy, linear momentum and angular momentum are conserved.

An most elegant way to uncover the 'laws' of nature is to search for nature's symmetries. In many historical cases, once this connection had been understood, physics made rapid progress. For example, Albert Einstein discovered the theory of relativity in this way, and Paul Dirac started off quantum electrodynamics. We will use the same method throughout our walk; in final third part we will uncover some symmetries which are even more mind-boggling than those of relativity. Now, though, we will move on to the next approach to a global description of motion.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009





Chapter 10

SIMPLE MOTIONS OF EXTENDED BODIES – OSCILLATIONS AND WAVES

We defined action, and thus change, as the integral of the Lagrangian, and the Lagrangian as the difference between kinetic and potential energy. One of the simplest systems in nature is a mass m attached to a (linear) spring. Its Lagrangian is given by

$$L = \frac{1}{2}mv^2 - kx^2 \,, \tag{82}$$

where k is a quantity characterizing the spring, the so-called spring constant. The Lagrangian is due to Robert Hooke, in the seventeenth century. Can you confirm it?

Challenge 427 e

The motion that results from this Lagrangian is periodic, and shown in Figure 147. The Lagrangian (82) thus describes the oscillation of the spring length. The motion is exactly the same as that of a long pendulum. It is called *harmonic motion*, because an object vibrating rapidly in this way produces a completely pure – or harmonic – musical sound. (The musical instrument producing the purest harmonic waves is the transverse flute. This instrument thus gives the best idea of how harmonic motion 'sounds'.) The graph of a harmonic or linear oscillation, shown in Figure 147, is called a *sine curve*; it can be seen as the basic building block of all oscillations. All other, non-harmonic oscillations in nature can be composed from sine curves, as we shall see shortly.

Page 229

Every oscillating motion continuously transforms kinetic energy into potential energy and vice versa. This is the case for the tides, the pendulum, or any radio receiver. But many oscillations also diminish in time: they are damped. Systems with large damping, such as the shock absorbers in cars, are used to avoid oscillations. Systems with *small* damping are useful for making precise and long-running clocks. The simplest measure of damping is the number of oscillations a system takes to reduce its amplitude to $1/e \approx 1/2.718$ times the original value. This characteristic number is the so-called *Q-factor*, named after the abbreviation of 'quality factor'. A poor Q-factor is 1 or less, an extremely good one is 100 000 or more. (Can you write down a simple Lagrangian for a damped oscillation with a given Q-factor?) In nature, damped oscillations do not usually keep constant frequency; however, for the simple pendulum this remains the case to a high degree of accuracy. The reason is that for a pendulum, the frequency does not depend significantly on the amplitude (as long as the amplitude is smaller than about 20°). This is one reason why pendulums are used as oscillators in mechanical clocks.

Challenge 428 ny

Obviously, for a good clock, the driving oscillation must not only show small damping, but must also be independent of temperature and be insensitive to other external influences. An important development of the twentieth century was the introduction of

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 35 Some mechanical frequency values found in nature

Observation	Frequency
Sound frequencies in gas emitted by black holes	*c.* 1 fHz
Precision in measured vibration frequencies of the Sun	down to 2 nHz
Vibration frequencies of the Sun	down to *c.* 300 nHz
Vibration frequencies that disturb gravitational radiation detection	down to 3 μHz
Lowest vibration frequency of the Earth Ref. 178	309 μHz
Resonance frequency of stomach and internal organs (giving the 'sound in the belly' experience)	1 to 10 Hz
Common music tempo	2 Hz
Official value, or *standard pitch*, of musical note 'A' or 'la', following ISO 16 (and of the telephone line signal in many countries)	440 Hz
Common values of musical note 'A' or 'la' used by orchestras	442 to 451 Hz
Wing beat of tiny fly	*c.* 1000 Hz
Sound audible to young humans	20 Hz to 20 kHz
Sonar used by bats	up to over 100 kHz
Sonar used by dolphins	up to 150 kHz
Sound frequency used in ultrasound imaging	2 to 20 MHz
Quartz oscillator frequencies	20 kHz up to 350 MHz
Highest electronically generated frequency (with CMOS, in 2007)	324 GHz
Phonon (sound) frequencies measured in single crystals	up to 20 THz and more

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009





FIGURE 147 The simplest oscillation, the *linear* or *harmonic* oscillation: how position changes over time, and how it is related to rotation



FIGURE 148 The interior of a commercial quartz oscillator, driven at high amplitude (QuickTime film © Microcrystal)

quartz crystals as oscillators. Technical quartzes are crystals of the size of a few grains of sand; they can be made to oscillate by applying an electric signal. They have little temperature dependence and a large Q-factor, and therefore low energy consumption, so that precise clocks can now run on small batteries.

Every harmonic oscillation is described by three quantities: the *amplitude*, the *period* (the inverse of the frequency) and the *phase*. The phase distinguishes oscillations of the same amplitude and period; it defines at what time the oscillation starts. Figure 147 shows how a harmonic oscillation is related to an imaginary rotation. As a result, the phase is best described by an angle between 0 and 2π.

All systems that oscillate also emit waves. In fact, oscillations only appear in extended systems, and oscillations are only the simplest of motions of extended systems. The general repetitive motion of an extended system is the wave.

Waves and their motion

Waves are travelling imbalances, or, equivalently, travelling oscillations. Waves move, even though the substrate does not move. Every wave can be seen as a superposition of *harmonic* waves. Can you describe the difference in wave shape between a pure harmonic tone, a musical sound, a noise and an explosion? Every sound effect can be thought of as being composed of harmonic waves. Harmonic waves, also called *sine waves* or *linear waves*, are the building blocks of which all internal motions of an extended body are

Challenge 429 e



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 149 Decomposing a general periodic signal (left) and a general, non-periodic signal (right) into the simplest, or *harmonic* waves, and their details (bottom)

constructed.

Every harmonic wave is characterized by an oscillation *frequency*, a propagation *velocity*, a *wavelength*, and a *phase*, as can be deduced from Figure 149. Low-amplitude water waves show this most clearly. In a harmonic wave, every position performs a harmonic oscillation. The phase of a wave specifies the position of the wave (or a crest) at a given time. It is an angle between 0 and 2π. How are frequency and wavelength related in a wave?

Challenge 430 e

Waves appear inside all *extended* bodies, be they solids, liquids, gases or plasmas. Inside fluid bodies, waves are *longitudinal*, meaning that the wave motion is in the same direction as the wave oscillation. Sound in air is an example of a longitudinal wave. Inside solid bodies, waves can also be *transverse*; in that case the wave oscillation is perpendicular to the travelling direction.

Waves appear also on *interfaces* between bodies: water–air interfaces are a well-known case. Even a saltwater–freshwater interface, so-called *dead water*, shows waves: they can appear even if the upper surface of the water is immobile. Any flight in an aeroplane provides an opportunity to study the regular cloud arrangements on the interface between warm and cold air layers in the atmosphere. Seismic waves travelling along the boundary between the sea floor and the sea water are also well-known. General surface waves are usually neither longitudinal nor transverse, but of a mixed type.

On water surfaces, one classifies waves according to the force that restores the plane surface. The first type, *surface tension waves*, plays a role on scales up to a few centimetres. At longer scales, gravity takes over as the main restoring force and one speaks of *gravity*



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 36 Some wave velocities

Wave	Velocity
Tsunami	around 0.2 km/s
Sound in most gases	0.3 ± 0.1 km/s
Sound in air at 273 K	0.331 km/s
Sound in air at 293 K	0.343 km/s
Sound in helium at 293 K	0.983 km/s
Sound in most liquids	1.2 ± 0.2 km/s
Sound in water at 273 K	1.402 km/s
Sound in water at 293 K	1.482 km/s
Sound in sea water at 298 K	1.531 km/s
Sound in gold	4.5 km/s
Sound in steel	5.8 to 5.960 km/s
Sound in granite	5.8 km/s
Sound in glass (longitudinal)	4 to 5.9 km/s
Sound in beryllium (longitudinal)	12.8 km/s
Sound in boron	up to 15 km/s
Sound in diamond	up to 18 km/s
Sound in fullerene (C_{60})	up to 26 km/s
Plasma wave velocity in InGaAs	600 km/s
Light in vacuum	$2.998 \cdot 10^8$ m/s



FIGURE 150 The formation of the shape of gravity waves on water from the circular motion of the water

waves. This is the type we focus on here. Gravity waves in water, in contrast to surface tension waves, are not sine waves. This is because of the special way the water moves in such a wave. As shown in Figure 150, the surface water for a (short) water wave moves in circles; this leads to the typical, asymmetrical wave shape with short sharp crests and long

Page 228



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

shallow troughs. (As long as there is no wind and the floor below the water is horizontal, the waves are also symmetric under front-to-back reflection.)

For water gravity waves, as for many other waves, the speed depends on the wavelength. Indeed, the speed c of water waves depends on the wavelength λ and on the depth of the water d in the following way:

$$c = \sqrt{\frac{g\lambda}{2\pi} \tanh \frac{2\pi d}{\lambda}} \ , \tag{83}$$

where g is the acceleration due to gravity (and an amplitude much smaller than the wavelength is assumed). The formula shows two limiting regimes. First, so-called *short* or *deep waves* appear when the water depth is larger than half the wavelength; for deep waves, the phase velocity is $c \approx \sqrt{g\lambda/2\pi}$, thus wavelength dependent, and the group velocity is about half the phase velocity. Shorter deep waves are thus slower. Secondly, *shallow* or *long waves* appear when the depth is less than 5% of the wavelength; in this case, $c \approx \sqrt{gd}$, there is no dispersion, and the group velocity is about the same as the phase velocity. The most impressive shallow waves are tsunamis, the large waves triggered by submarine earthquakes. (The Japanese name is composed of *tsu*, meaning harbour, and *nami*, meaning wave.) Since tsunamis are shallow waves, they show little dispersion and thus travel over long distances; they can go round the Earth several times. Typical oscillation times are between 6 and 60 minutes, giving wavelengths between 70 and 700 km and speeds in the open sea of 200 to 250 m/s, similar to that of a jet plane. Their amplitude on the open sea is often of the order of 10 cm; however, the amplitude scales with depth d as $1/d^4$ and heights up to 40 m have been measured at the shore. This was the order of magnitude of the large and disastrous tsunami observed in the Indian Ocean on 26 December 2004.

Challenge 431 e

Waves can also exist in empty space. Both light and gravity waves are examples. The exploration of electromagnetism and relativity will tell us more about their properties.

Any study of motion must include the study of wave motion. We know from experience that waves can hit or even damage targets; thus every wave carries energy and momentum, even though (on average) no matter moves along the wave propagation direction. The *energy* E of a wave is the sum of its kinetic and potential energy. The kinetic energy (density) depends on the temporal change of the displacement u at a given spot: rapidly changing waves carry a larger kinetic energy. The potential energy (density) depends on the gradient of the displacement, i.e., on its spatial change: steep waves carry a larger potential energy than shallow ones. (Can you explain why the potential energy does not depend on the displacement itself?) For harmonic waves propagating along the direction z, each type of energy is proportional to the square of its respective displacement change:

Challenge 432 s

Ref. 179

$$E \sim (\frac{\partial u}{\partial t})^2 + v^2 (\frac{\partial u}{\partial z})^2 \ . \tag{84}$$

How is the energy density related to the frequency?

Challenge 433 ny

The *momentum* of a wave is directed along the direction of wave propagation. The momentum value depends on both the temporal and the spatial change of displacement



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 151 The six main properties of the motion of waves

u. For harmonic waves, the momentum (density) P is proportional to the product of these two quantities:

$$P_z \sim \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}\frac{\partial u}{\partial z} \,. \tag{85}$$

When two linear wave trains collide or interfere, the total momentum is conserved throughout the collision. An important consequence of momentum conservation is that waves that are reflected by an obstacle do so with an outgoing angle equal to minus the infalling angle. What happens to the phase?

Challenge 434 s

In summary, waves, like moving bodies, carry energy and momentum. In simple terms, if you shout against a wall, the wall is hit. This hit, for example, can start avalanches on snowy mountain slopes. In the same way, waves, like bodies, can carry also angular momentum. (What type of wave is necessary for this to be possible?) However, we can distinguish six main properties that set the motion of waves apart from the motion of bodies.

Challenge 435 ny

— Waves can add up or cancel each other out; thus they can interpenetrate each other. These effects, called *superposition* and *interference*, are strongly tied to the linearity of most waves.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 152 Interference of two circular or spherical waves emitted in phase: a snapshot of the amplitude (left), most useful to describe observations of water waves, and the distribution of the time-averaged intensity (right), most useful to describe interference of light waves (© Rüdiger Paschotta)

— Transverse waves in three dimensions can oscillate in different directions: they show *polarization*.
— Waves, such as sound, can go around corners. This is called *diffraction*.
— Waves change direction when they change medium. This is called *refraction*.
— Waves can have a frequency-dependent propagation speed. This is called *dispersion*.
— Often, the wave amplitude decreases over time: waves show *damping*.

Material bodies in everyday life do not behave in these ways when they move. These six wave effects appear because wave motion is the motion of *extended* entities. The famous debate whether electrons or light are waves or particles thus requires us to check whether these effects specific to waves can be observed or not. This is one topic of quantum theory. Before we study it, can you give an example of an observation that implies that a motion surely cannot be a wave?

Challenge 436 s

As a result of having a frequency f and a propagation velocity v, all sine waves are characterized by the distance λ between two neighbouring wave crests: this distance is called the wavelength. All waves obey the basic relation

$$\lambda f = v \,. \tag{86}$$

In many cases the wave velocity v depends on the wavelength of the wave. For example, this is the case for water waves. This change of speed with wavelength is called *dispersion*. In contrast, the speed of sound in air does not depend on the wavelength (to a high degree of accuracy). Sound in air shows almost no dispersion. Indeed, if there were dispersion for sound, we could not understand each other's speech at larger distances.

In everyday life we do not experience light as a wave, because the wavelength is only around one two-thousandth of a millimetre. But light shows all six effects typical of wave motion. A rainbow, for example, can only be understood fully when the last five wave

Page 723



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

effects are taken into account. Diffraction and interference can even be observed with your fingers only. Can you tell how? Challenge 437 s

Like every anharmonic oscillation, every anharmonic wave can be decomposed into sine waves. Figure 149 gives examples. If the various sine waves contained in a disturbance propagate differently, the original wave will change in shape while it travels. That is the reason why an echo does not sound exactly like the original sound; for the same reason, a nearby thunder and a far-away one sound different.

All systems which oscillate also emit waves. Any radio or TV receiver contains oscillators. As a result, any such receiver is also a (weak) transmitter; indeed, in some countries the authorities search for people who listen to radio without permission listening to the radio waves emitted by these devices. Also, inside the human ear, numerous tiny structures, the hair cells, oscillate. As a result, the ear must also emit sound. This prediction, made in 1948 by Tommy Gold, was confirmed only in 1979 by David Kemp. These so-called *otoacoustic emissions* can be detected with sensitive microphones; they are presently being studied in order to unravel the still unknown workings of the ear and in order to diagnose various ear illnesses without the need for surgery. Ref. 180

Since any travelling disturbance can be decomposed into sine waves, the term 'wave' is used by physicists for all travelling disturbances, whether they look like sine waves or not. In fact, the disturbances do not even have to be travelling. Take a standing wave: is it a wave or an oscillation? Standing waves do not travel; they are oscillations. But a standing wave can be seen as the superposition of two waves travelling in opposite directions. Since all oscillations are standing waves (can you confirm this?), we can say that in fact, all oscillations are special forms of waves. Challenge 438 ny

The most important travelling disturbances are those that are localized. Figure 149 shows an example of a localized wave group or pulse, together with its decomposition into harmonic waves. Wave groups are extensively used to talk and as signals for communication.

Why can we talk to each other? – Huygens' principle

The properties of our environment often disclose their full importance only when we ask simple questions. Why can we use the radio? Why can we talk on mobile phones? Why can we listen to each other? It turns out that a central part of the answer to these questions is that the space we live has an *odd* numbers of dimensions.

In spaces of *even* dimension, it is impossible to talk, because messages do not stop. This is an important result which is easily checked by throwing a stone into a lake: even after the stone has disappeared, waves are still emitted from the point at which it entered the water. Yet, when we stop talking, no waves are emitted any more. Waves in two and three dimensions thus behave differently.

In three dimensions, it is possible to say that the propagation of a wave happens in the following way: Every point on a wave front (of light or of sound) can be regarded as the source of secondary waves; the surface that is formed by the envelope of all the secondary waves determines the future position of the wave front. The idea is illustrated in Figure 153. It can be used to describe, without mathematics, the propagation of waves, their reflection, their refraction, and, with an extension due to Augustin Fresnel, their diffraction. (Try!) Challenge 439 e



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 153 Wave propagation as a consequence of Huygens' principle



FIGURE 154 An impossible water wave: the centre is never flat

This idea was first proposed by Christiaan Huygens in 1678 and is called *Huygens' principle*. Almost two hundred years later, Gustav Kirchoff showed that the principle is a consequence of the wave equation in three dimensions, and thus, in the case of light, a consequence of Maxwell's field equations.

But the description of wave fronts as envelopes of secondary waves has an important limitation. It is not correct in two dimensions (even though Figure 153 is two-dimensional!). In particular, it does not apply to water waves. Water wave propagation *cannot* be calculated in this way in an exact manner. (It is only possible if the situation is limited to a waves of a single frequency.) It turns out that for water waves, secondary waves do not only depend on the wave front of the primary waves, but depend also on their interior. The reason is that in two (and other even) dimensions, waves of different frequency necessarily have different speeds. And a stone falling into water generates waves of many frequencies. In contrast, in three (and larger odd) dimensions, waves of all frequencies have the same speed.

We can also say that Huygens' principle holds if the wave equation is solved by a circular wave leaving no amplitude behind it. Mathematicians translate this by requiring that the evolving delta function $\delta(c^2t^2 - r^2)$ satisfies the wave equation, i.e., that $\partial_t^2\delta = c^2\Delta\delta$. The delta function is that strange 'function' which is zero everywhere except at the origin, where it is infinite. A few more properties describe the precise way in which this happens.* It turns out that the delta function is a solution of the wave equation only if the space dimension is odd and at least three. In other words, while a spherical wave pulse is possible, a circular pulse is not: there is no way to keep the centre of an expanding wave quiet. (See Figure 154.) That is exactly what the stone experiment shows. You can try to produce a circular pulse (a wave that has only a few crests) the next time you

* The main property is $\int \delta x \, dx = 1$. In mathematically precise terms, the delta 'function' is a distribution.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

are in the bathroom or near a lake: you will not succeed.

In summary, the reason a room gets dark when we switch off the light, is that we live in a space with a number of dimensions which is odd and larger than one.

Why is music so beautiful?

Music works because it connect to emotions. And it does so, among others, by reminding us of the sounds (and emotions connected to them) that we experienced before birth. Percussion instruments remind us of the heart beat of our mother and ourselves, cord and wind instruments remind us of all the voices we heard back then. Musical instruments are especially beautiful if they are driven and modulated by the body of the player. All classical instruments are optimized to allow this modulation and the ability to express emotions in this way.

The connection between the musician and the instrument is most intense for the human voice; the next approximation are the wind instruments. In all these cases, the breath of the singer or player does two things: it provides the energy for the sound and it gives an input for the feedback loop that sets the pitch. While singing, the air passes the vocal cords. The rapid air flow reduces the air pressure, which attracts the cords to each other and thus reduces the cross section for the air flow. (This pressure reduction is described Page 260 by the Bernoulli equation, as explained below.) As a result of the smaller cross section, the airflow is reduced, the pressure rises again, and the vocal cords open up again. This leads to larger airflow, and the circle starts again. The change between larger and smaller cord distance repeats so rapidly that sound is produced; the sound is then amplified in the mouth by the resonances that depend on the shape of the oral cavity.

Ref. 181 In *reed instruments*, such as the clarinet, the reed has the role of the vocal cords, and the pipe and the mechanisms have the role of the mouth. In *brass instruments*, such as the trombone, the lips play the role of the reed. In *airflow instruments*, such as the flute, the feedback loop is due to another effect: at the sound-producing edge, the airflow is deflected by the sound itself.

The second reason that music is beautiful is due to the way the frequencies of the notes are selected. Certain frequencies sound agreeable to the ear when they are played together or closely after each other; other produce a sense of tension. Already the ancient Greek had discovered that these sensations depend exclusively on the on the *ratio* of the frequencies, or as musician say, on the *interval* between the pitches.

More specifically, a frequency ratio of 2 – musicians call the interval an *octave* – is the most agreeable consonance. A ratio of 3/2 (called perfect fifth) is the next most agreeable, followed by the ratio 4/3 (a perfect fourth), the ratio 5/4 (a major third) and the ratio 6/5 (a minor third). The choice of the first third in a scale has an important effect on the average emotions expressed by the music and is therefore also taken over in the name of the scale. Songs in C major generally have a more happy tune, whereas songs in A minor tend to sound sadder.

The least agreeable frequency ratios, the dissonances, are the *tritone* (7/5, also called *augmented fourth* or *diminished fifth*) and, to a lesser extent, the major and minor seventh (15/8 and 9/5). The false quint is used for the siren in German red cross vans. Long sequences of dissonances have the effect to induce trance; they are common in Balinese music and in jazz.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 37 Some signals

System	Signal	Speed	Sensor
Matter signals			
Human	voltage pulses in nerves	up to 120 m/s	brain, muscles
	hormones in blood stream	up to 0.3 m/s	molecules on cell membranes
	immune system signals	up to 0.3 m/s	molecules on cell membranes
	singing	340 m/s	ear
Elephant, insects	soil trembling	*c.* 2 km/s	feet
Whale	singing, sonar	1500 m/s	ear
Dog	chemical tracks	1 m/s	nose
Butterfly	chemical mating signal carried by the wind	up to 10 m/s	antennae
Tree	chemical signal of attack carried by the air from one tree to the next	up to 10 m/s	leaves
Erratic block	carried by glacier	up to 0.1 µm/s	foot
Post	paper letters transported by trucks, ships and planes	up to 300 m/s	mail box
Electromagnetic fields			
Humans	yawning	300 Mm/s	eye
Electric eel	voltage pulse	up to 300 Mm/s	nerves
Insects, fish, molluscs	light pulse sequence	up to 300 Mm/s	eye
Flag signalling	orientation of flags	300 Mm/s	eye
Radio transmissions	electromagnetic field strength	up to 300 Mm/s	radio
Nuclear signals			
Supernovas	neutrino pulses	close to 300 Mm/s	specific chemical and radiation detectors
Nuclear reactions	glueballs, if they exist	close to 300 Mm/s	custom particle detectors

After centuries of experimenting, these results lead to a standardized arrangement of the notes and their frequencies that is shown in Figure 155. The arrangement, called the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Equal-tempered frequency ratio	**1**	**1.059**	**1.122**	**1.189**	**1.260**	**1.335**	**1.414**	**1.498**	**1.587**	**1.682**	**1.782**	**1.888**	**2**
Just intonation frequency ratio	**1**		**9/8**	**6/5**	**5/4**	**4/3**	**none**	**3/2**	**8/5**	**5/3**		**15/8**	**2**
Appears as harmonic nr.	**1,2,4,8**		**9**		**5, 10**			**3, 6**			**c. 7**	**15**	**1,2,4,8**

Italian and international solfège names	**Do** Si#	Do# Reb	**Re**	Re# Mib	**Mi** Fab	**Fa** Mi#	Fa# Solb	**Sol**	Sol# Lab	**La**	La# Sib	**Si** Dob	**Do** Si#
French names	Ut Si#	Ut# Reb	Re	Re# Mib	Mi Fab	Fa Mi#	Fa# Solb	Sol	Sol# Lab	La	La# Sib	Si Ut b	Ut Si#
German names	C His	Cis Des	D	Dis Es	E Fes	F Eis	Fis Ges	G	Gis As	A	Ais B	H Ces	C His
English names	C B#	C# Db	D	D# Eb	E Fb	F E#	F# Gb	G	G# Ab	A	A# Bb	B Cb	C B#
Interval name, starting from Do / Ut / C	uni-son	min. 2nd	maj. 2nd	min. 3rd	maj. 3rd	4th	triton	5th	min. 6th	maj. 6th	min. 7th	maj. 7th	octave
Pianoforte keys													

FIGURE 155 The twelve notes used in music and their frequency ratios

equal intonation or *well-tempered intonation*, contains approximations to all the mentioned intervals; the approximations have the advantage that they allow the *transposition* of music to lower or higher notes. This is not possible with the ideal, so-called *just intonation*.

Ref. 182

The next time you sing a song that you like, you might try to determine whether you use just or equal intonation – or a different intonation altogether. Different people have different tastes and habits.

Challenge 440 e

Signals

A signal is the transport of information. Every signal, including those from Table 37, is motion of energy. Signals can be either objects or waves. A thrown stone can be a signal, as can a whistle. Waves are a more practical form of communication because they do not require transport of matter: it is easier to use electricity in a telephone wire to transport a statement than to send a messenger. Indeed, most modern technological advances can be traced to the separation between signal and matter transport. Instead of transporting an

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

orchestra to transmit music, we can send radio signals. Instead of sending paper letters we write email messages. Instead of going to the library we browse the internet.

The greatest advances in communication have resulted from the use of signals to transport large amounts of energy. That is what electric cables do: they transport energy without transporting any (noticeable) matter. We do not need to attach our kitchen machines to the power station: we can get the energy via a copper wire.

For all these reasons, the term 'signal' is often meant to imply waves only. Voice, sound, electric signals, radio and light signals are the most common examples of wave signals.

Signals are characterized by their speed and their information content. Both quantities turn out to be limited. The limit on speed is the central topic of the theory of special relativity.

Page 401

A simple limit on information content can be expressed when noting that the information flow is given by the detailed shape of the signal. The shape is characterized by a frequency (or wavelength) and a position in time (or space). For every signal – and every wave – there is a relation between the time-of-arrival error Δt and the angular frequency error $\Delta\omega$:

$$\Delta t \, \Delta\omega \geqslant \frac{1}{2} \,. \tag{87}$$

This time–frequency indeterminacy relation expresses that, in a signal, it is impossible to specify both the time of arrival and the frequency with full precision. The two errors are (within a numerical factor) the inverse of each other. (One also says that the time-bandwidth product is always larger than $1/4\pi$.) The limitation appears because on one hand one needs a wave as similar as possible to a sine wave in order to precisely determine the frequency, but on the other hand one needs a signal as narrow as possible to precisely determine its time of arrival. The contrast in the two requirements leads to the limit. The indeterminacy relation is thus a feature of every wave phenomenon. You might want to test this relation with any wave in your environment.

Challenge 441 e

Similarly, there is a relation between the position error Δx and the wave vector error $\Delta k = 2\pi/\Delta\lambda$ of a signal:

$$\Delta x \, \Delta k \geqslant \frac{1}{2} \,. \tag{88}$$

Like the previous case, also this indeterminacy relation expresses that it is impossible to specify both the position of a signal and its wavelength with full precision. Also this position–wave-vector indeterminacy relation is a feature of any wave phenomenon.

Every indeterminacy relation is the consequence of a smallest entity. In the case of waves, the smallest entity of the phenomenon is the period (or cycle, as it used to be called). Whenever there is a smallest unit in a natural phenomenon, an indeterminacy relation results. We will encounter other indeterminacy relations both in relativity and in quantum theory. As we will find out, they are due to smallest entities as well.

Whenever signals are sent, their content can be lost. Each of the six characteristics of waves listed on page 232 can lead to content degradation. Can you provide an example for each case? The energy, the momentum and all other conserved properties of signals are never lost, of course. The disappearance of signals is akin to the disappearance of motion. When motion disappears by friction, it only seems to disappear, and is in fact

Challenge 442 ny

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Fig. 13. Upper curve: solution of eqn. (26) for initial depolarization of 15 mV, calculated for 6° C. Lower curve: tracing of membrane action potential recorded at 9·1° C (axon 14). The vertical scales are the same in both curves (apart from curvature in the lower record). The horizontal scales differ by a factor appropriate to the temperature difference.

FIGURE 156 The electrical signals calculated (above) and measured (below) in a nerve, following Hodgkin and Huxley

transformed into heat. Similarly, when a signal disappears, it only seems to disappear, and is in fact transformed into noise. *(Physical) noise* is a collection of numerous disordered signals, in the same way that heat is a collection of numerous disordered movements.

All signal propagation is described by a wave equation. A famous example is the set
Ref. 183 of equations found by Hodgkin and Huxley. It is a realistic approximation for the behaviour of electrical potential in nerves. Using facts about the behaviour of potassium and sodium ions, they found an elaborate equation that describes the voltage V in nerves, and thus the way the signals are propagated. The equation accurately describes the characteristic voltage spikes measured in nerves, shown in Figure 156. The figure clearly shows that these waves differ from sine waves: they are not harmonic. Anharmonicity is one result of nonlinearity. But nonlinearity can lead to even stronger effects.

Solitary waves and solitons

In August 1834, the Scottish engineer John Scott Russell (1808–1882) recorded a strange observation in a water canal in the countryside near Edinburgh. When a boat pulled through the channel was suddenly stopped, a strange water wave departed from it. It consisted of a *single* crest, about 10 m long and 0.5 m high, moving at about 4 m/s. He followed that crest, shown in a reconstruction in Figure 157, with his horse for several kilometres: the wave died out only very slowly. Russell did not observe any dispersion, as is usual in water waves: the width of the crest remained constant. Russell then started pro-
Ref. 184 ducing such waves in his laboratory, and extensively studied their properties. He showed

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 157 A solitary water wave followed by a motor boat, reconstructing the discovery by Scott Russel (© Dugald Duncan)

that the speed depended on the amplitude, in contrast to linear, harmonic waves. He also found that the depth d of the water canal was an important parameter. In fact, the speed v, the amplitude A and the width L of these single-crested waves are related by

$$v = \sqrt{gd}\left(1 + \frac{A}{2d}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad L = \sqrt{\frac{4d^3}{3A}} \,. \tag{89}$$

As shown by these expressions, and noted by Russell, high waves are narrow and fast, whereas shallow waves are slow and wide. The shape of the waves is fixed during their motion. Today, these and all other stable waves with a single crest are called *solitary waves*. They appear only where the dispersion and the nonlinearity of the system exactly compensate for each other. Russell also noted that the solitary waves in water channels can cross each other unchanged, even when travelling in opposite directions; solitary waves with this property are called *solitons*. In short, solitons are stable against encounters, as shown in Figure 158, whereas solitary waves in general are not.

Only sixty years later, in 1895, Korteweg and de Vries found out that solitary waves in water channels have a shape described by

$$u(x,t) = A \operatorname{sech}^2 \frac{x - vt}{L} \quad \text{where} \quad \operatorname{sech} x = \frac{2}{e^x + e^{-x}} \,, \tag{90}$$

and that the relation found by Russell was due to the wave equation

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{gd}} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \left(1 + \frac{3}{2d} u\right) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \frac{d^2}{6} \frac{\partial^3 u}{\partial x^3} = 0 \,. \tag{91}$$

This equation for the elongation u is called the *Korteweg–de Vries equation* in their hon-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 158 Solitons are stable against encounters (QuickTime film © Jarmo Hietarinta)

our.* The surprising stability of the solitary solutions is due to the opposite effect of the two terms that distinguish the equation from linear wave equations: for the solitary solutions, the nonlinear term precisely compensates for the dispersion induced by the third-derivative term.

For many decades such solitary waves were seen as mathematical and physical curiosities. But almost a hundred years later it became clear that the Korteweg–de Vries equation is a universal model for weakly nonlinear waves in the weak dispersion regime, and thus of basic importance. This conclusion was triggered by Kruskal and Zabusky, who in 1965 proved mathematically that the solutions (90) are unchanged in collisions. Ref. 185 This discovery prompted them to introduce the term *soliton*. These solutions do indeed interpenetrate one another without changing velocity or shape: a collision only produces a small positional shift for each pulse.

Solitary waves play a role in many examples of fluid flows. They are found in ocean currents; and even the red spot on Jupiter, which was a steady feature of Jupiter photographs for many centuries, is an example.

Solitary waves also appear when extremely high-intensity sound is generated in solids. Ref. 186 In these cases, they can lead to sound pulses of only a few nanometres in length. Solitary light pulses are also used inside certain optical communication fibres, where the lack of dispersion allows higher data transmission rates than are achievable with usual light Ref. 184 pulses.

Towards the end of the twentieth century a second wave of interest in the mathematics of solitons arose, when quantum theorists became interested in them. The reason is simple but deep: a soliton is a 'middle thing' between a particle and a wave; it has features of both concepts. For this reason, solitons are seen as candidates for the description of

* The equation can be simplified by transforming the variable u; most concisely, it can be rewritten as $u_t + u_{xxx} = 6uu_x$. As long as the solutions are sech functions, this and other transformed versions of the equation are known by the same name.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

elementary particles.

Curiosities and fun challenges about waves and extended bodies

> Society is a wave. The wave moves onward, but the water of which it is composed does not.
> Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Self-Reliance*.

When the frequency of a tone is doubled, one says that the tone is higher by an octave. Two tones that differ by an octave, when played together, sound pleasant to the ear. Two other agreeable frequency ratios – or 'intervals', as musicians say – are quarts and quints. Challenge 443 e What are the corresponding frequency ratios? (Note: the answer was one of the oldest discoveries in physics and perception research; it is attributed to Pythagoras, around 500 BCE.)

* *

An orchestra is playing music in a large hall. At a distance of 30 m, somebody is listening to the music. At a distance of 3000 km, another person is listening to the music via the Challenge 444 s radio. Who hears the music first?

* *

What is the period of a simple pendulum, i.e., a mass m attached to a massless string of Challenge 445 ny length l? What is the period if the string is much longer than the radius of the Earth?

* *

What path is followed by a body that moves without friction on a plane, but that is at-Challenge 446 s tached by a spring to a fixed point on the plane?

* *

A device that shows how rotation and oscillation are linked is the alarm *siren*. Find out Challenge 447 e how it works, and build one yourself.

* *

Light is a wave, as we will discover later on. As a result, light reaching the Earth from space is refracted when it enters the atmosphere. Can you confirm that as a result, stars Challenge 448 e appear somewhat higher in the night sky than they really are?

* *

What are the highest sea waves? This question has been researched systematically only Ref. 187 recently, using satellites. The surprising result is that sea waves with a height of 25 m and more are *common*: there are a few such waves on the oceans at any given time. This result confirms the rare stories of experienced ship captains and explains many otherwise ship sinkings.

Surfers may thus get many chances to ride 30 m waves. (The record is just below this height.) But maybe the most impressive waves to surf are those of the Pororoca, a series of 4 m waves that move from the sea into the Amazon River every spring, against the flow of the river. These waves can be surfed for tens of kilometres.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 159 Shadows show the refraction of light

* *

All waves are damped, eventually. This effect is often frequency-dependent. Can you pro-
Challenge 449 s vide a confirmation of this dependence in the case of sound in air?

* *

When you make a hole with a needle in black paper, the hole can be used as a magnifying
Challenge 450 e lens. (Try it.) Diffraction is responsible for the lens effect. By the way, the diffraction of light by holes was noted already by Francesco Grimaldi in the seventeenth century; he correctly deduced that light is a wave. His observations were later discussed by Newton, who wrongly dismissed them.

* *

Put an empty cup near a lamp, in such a way that the bottom of the cup remains in the shadow. When you fill the cup with water, some of the bottom will be lit, because of the refraction of the light from the lamp. The same effect is at the basis of instruments such as the telescope.
Page 739

* *

Challenge 451 s Are water waves transverse or longitudinal?

* *

The speed of water waves limits the speeds of ships. A surface ship cannot travel (much) faster than about $v_{\text{crit}} = \sqrt{0.16gl}$, where $g = 9.8\,\text{m/s}^2$, l is its length, and 0.16 is a number determined experimentally, called the *critical Froude number*. This relation is valid for all vessels, from large tankers ($l = 100\,\text{m}$ gives $v_{\text{crit}} = 13\,\text{m/s}$) down to ducks ($l = 0.3\,\text{m}$ gives $v_{\text{crit}} = 0.7\,\text{m/s}$). The critical speed is that of a wave with the same wavelength as the ship. In fact, moving a ship at higher speeds than the critical value is possible, but requires much more energy. (A higher speed is also possible if the ship surfs on a wave.) How far
Challenge 452 s away is the crawl *olympic swimming* record from the critical value?

Most water animals and ships are faster when they swim below the surface – where the limit due to surface waves does not exist – than when they swim on the surface. For example, ducks can swim three times as fast under water than on the surface.

* *

The group velocity of water waves (in deep water) is less than the velocity of the individual wave crests, the so-called *phase velocity*. As a result, when a group of wave crests travels, within the group the crests move from the back to the front: they appear at the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

back, travel forward and then die out at the front. The group velocity of water waves is lower than its phase velocity.

* *

One can hear the distant sea or a distant highway more clearly in the evening than in the morning. This is an effect of refraction. Sound speed decreases with temperature. In the evening, the ground cools more quickly than the air above. As a result, sound leaving the ground and travelling upwards is refracted downwards, leading to the long hearing distance. In the morning, usually the air is cold above and warm below. Sound is refracted upwards, and distant sound does not reach a listener on the ground. Refraction thus implies that mornings are quiet, and that one can hear more distant sounds in the evenings. Elephants use the sound situation during evenings to communicate over distances of more than 10 km. (They also use sound waves in the ground to communicate, but that is another story.)

* *

Refraction also implies that there is a sound channel in the ocean, and in the atmosphere. Sound speed decreases with temperature, and increases with pressure. At an ocean depth of 1 km, or at an atmospheric height of 13 to 17 km (that is at the top of the tallest cumulonimbus clouds or equivalently, at the middle of the ozone layer) sound has *minimal* speed. As a result, sound that starts from that level and tries to leave is channelled back to it. Whales use the sound channel to communicate with each other with beautiful songs; one can find recordings of these songs on the internet. The military successfully uses microphones placed at the sound channel in the ocean to locate submarines, and microphones on balloons in the atmospheric channel to listen for nuclear explosions. (In fact, sound experiments conducted by the military are the main reason why whales are deafened and lose their orientation, stranding on the shores. Similar experiments in the air with high-altitude balloons are often mistaken for flying saucers, as in the famous Roswell incident.)

Challenge 453 e

Ref. 188

* *

Ref. 189 Also small animals communicate by sound waves. In 2003, it was found that herring communicate using noises they produce when farting. When they pass wind, the gas creates a ticking sound whose frequency spectrum reaches up to 20 kHz. One can even listen to recordings of this sound on the internet. The details of the communication, such as the differences between males and females, are still being investigated. It is possible that the sounds may also be used by predators to detect herring, and they might even be used by future fishing vessels.

* *

On windy seas, the white wave crests have several important effects. The noise stems from tiny exploding and imploding water bubbles. The noise of waves on the open sea is thus the superposition of many small explosions. At the same time, white crests are the events where the seas absorb carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, and thus reduce global warming.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

Challenge 454 s Why are there many small holes in the ceilings of many office rooms?

* *

Challenge 455 ny Which quantity determines the wavelength of water waves emitted when a stone is thrown into a pond?

* *

Ref. 2 Yakov Perelman lists the following four problems in his delightful physics problem book.

Challenge 456 s (1) A stone falling into a lake produces circular waves. What is the shape of waves produced by a stone falling into a river, where the water flows?

Challenge 457 s (2) It is possible to build a lens for sound, in the same way as it is possible to build lenses for light. What would such a lens look like?

Challenge 458 ny (3) What is the sound heard inside a shell?

Challenge 459 s (4) Light takes about eight minutes to travel from the Sun to the Earth. What consequence does this have for the timing of sunrise?

* *

Challenge 460 s Can you deduce how a Rubik's Cube is built? And its generalizations to higher numbers of segments? Is there a limit to the number of segments? These puzzles are even tougher than the search for a rearrangement of the cube.

* *

Challenge 461 ny Typically, sound of a talking person produces a pressure variation of 20 mPa on the ear. How is this determined?

The ear is indeed a sensitive device. It is now known that most cases of sea mammals, like whales, swimming onto the shore are due to ear problems: usually some military device (either sonar signals or explosions) has destroyed their ear so that they became deaf and lose orientation.

* *

Infrasound, inaudible sound below 20 Hz, is a modern topic of research. In nature, infrasound is emitted by earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, wind, thunder, waterfalls, falling meteorites and the surf. Glacier motion, seaquakes, avalanches and geomagnetic storms Ref. 190 also emit infrasound. Human sources include missile launches, traffic, fuel engines and air compressors.

It is known that high intensities of infrasound lead to vomiting or disturbances of the sense of equilibrium (140 dB or more for 2 minutes), and even to death (170 dB for 10 minutes). The effects of lower intensities on human health are not yet known.

Infrasound can travel several times around the world before dying down, as the explosion of the Krakatoa volcano showed in 1883. With modern infrasound detectors, sea surf can be detected hundreds of kilometres away. Sea surf leads to a constant 'hum' of the Earth's crust at frequencies between 3 and 7 mHz. The *Global infrasound Network* uses infrasound to detect nuclear weapon tests, earthquakes and volcanic eruptions, and can count meteorites. Only very rarely can meteorites be heard with the human ear.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 160 The shock wave created by a body in supersonic motion leads to a 'sonic boom' that moves through the air; it can be made visible by Schlieren photography or by water condensation (photo © Andrew Davidhazy, Gary Settles, NASA)

* *

The method used to deduce the sine waves contained in a signal, as shown in Figure 149, is called the Fourier transformation. It is of importance throughout science and technology. In the 1980s, an interesting generalization became popular, called the *wavelet transformation*. In contrast to Fourier transformations, wavelet transformations allow us to localize signals in time. Wavelet transformations are used to compress digitally stored images in an efficient way, to diagnose aeroplane turbine problems, and in many other applications. Ref. 191

* *

If you like engineering challenges, here is one that is still open. How can one make a robust and efficient system that transforms the energy of sea waves into electricity? Challenge 462 r

* *

If you are interested in ocean waves, you might also enjoy the science of *oceanography*. For an introduction, see the open source textbooks at oceanworld.tamu.edu/.

* *

In our description of extended bodies, we assumed that each spot of a body can be followed separately throughout its motion. Is this assumption justified? What would happen if it were not? Challenge 463 r

* *

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

A special type of waves appears in explosions and supersonic flight: *shock waves*. In a shock wave, the density or pressure of a gas changes abruptly, on distances of a few micrometers. Studying shock waves is a research field in itself; shock waves determine the flight of bullets, the snapping of whips and the effects of detonations.

Around a body moving with supersonic speed, the sound waves form a cone, as shown in Figure 160. When the cone passes an observer on the ground, the cone leads to a *sonic boom*. What is less well known is that the boom can be amplified. If an aeroplane *accelerates* through the sound barrier, certain observers at the ground will hear a superboom, because cones from various speeds can superpose at certain spots on the ground. A plane that performs certain manoeuvers, such as a curve at high speed, can even produce a superboom at a predefined spot on the ground. In contrast to normal sonic booms, superbooms can destroy windows, eardrums and lead to trauma, especially in children. Unfortunately, they are regularly produced on purpose by frustrated military pilots in various places of the world.

* *

Bats fly at night using *echolocation*. Dolphins also use it. Sonar, used by fishing vessels to look for fish, copies the system of dolphins. Less well known is that humans have the same ability. Have you ever tried to echolocate a wall in a completely dark room? You will be surprised at how easily this is possible. Just make a loud hissing or whistling noise that stops abruptly, and listen to the echo. You will be able to locate walls reliably.

Ref. 192

Challenge 464 e

* *

Birds sing. If you want to explore how this happens, look at the X-ray film found at the www.indiana.edu/~songbird/multi/cineradiography_index.html website.

* *

Every soliton is a one-dimensional structure. Do two-dimensional analogues exist? This issue was open for many years. Finally, in 1988, Boiti, Leon, Martina and Pempinelli found that a certain evolution equation, the so-called Davey–Stewartson equation, can have solutions that are localized in two dimensions. These results were generalized by Fokas and Santini and further generalized by Hietarinta and Hirota. Such a solution is today called a *dromion*. Dromions are bumps that are localized in two dimensions and can move, without disappearing through diffusion, in non-linear systems. An example is shown in Figure 161. However, so far, no such solution has be observed in experiments; this is one of the most important experimental challenges left open in non-linear science.

Ref. 193

* *

How does the tone produced by blowing over a bottle depend on the dimension? For bottles that are bulky, the frequency f, the so-called *cavity resonance*, is found to depend on the volume V of the bottle:

Ref. 194

$$f = \frac{c}{2\pi}\sqrt{\frac{A}{VL}} \quad \text{or} \quad f \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}} \tag{92}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 161 The calculated motion of a dromion across a two-dimensional substrate (QuickTime film © Jarmo Hietarinta)

where c is the speed of sound, A is the area of the opening, and L is the length of the neck of the bottle. Does the formula agree with your observations? Challenge 465 e

In fact, tone production is a complicated issue, and specialized books exist on the topic. For example, when overblowing, a saxophone produces a second harmonic, an octave, whereas a clarinet produces a third harmonic, a quint (more precisely, a twelfth). Why is this the case? The theory is complex, but the result simple: instruments whose cross-section increases along the tube, such as horns, trumpets, oboes or saxophones, overblow to octaves. For air instruments that have a (mostly) cylindrical tube, the effect of overblowing depends on the tone generation mechanism. Flutes overblow to the octave, but clarinets to the twelfth. Ref. 195

* *

Many acoustical systems do not only produce harmonics, but also subharmonics. There is a simple way to observe production of subharmonics: sing with your ears below water, in the bathtub. Depending on the air left in your ears, you can hear subharmonics of your own voice. The effect is quite special.

Summary on waves and oscillations

In nature, apart from the motion of bodies, we observe also the motion of signals, or waves. Waves have energy, momentum and angular momentum. They can interfere, diffract, refract, disperse, dampen out and, if transverse, can be polarized. Oscillations are a special case of waves.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 11

DO EXTENDED BODIES EXIST? – LIMITS OF CONTINUITY

We have just discussed the motion of extended bodies. We have seen that all extended bodies show wave motion. But are extended bodies found in nature? Strangely enough, this question has been one of the most intensely discussed questions in physics. Over the centuries, it has reappeared again and again, at each improvement of the description of motion; the answer has alternated between the affirmative and the negative. Many thinkers have been imprisoned, and many still are being persecuted, for giving answers that are not politically correct! In fact, the issue already arises in everyday life.

Mountains and fractals

Whenever we climb a mountain, we follow the outline of its shape. We usually describe this outline as a curved two-dimensional surface. But is this correct? There are alternative possibilities. The most popular is the idea that mountains are fractal surfaces. A *fractal* was defined by Benoît Mandelbrot as a set that is self-similar under a countable but in-
Page 58
finite number of magnification values.* We have already encountered fractal lines. An example of an algorithm for building a (random) fractal *surface* is shown on the right
Ref. 196
side of Figure 162. It produces shapes which look remarkably similar to real mountains. The results are so realistic that they are used in Hollywood films. If this description were correct, mountains would be extended, but not continuous.

But mountains could also be fractals of a different sort, as shown in the left side of Figure 162. Mountain surfaces could have an infinity of small and smaller holes. In fact, one could also imagine that mountains are described as three-dimensional versions of the left side of the figure. Mountains would then be some sort of mathematical Swiss cheese. Can you devise an experiment to decide whether fractals provide the correct
Challenge 466 s
description for mountains? To settle the issue, a chocolate bar can help.

Can a chocolate bar last forever?

> From a drop of water a logician could predict
> an Atlantic or a Niagara.
> Arthur Conan Doyle, *A Study in Scarlet*

Any child knows how to make a chocolate bar last forever: eat half the remainder every day. However, this method only works if matter is scale-invariant. In other words, the method only works if matter is either *fractal*, as it then would be scale-invariant for a

* For a definition of uncountability, see page 825.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 162 Floors (left) and mountains (right) could be fractals; for mountains this approximation is often used in computer graphics (image © Paul Martz)

discrete set of zoom factors, or *continuous*, in which case it would be scale-invariant for any zoom factor. Which case, if either, applies to nature?

Page 57

We have already encountered a fact making continuity a questionable assumption: continuity would allow us, as Banach and Tarski showed, to multiply food and any other matter by clever cutting and reassembling. Continuity would allow children to eat the *same* amount of chocolate every day, without ever buying a new bar. Matter is thus not continuous. Now, fractal chocolate is not ruled out in this way; but other experiments settle the question. Indeed, we note that melted materials do not take up much smaller volumes than solid ones. We also find that even under the highest pressures, materials do not shrink. Thus matter is not a fractal. What then is its structure?

To get an idea of the structure of matter we can take fluid chocolate, or even just some oil – which is the main ingredient of chocolate anyway – and spread it out over a large surface. For example, we can spread a drop of oil onto a pond on a day without rain or wind; it is not difficult to observe which parts of the water are covered by the oil and which are not. A small droplet of oil cannot cover a surface larger than – can you guess the value? Trying to spread the film further inevitably rips it apart. The child's method of prolonging chocolate thus does not work for ever: it comes to a sudden end. The oil experiment, which can even be conducted at home, shows that there is a *minimum* thickness of oil films, with a value of about 2 nm. The experiment shows that there is a smallest size in oil. Oil, and all matter, is made of tiny components. This confirms the observations made by Joseph Loschmidt* in 1865, who was the first person to measure

Challenge 467 s

* Joseph Loschmidt (b. 1821 Putschirn, d. 1895 Vienna) Austrian chemist and physicist. The oil experiment was popularized a few decades later, by Kelvin. It is often claimed that Benjamin Franklin was the first to conduct the oil experiment; that is wrong. Franklin did not measure the thickness, and did not even consider the question of the thickness. He did pour oil on water, but missed the most important conclusion that could be drawn from it. Even geniuses do not discover everything.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

the size of the components of matter.

Loschmidt knew that the (dynamic) viscosity of a gas was given by $\eta = \rho l v/3$, where ρ is the density of the gas, v the average speed of the components and l their mean free path. With Avogadro's prediction (made in 1811 without specifying any value) that a volume V of any gas always contains the same number N of components, one also has $l = V/\sqrt{2\pi N\sigma^2}$, where σ is the cross-section of the components. (The cross-section is roughly the area of the shadow of an object.) Loschmidt then assumed that when the gas is liquefied, the volume of the liquid is the sum of the volumes of the particles. He then measured all the involved quantities and determined N. The modern value of N, called *Avogadro's number* or *Loschmidt's number*, is $6.02 \cdot 10^{23}$ particles in 22.4 l of any gas at standard conditions (today called 1 mol).

In 1865, it was not a surprise that matter was made of small components, as the existence of a smallest size – but not its value – had already been deduced by Galileo, when studying some other simple questions.

The case of Galileo Galilei

During his life, Galileo (1564–1642) was under attack for two reasons: because of his ideas about atoms, and because of his ideas on the motion of the Earth. * The discovery of the importance of both issues is the merit of the great historian Pietro Redondi, a collaborator of another great historian, Pierre Costabel. One of Redondi's research topics is the history of the dispute between the Jesuits, who at the time defended orthodox theology, and Galileo and the other scientists. In the 1980s, Redondi discovered a document of that time, an anonymous denunciation called G3, that allowed him to show that the condemnation of Galileo to life imprisonment for his views on the Earth's motion was organized by his friend the Pope to *protect* him from a sure condemnation to death over a different issue: atoms.

Galileo defended the view that since matter is not scale invariant, it must be made of 'atoms' or, as he called them, piccolissimi quanti – smallest quanta. This was and still is a heresy, because atoms of matter contradict the central Catholic idea that in the Eucharist the *sensible qualities* of bread and wine exist independently of their *substance*. The distinction between substance and sensible qualities, introduced by Thomas Aquinas, is essential to make sense of *transubstantiation*, the change of bread and wine into human flesh and blood, which is a central tenet of the Catholic faith. Indeed, a true Catholic is still not allowed to believe in atoms to the present day, because the idea that matter is made of atoms contradicts transubstantiation.

Ref. 197

In Galileo's days, church tribunals punished heresy, i.e., personal opinions deviating from orthodox theology, by the death sentence. Galileo's life was saved by the Pope by making sure that the issue of transubstantiation would not be topic of the trial, and by ensuring that the trial at the Inquisition be organized by a papal commission led by his nephew, Francesco Barberini. But the Pope also wanted Galileo to be punished, because

* To get a clear view of the matters of dispute in the case of Galileo, especially those of interest to physicists, the best text is the excellent book by Pietro Redondi, *Galileo eretico*, Einaudi, 1983, translated into English as *Galileo Heretic*, Princeton University Press, 1987. It is also available in many other languages; an updated edition that includes the newest discoveries appeared in 2004.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

he felt that his own ideas had been mocked in Galileo's book *Il Dialogo* and also because, under attack for his foreign policy, he was not able to ignore or suppress the issue.

As a result, in 1633 the seventy-year-old Galileo was condemned to a prison sentence, 'after invoking the name of Jesus Christ', for 'suspicion of heresy' (and thus not for heresy), Ref. 198 because he did not comply with an earlier promise not to teach that the Earth moves. Indeed, the motion of the Earth contradicts what the Christian bible states. Galileo was convinced that *truth* was determined by observation, the Inquisition that it was determined by a book – and by itself. In many letters that Galileo wrote throughout his life he expressed his conviction that observational truth could never be a heresy. The trial showed him the opposite: he was forced to state that he erred in teaching that the Earth Ref. 199 moves. After a while, the Pope reduced the prison sentence to house arrest.

Galileo's condemnation on the motion of the Earth was not the end of the story. In the years after Galileo's death, also atomism was condemned in several trials against Galileo's ideas and his followers. But the effects of these trials were not those planned by the Inquisition. Only twenty years after the famous trial, around 1650, every astronomer in the world was convinced of the motion of the Earth. And the result of the trials against atomism was that at the end of the 17th century, practically every scientist in the world was convinced that atoms exist. The trials accelerated an additional effect: after Galileo and Descartes, the centre of scientific research and innovation shifted from Catholic countries, like Italy or France, to protestant countries. In these, such as the Netherlands, England, Germany or the Scandinavian countries, the Inquisition had no power. This shift is still felt today.

It is a sad story that in 1992, the Catholic church did not revoke Galileo's condemnation. In that year, Pope John Paul II gave a speech on the Galileo case. Many years before, he had asked a study commission to re-evaluate the trial, because he wanted to express his regrets for what had happened and wanted to rehabilitate Galileo. The commission Ref. 201 worked for twelve years. But the bishop that presented the final report was a crook: he avoided citing the results of the study commission, falsely stated the position of both parties on the subject of truth, falsely stated that Galileo's arguments on the motion of the Earth were weaker than those of the church, falsely summarized the past positions of the church on the motion of the Earth, avoided stating that prison sentences are not good arguments in issues of opinion or of heresy, made sure that rehabilitation was not even discussed, and of course, avoided any mention of transubstantiation. At the end of this power struggle, Galileo was thus *not* rehabilitated, in contrast to what the Pope wanted and in contrast to what most press releases of the time said; the Pope only stated that 'errors were made on both sides', and the crook behind all this was rewarded with a promotion.*

But that is not the end of the story. The documents of the trial, which were kept locked when Redondi made his discovery, were later made accessible to scholars by Pope John Paul II. In 1999, this led to the discovery of a new document, called EE 291, an internal expert opinion the atom issue that was written for the trial in 1632, a few months before the Ref. 200 start of the procedure. The author of the document comes to the conclusion that Galileo was indeed a heretic in the matter of atoms. The document thus proves that the cover-up

* We should not be too indignant: the same situation happens in many commercial companies every day; most industrial employees can tell similar stories.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

of the transubstantiation issue during the trial of Galileo must have been systematic and thorough, as Redondi had deduced. Indeed, church officials and the Catholic catechism carefully avoid the subject of atoms even today; you can search the Vatican website www.vatican.va for any mention of them.

But Galileo did not want to attack transubstantiation; he wanted to advance the idea of atoms. And he did. Despite being condemned to prison in his trial, Galileo published his last book, the *Discorsi*, written as a blind old man under house arrest, on atoms. It is an irony of history that today, quantum theory, named by Max Born after the term used by Galileo for atoms, has become the most precise description of nature yet.

Page 976

How high can animals jump?

Fleas can jump to heights a hundred times their size, humans only to heights about their own size. In fact, biological studies yield a simple observation: most animals, regardless of their size, achieve about the same jumping height, namely between 0.8 and 2.2 m, whether they are humans, cats, grasshoppers, apes, horses or leopards. We have explained this fact earlier on.

Ref. 202

Page 77

At first sight, the observation of constant jumping height seems to be a simple example of scale invariance. But let us look more closely. There are some interesting exceptions at both ends of the mass range. At the small end, mites and other small insects do not achieve such heights because, like all small objects, they encounter the problem of air resistance. At the large end, elephants do not jump that high, because doing so would break their bones. But why do bones break at all?

Why are all humans of about the same size? Why are there no giant adults with a height of ten metres? Why aren't there any land animals larger than elephants? The answer, already given by Galileo, yields the key to understanding the structure of matter. The materials of which people and animals are made would not allow such changes of scale, as the bones of giants would collapse under the weight they have to sustain. Bones have a finite strength because their constituents stick to each other with a finite attraction. Continuous matter – which exists only in cartoons – could not break at all, and fractal matter would be infinitely fragile. Matter breaks under finite loads because it is composed of small basic constituents.

Felling trees

The gentle lower slopes of Motion Mountain are covered by trees. Trees are fascinating structures. Take their size. Why do trees have limited size? Already in the sixteenth century, Galileo knew that it is not possible to increase tree height without limits: at some point a tree would not have the strength to support its own weight. He estimated the maximum height to be around 90 m; the actual record, unknown to him at the time, seems to be 150 m, for the Australian tree *Eucalyptus regnans*. But why does a limit exist at all? The answer is the same as for bones: wood has a finite strength because it is not scale invariant; and it is not scale invariant because it is made of small constituents, namely atoms.*

Ref. 203

* There is another important limiting factor: the water columns inside trees must not break. Both factors seem to yield similar limiting heights.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 163 Atoms exist: rotating an illuminated, perfectly round single crystal aluminium rod leads to brightness oscillations because of the atoms that make it up



FIGURE 164 Atomic steps in broken gallium arsenide crystals (wafers) can be seen under a light microscope

In fact, the derivation of the precise value of the height limit is more involved. Trees must not break under strong winds. Wind resistance limits the height-to-thickness ratio h/d to about 50 for normal-sized trees (for $0.2\,\mathrm{m} < d < 2\,\mathrm{m}$). Can you say why? Thinner trees are limited in height to less than 10 m by the requirement that they return to the vertical after being bent by the wind.

Challenge 468 ny

Ref. 204

Such studies of natural constraints also answer the question of why trees are made from wood and not, for example, from steel. You could check for yourself that the maximum height of a column of a given mass is determined by the ratio E/ρ^2 between the elastic module and the square of the mass density. For a long time, wood was actually the material for which this ratio was highest. Only recently have material scientists managed to engineer slightly better ratios with fibre composites.

Challenge 469 s

Ref. 205

Why do materials break at all? All observations yield the same answer and confirm Galileo's reasoning: because there is a smallest size in materials. For example, bodies under stress are torn apart at the position at which their strength is minimal. If a body were completely homogeneous, it could not be torn apart; a crack could not start anywhere. If a body had a fractal Swiss-cheese structure, cracks would have places to start, but they would need only an infinitesimal shock to do so.

A simple experiment that shows that solids have a smallest size is shown in Figure 163. A cylindrical rod of pure, single crystal aluminium shows a surprising behaviour when it is illuminated from the side: its brightness depends on how the rod is oriented, even though it is completely round. This angular dependence is due to the atomic arrangement of the aluminium atoms in the rod.

It is not difficult to confirm experimentally the existence of smallest size in solids. It is sufficient to break a single crystal, such as a gallium arsenide wafer, in two. The breaking surface is either completely flat or shows extremely small steps, as shown in Figure 164. These steps are visible under a normal light microscope. (Why?) It turns out that all the step heights are multiples of a smallest height: its value is about 0.2 nm. The existence of a smallest height, corresponding to the height of an atom, contradicts all possibilities of scale invariance in matter.

Challenge 470 ny

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 165 An effect of atoms: steps on single crystal surfaces – here silicon carbide grown on a carbon-terminated substrate (left) and on a silicon terminated substrate (right) (© Dietmar Siche)

The sound of silence

Climbing the slopes of Motion Mountain, we arrive in a region of the forest covered with deep snow. We stop for a minute and look around. It is dark; all the animals are asleep; there is no wind and there are no sources of sound. We stand still, without breathing, and listen to the silence. (You can have this experience also in a sound studio such as those used for musical recordings, or in a quiet bedroom at night.) In situations of complete silence, the ear automatically becomes more sensitive*; we then have a strange experience. We hear two noises, a lower- and a higher-pitched one, which are obviously generated inside the ear. Experiments show that the higher note is due to the activity of the nerve cells in the inner ear. The lower note is due to pulsating blood streaming through the head. But why do we hear a noise at all?

Many similar experiments confirm that whatever we do, we can never eliminate noise from measurements. This unavoidable type of noise is called *shot noise* in physics. The statistical properties of this type of noise actually correspond precisely to what would be expected if flows, instead of being motions of continuous matter, were transportation of a large number of equal, small and discrete entities. Thus, simply listening to noise proves that electric current is made of electrons, that air and liquids are made of molecules, and that light is made of photons. In a sense, the sound of silence is the sound of atoms. Shot noise would not exist in continuous systems.

Little hard balls

> “I prefer knowing the cause of a single thing to being king of Persia.”
>
> Democritus

Precise observations show that matter is neither continuous nor a fractal: matter is made of smallest basic particles. Galileo, who deduced their existence by thinking about giants and trees, called them ‘smallest quanta.’ Today they are called ‘atoms’, in honour of

* The human ear can detect pressure variations at least as small as 20 μPa.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 38 Some measured pressure values

Observation	Pressure
Record negative pressure (tension) measured in water, after careful purification Ref. 206	−140 MPa = −1400 bar
Negative pressure measured in tree sap (xylem) Ref. 207	up to −9 MPa = −20 bar
Negative pressure in gases	does not exist
Negative pressure in solids	is called tension
Record vacuum pressure achieved in laboratory	10 pPa (10^{-13} torr)
Pressure variation at hearing threshold	20 µPa
Pressure variation at hearing pain	100 Pa
Atmospheric pressure in La Paz, Bolivia	51 kPa
Atmospheric pressure in cruising passenger aircraft	75 kPa
Time-averaged pressure in pleural cavity in human thorax	0.5 kPa below atmospheric pressure
Standard sea-level atmospheric pressure	101.325 kPa or 1013.25 mbar or 760 torr
Healthy human arterial blood pressure at height of the heart: systolic, diastolic	17 kPa,11 kPa above atmospheric pressure
Record pressure produced in laboratory, using a diamond anvil	*c.* 200 GPa
Pressure at the centre of the Earth	*c.* 370(20) GPa
Pressure at the centre of the Sun	*c.* 24 PPa
Pressure at the centre of a neutron star	*c.* $4 \cdot 10^{33}$ Pa
Planck pressure (maximum pressure possible in nature)	$4.6 \cdot 10^{113}$ Pa

a famous argument of the ancient Greeks. Indeed, 2500 years ago, the Greeks asked the following question. If motion and matter are conserved, how can change and transformation exist? The philosophical school of Leucippus and Democritus of Abdera* studied

* Leucippus of Elea (Λευκιππος) (*c.* 490 to *c.* 430 BCE), Greek philosopher; Elea was a small town south of Naples. It lies in Italy, but used to belong to the Magna Graecia. Democritus (Δεμοκριτος) of Abdera (*c.* 460 to *c.* 356 or 370 BCE), also a Greek philosopher, was arguably the greatest philosopher who ever lived. Together with his teacher Leucippus, he was the founder of the atomic theory; Democritus was a much admired thinker, and a contemporary of Socrates. The vain Plato never even mentions him, as Democritus was a danger to his own fame. Democritus wrote many books which all have been lost; they were not copied during the Middle Ages because of his scientific and rational world view, which was felt to be a danger by religious zealots who had the monopoly on the copying industry. Nowadays, it has become common to

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 166 The principle and a realization of an atomic force microscope (photograph © Nanosurf)

two particular observations in special detail. They noted that salt dissolves in water. They also noted that fish can swim in water. In the first case, the volume of water does not increase when the salt is dissolved. In the second case, when fish advance, they must push water aside. Leucippus and Democritus deduced that there is only one possible explanation that satisfies observations and also reconciles conservation and transformation: nature is made of void and of small, indivisible and conserved particles.* In this way any example of motion, change or transformation is due to rearrangements of these particles; change and conservation are thus reconciled.

In short, since matter is hard, has a shape and is divisible, Leucippus and Democritus imagined it as being made of atoms. Atoms are particles which are hard, have a shape, but are indivisible. In other words, the Greeks imagined nature as a big Lego set. Lego pieces are first of all hard or *impenetrable*, i.e., repulsive at very small distances. They are *attractive* at small distances: they remain stuck together. Finally, they have *no interaction* at large distances. Atoms behave in the same way. (Actually, what the Greeks called 'atoms' partly corresponds to what today we call 'molecules'. The latter term was invented by Amadeo Avogadro in 1811 in order to clarify the distinction. But we can forget this detail for the moment.)

Since atoms are invisible, it took many years before all scientists were convinced by the experiments showing their existence. In the nineteenth century, the idea of atoms was Page 286 beautifully verified by the discovery of the 'laws' of chemistry and those of gas behaviour.

claim – incorrectly – that Democritus had no proof for the existence of atoms. That is a typical example of disinformation with the aim of making us feel superior to the ancients.

* The story is told by Lucretius, in full Titus Lucretius Carus, in his famous text *De rerum natura*, around 60 BCE. (An English translation can be found on perseus.uchicago.edu/hopper/text.jsp?doc=Perseus:text:1999.02.0131.) Lucretius relates many other proofs; in Book 1, he shows that there is vacuum in solids – as proven by porosity and by density differences – and in gases – as proven by wind. He shows that smells are Challenge 471 ny due to particles, and that so is evaporation. (Can you find more proofs?) He also explains that the particles cannot be seen due to their small size, but that their effects can be felt and that they allow to consistently explain all observations.

Especially if we the imagine particles as little balls, we cannot avoid calling this a typically male idea. Challenge 472 d (What would be the female approach?)

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 167 The atoms on the surface of a silicon crystal, mapped with an atomic force microscope (© Universität Augsburg)



FIGURE 168 The result of moving helium atoms on a metallic surface (© IBM)

Later on, the noise effects were discovered.

Nowadays, with advances in technology, single atoms can be seen, photographed, Ref. 208, Ref. 209 hologrammed, counted, touched, moved, lifted, levitated, and thrown around. And indeed, like everyday matter, atoms have mass, size, shape and colour. Single atoms have Ref. 210 even been used as lamps and lasers.

Modern researchers in several fields have fun playing with atoms in the same way that children play with Lego. Maybe the most beautiful demonstration of these possibilities Ref. 211 is provided by the many applications of the atomic force microscope. If you ever have the opportunity to use one, do not miss it! An atomic force microscope is a simple tabletop device which follows the surface of an object with an atomically sharp needle;* such Ref. 212 needles, usually of tungsten, are easily manufactured with a simple etching method. The changes in the height of the needle along its path over the surface are recorded with the help of a deflected light ray. With a little care, the atoms of the object can be felt and made visible on a computer screen. With special types of such microscopes, the needle can be used to move atoms one by one to specified places on the surface. It is also possible to scan a surface, pick up a given atom and throw it towards a mass spectrometer to determine Ref. 213 what sort of atom it is.

Incidentally, the construction of atomic force microscopes is only a small improvement on what nature is building already by the millions; when we use our ears to listen, we are actually detecting changes in eardrum position of about 1 nm. In other words, we all have two 'atomic force microscopes' built into our heads.

In summary, matter is not scale invariant: in particular, it is neither smooth nor fractal. Matter is made of atoms. Different types of atoms, as well as their various combinations, produce different types of substances. Pictures from atomic force microscopes show that the size and arrangement of atoms produce the *shape* and the *extension* of objects, confirming the Lego model of matter.** As a result, the description of the motion of extended objects can be reduced to the description of the motion of their atoms. Atomic motion

* A cheap version costs only a few thousand euro, and will allow you to study the difference between a silicon wafer – crystalline – a flour wafer – granular-amorphous – and a consecrated wafer.

** Studying matter in even more detail yields the now well-known idea that matter, at higher and higher magnifications, is made of molecules, atoms, nuclei, protons and neutrons, and finally, quarks. Atoms also

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 169 A single barium ion levitated in a Paul trap (image size around 2 mm) at the centre of the picture, visible also to the naked eye in the original experiment, performed in 1985 (© Werner Neuhauser)

will be a major theme in the following pages. One of its consequences is especially important: heat. Before we study it, we have a look at fluids.

The motion of fluids

Fluids can be liquids or gases. Their motion can be exceedingly complex, as Figure 170 shows. Such complex motions are often examples of self-organization or chaos; an introduction into such effects is given below.

Ref. 214
Page 302

Like all motion, fluid motion obeys energy conservation. In the case that no energy is transformed into heat, the conservation of energy is particularly simple. Motion that does not generate heat implies the lack of vortices; such fluid motion is called *laminar*. If the speed of the fluid does not depend on time at all positions, it is called *stationary*. For motion that is both laminar and stationary, energy conservation can be expressed with speed v and pressure p:

$$\frac{1}{2}\rho v^2 + p + \rho g h = \text{const} \tag{93}$$

where h is the height above ground. This is called *Bernoulli's equation*.* In this equation,

contain electrons. A final type of matter, neutrinos, is observed coming from the Sun and from certain types of radioactive materials. Even though the fundamental bricks have become smaller with time, the basic idea remains: matter is made of smallest entities, nowadays called elementary particles. In the part of our mountain ascent on quantum theory we will explore this idea in detail. Page 1290 lists the measured properties of all known elementary particles.

Page 1248

* Daniel Bernoulli (b. 1700 Bâle, d. 1782 Bâle), important Swiss mathematician and physicist. His father Johann and his uncle Jakob were famous mathematicians, as were his brothers and some of his nephews. Daniel Bernoulli published many mathematical and physical results. In physics, he studied the separation of compound motion into translation and rotation. In 1738 he published the *Hydrodynamique*, in which he deduced all results from a single principle, namely the conservation of energy. The so-called *Bernoulli equation* states that (and how) the pressure of a fluid decreases when its speed increases. He studied the tides and many complex mechanical problems, and explained the Boyle–Mariotte gas 'law'. For his publications he won the prestigious prize of the French Academy of Sciences – a forerunner of the Nobel Prize – ten times.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 170 Examples of fluid motion: a vertical water jet striking a horizontal impactor, two jets of a glycerol–water mixture colliding at an oblique angle, a water jet impinging on a reservoir, a glass of wine showing tears (all © John Bush, MIT) and a dripping water tap (© Andrew Davidhazy)

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 171 Daniel Bernoulli (1700–1782)

the first term is the kinetic energy (per volume) of the fluid, and the other two terms are potential energies (per volume). Indeed, the second term is the potential energy (per volume) resulting from the compression of the fluid. Indeed, pressure is a potential energy per volume. The last term is only important if the fluid rises against ground.

Challenge 473 e

Energy conservation implies that the lower the pressure is, the larger the speed of a fluid becomes. One can use this relation to measure the speed of a stationary water flow in a tube. One just has to narrow the tube somewhat at one location along the tube, and measure the pressure difference before and at the tube restriction. One finds that the speed v far from the constriction is given as $v = k\sqrt{p_1 - p_2}$. (What is the constant k?) A device using this method is called a Venturi gauge.

Challenge 474 s

If the geometry of a system is kept fixed and the fluid speed is increased, at a certain speed one observes a transition: the liquid loses its clarity, the flow is not stationary any more. This is seen whenever a water tap is opened. The flow has changed from laminar to turbulent. At this point, Bernoulli's equation is not valid any more.

The description of turbulence might be the toughest of all problems in physics. When the young Werner Heisenberg was asked to continue research on turbulence, he refused – rightly so – saying it was too difficult; he turned to something easier and discovered and developed quantum mechanics instead. Turbulence is such a vast topic, with many of its concepts still not settled, that despite the number and importance of its applications, only now, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, are its secrets beginning to be unravelled. It is thought that the equations of motion describing fluids, the so-called *Navier–Stokes equations*, are sufficient to understand turbulence.* But the mathematics behind them is mind-boggling. There is even a prize of one million dollars offered by the Clay Mathematics Institute for the completion of certain steps on the way to solving the equations.

Ref. 215

Important systems which show laminar flow, vortices and turbulence at the same time are wings and sails. (See Figure 172.) All wings work best in laminar mode. The essence of a wing is that it imparts air a downward velocity with as little turbulence as possible. (The aim to minimize turbulence is the reason that wings are curved. If the engine is very powerful, a flat wing at an angle also works. Strong turbulence is also of advantage for landing safely.) The downward velocity of the trailing air leads to a centrifugal force

* They are named after Claude Navier (b. 1785 Dijon, d. 1836 Paris), important French engineer and bridge builder, and Georges Gabriel Stokes (b. 1819 Skreen, d. 1903 Cambridge), important Irish physicist and mathematician.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 172 The *moth* sailing class: a 30 kg boat that sails above the water using *hydrofoils*, i.e., underwater wings (© Bladerider International)



FIGURE 173 Wasting money because of lack of knowledge about fluids

Ref. 216 acting on the air that passes above the wing. This leads to a lower pressure, and thus to lift. (Wings thus do *not* rely on the Bernoulli equation, where lower pressure *along* the flow leads to higher air speed, as unfortunately, many books used to say. Above a wing, the higher speed is related to lower pressure *across* the flow.)

The different speeds of the air above and below the wing lead to vortices at the end of every wing. These vortices are especially important for the take-off of any insect, bird Page 1303 and aeroplane. More details on wings are discussed later on.

Curiosities and fun challenges about fluids

What happens if people do not know the rules of nature? The answer is the same since 2000 years: taxpayer's money is wasted or health is in danger. One of the oldest examples, the aqueducts from Roman time, is shown in Figure 173. They only exist because Romans

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

did not know how fluids move. Now you know why there are no aqueducts any more. But
Challenge 475 s using a 1 or 2 m water hose in this way to transport gasoline can be dangerous. Why?

* *

You bathtub is full of water. You have an unmarked 3-litre container and an unmarked
Challenge 476 e 5-litre container. How can you get 4 litres of water from the bathtub?

* *

What is the speed record for motion under water? Probably nobody knows: it is a military secret. In fact, the answer needs to be split. The fastest published speed for a projectile under water, almost fully enclosed in a gas bubble, is 1550 m/s, faster than the speed of sound in water, achieved over a distance of a few metres in a military laboratory in the 1990s. The fastest system with an engine seems to be a torpedo, also moving mainly in a gas bubble, that reaches over 120 m/s, thus faster than any formula 1 racing car. The exact speed achieved is higher and secret. (The method of enclosing objects under water in gas bubbles, called *supercavitation*, is a research topic of military engineers all over the world.) The fastest fish, the sailfish *Istiophorus platypterus*, reaches 22 m/s, but speeds up to 30 m are suspected. The fastest manned objects are military submarines, whose speeds are secret, but believed to be around 21 m/s. (All military naval engineers in this world, with the enormous budgets they have, are not able to make submarines that are faster than fish. The reason that aeroplanes are faster than birds is evident: aeroplanes were not developed by military engineers.) The fastest human-powered submarines reach around 4 m/s. One can guess that if human-powered submarine developers had the same development budget as military engineers, their machines would probably be faster than nuclear submarines.

There are no record lists for swimming under water. Underwater swimming is known to be faster than above-water breast stroke, back stroke or dolphin stroke: that is the reason that swimming underwater over long distances is forbidden in competitions in these styles. However, it is not known whether crawl-style records are faster or slower than records for the fastest swimming style below water. Which one is faster in your own
Challenge 477 e case?

* *

How much water is necessary to moisten the air in a room in winter? At 0 °C, the vapour pressure of water is 6 mbar, 20 °C it is 23 mbar. As a result, heating air in the winter gives
Challenge 478 e at most a humidity of 25%. To increase the humidity by 50%, one thus needs about 1 litre of water per 100 m^3.

* *

Fluid motion is of vital importance. There are at least four fluid circulation systems inside the human body. First, *air* is circulated inside the lungs by the diaphragm and other chest muscles. Second, *blood* flows through the blood system by the heart. Third, *lymph* flows through the lymphatic vessels, moved passively by body muscles. Fourth, the *cerebrospinal fluid* circulates aorund the brain and the spine, moved by motions of the head. For this reason, medical doctors like the simple statement: every illness is ultimately due to bad circulation.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 479 e Why do animals have blood and other circulation systems? Because fluid diffusion is too slow. Can you detail the argument?

* *

Challenge 480 ny All animals have similar blood circulation speeds, namely between 0.2 m/s and 0.4 m/s. Why?

* *

Challenge 481 s Liquid pressure depends on height. If the average human blood pressure at the height of the heart is 13.3 kPa, can you guess what it is inside the feet when standing?

* *

Challenge 482 s The human heart pumps blood at a rate of about 0.1 l/s. A tyical capillary has the diameter of a red blood cell, around 7 µm, and in it the blood moves at a speed of half a millimetre per second. How many capillaries are there in a human?

* *

Challenge 483 s You are in a boat on a pond with a stone, a bucket of water and a piece of wood. What happens to the water level of the pond after you throw the stone in it? After you throw the water into the pond? After you throw the piece of wood?

* *

Challenge 484 s A ship leaves a river and enter the sea. What happens?

* *

Challenge 485 e Put a rubber air balloon over the end of a bottle and let it hang inside the bottle. How much can you blow up the balloon inside the bottle?

* *

Challenge 486 e Put a small paper ball into the neck of a horizontal bottle and try to blow it into the bottle. The paper will fly *towards* you. Why?

* *

Challenge 487 e It is possible to blow an egg from one egg-cup to a second one just behind it. Can you perform this trick?

* *

Challenge 488 s In the seventeenth century, engineers who needed to pump water faced a challenge. To pump water from mine shafts to the surface, no water pump managed more than 10 m of height difference. For twice that height, one always needed two pumps in series, connected by an intermediate reservoir. Why? How then do trees manage to pump water upwards for larger heights?

* *

When hydrogen and oxygen are combined to form water, the amount of hydrogen needed is exactly twice the amount of oxygen, if no gas is to be left over after the reaction.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 174 What is your personal stone-skipping record?

Challenge 489 s How does this observation confirm the existence of atoms?

* *

Challenge 490 s How are alcohol-filled chocolate pralines made? Note that the alcohol is not injected into them afterwards, because there would be no way to keep the result tight enough.

* *

How often can a stone jump when it is thrown over the surface of water? The present world record was achieved in 2002: 40 jumps. More information is known about the previous world record, achieved in 1992: a palm-sized, triangular and flat stone was thrown with a speed of 12 m/s (others say 20 m/s) and a rotation speed of about 14 revolutions per second along a river, covering about 100 m with 38 jumps. (The sequence was filmed with a video recorder from a bridge.)

Ref. 217

What would be necessary to increase the number of jumps? Can you build a machine that is a better thrower than yourself?

Challenge 491 r

* *

The most important component of air is nitrogen (about 78 %). The second component is oxygen (about 21 %). What is the third one?

Challenge 492 s

* *

Which everyday system has a pressure lower than that of the atmosphere and usually kills a person if the pressure is raised to the usual atmospheric value?

Challenge 493 s

* *

Water can flow uphill: Heron's fountain shows this most clearly. Heron of Alexandria (*c.* 10 to *c.* 70) described it 2000 years ago; it is easily built at home, using some plastic bottles and a little tubing. How does it work?

Challenge 494 s

* *

A light bulb is placed, underwater, in a stable steel cylinder with a diameter of 16 cm. A Fiat Cinquecento car (500 kg) is placed on a piston pushing onto the water surface. Will the bulb resist?

Challenge 495 s

* *

Challenge 496 s What is the most dense gas? The most dense vapour?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 175 Heron's fountain

* *

Every year, the Institute of Maritime Systems of the University of Rostock organizes a contest. The challenge is to build a paper boat with the highest carrying capacity. The paper boat must weigh at most 10 g and fulfil a few additional conditions; the carrying capacity is measured by pouring lead small shot onto it, until the boat sinks. The 2008 record stands at 5.1 kg. Can you achieve this value? (For more information, see the www.paperboat.de website.)

Challenge 497 e

* *

A modern version of an old question – already posed by Daniel Colladon (1802–1893) – is the following. A ship of mass m in a river is pulled by horses walking along the river bank attached by ropes. If the river is of superfluid helium, meaning that there is no friction between ship and river, what energy is necessary to pull the ship upstream along the river until a height h has been gained?

Challenge 498 s

* *

An urban legend pretends that at the bottom of large waterfalls there is not enough air to breathe. Why is this wroong?

Challenge 499 e

* *

The Swiss physicist and inventor Auguste Piccard (1884–1962) was a famous explorer. Among others, he explored the stratosphere: he reached the record height of 16 km in his *aerostat*, a hydrogen gas balloon. Inside the airtight cabin hanging under his balloon, he had normal air pressure. However, he needed to introduce several ropes attached at the balloon into the cabin, in order to be able to pull and release them, as they controlled his balloon. How did he get the ropes into the cabin while at the same time preventing air from leaving?

Challenge 500 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

A human cannot breathe at any depth under water, even if he has a tube going to the surface. At a few metres of depth, trying to do so is inevitably fatal! Even at a depth of
Challenge 501 s 60 cm only, the human body can only breathe in this way for a few minutes. Why?

* *

A human in air falls with a limiting speed of about 50 m/s (the precise value depends on clothing). How long does it take to fall from a plane at 3000 m down to a height of
Challenge 502 ny 200 m?

* *

To get an idea of the size of Avogadro's and Loschmidt's number, two questions are usually asked. First, on average, how many molecules or atoms that you breathe in with every breath have previously been exhaled by Caesar? Second, on average, how many atoms of
Challenge 503 s Jesus do you eat every day? Even though the Earth is large, the resulting numbers are still telling.

* *

A few drops of tea usually flow along the underside of the spout of a teapot (or fall onto the table). This phenomenon has even been simulated using supercomputer simula-
Ref. 218 tions of the motion of liquids, by Kistler and Scriven, using the Navier–Stokes equations. Teapots are still shedding drops, though.

* *

The best giant soap bubbles can be made by mixing 1.5 l of water, 200 ml of corn syrup and 450 ml of washing-up liquid. Mix everything together and then let it rest for four hours. You can then make the largest bubbles by dipping a metal ring of up to 100 mm
Challenge 504 s diameter into the mixture. But why do soap bubbles burst?

* *

A drop of water that falls into a pan containing hot oil dances on the surface for a considerable time, if the oil is above 220 °C. Cooks test the temperature of oil in this way.
Challenge 505 ny Why does this so-called *Leidenfrost effect** take place? The Leidenfrost effect allows one to plunge the bare hand into molten lead, to keep liquid nitrogen in one's mouth, to check whether a pressing iron is hot, or to walk over hot coal – if one follows several safety rules,
Ref. 219 as explained by Jearl Walker. (Do *not* try this yourself! Many things can go wrong.) The main condition is that the hand, the mouth or the feet must be wet. Walker lost two teeth in a demonstration and badly burned his feet in a walk when the condition was not met.

* *

Challenge 506 s Why don't air molecules fall towards the bottom of the container and stay there?

* *

Challenge 507 s Which of the two water funnels in Figure 176 is emptied more rapidly? Apply energy

* It is named after Johann Gottlieb Leidenfrost (1715–1794), German physician.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 176 Which funnel is faster?

Ref. 220 conservation to the fluid's motion (the Bernoulli equation) to find the answer.

* *

As we have seen, fast flow generates an underpressure. How do fish prevent their eyes
Challenge 508 s from popping when they swim rapidly?

* *

Golf balls have dimples for the same reasons that tennis balls are hairy and that shark and dolphin skin is not flat: deviations from flatness reduce the flow resistance because
Challenge 509 ny many small eddies produce less friction than a few large ones. Why?

* *

The recognized record height reached by a helicopter is 12 442 m above sea level, though 12 954 m has also been claimed. (The first height was reached in 1972, the second in 2002, both by French pilots in French helicopters.) Why, then, do people still continue to use their legs in order to reach the top of Mount Sagarmatha, the highest mountain in the
Challenge 510 s world?

* *

A loosely knotted sewing thread lies on the surface of a bowl filled with water. Putting a bit of washing-up liquid into the area surrounded by the thread makes it immediately
Challenge 511 e become circular. Why?

* *

Challenge 512 s How can you put a handkerchief under water using a glass, while keeping it dry?

* *

Are you able to blow a ping-pong ball out of a funnel? What happens if you blow through a funnel towards a burning candle?

* *

The fall of a leaf, with its complex path, is still a topic of investigation. We are far from being able to predict the time a leaf will take to reach the ground; the motion of the air around a leaf is not easy to describe. One of the simplest phenomena of hydrodynamics remains one of its most difficult problems.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 177 A smoke ring, around 100 m in size, ejected from Etna's Bocca Nova in 2000 (© Daniela Szczepanski at www.vulkanarchiv.de and www.vulkane.net)

* *

Fluids exhibit many interesting effects. Soap bubbles in air are made of a thin spherical film of liquid with air on both sides. In 1932, anti-bubbles, thin spherical films of air with liquid on both sides, were first observed. In 2004, the Belgian physicist Stéphane Dorbolo and his team showed that it is possible to produce them in simple experiments, and in particular, in Belgian beer.

Ref. 221

* *

Have you ever dropped a Mentos candy into a Diet Coca Cola bottle? You will get an interesting effect. (Do it at your own risk...) Is it possible to build a rocket in this way?

Challenge 513 e

* *

A needle can swim on water, if you put it there carefully. Just try, using a fork. Why does it float?

Challenge 514 e

* *

The Rhine emits about 2 300 m^3/s of water into the North Sea, the Amazon River about 120 000 m^3/s into the Atlantic. How much is this less than $c^3/4G$?

Challenge 515 e

* *

Fluids exhibit many complex motions. To see an overview, have a look at the beautiful collection on the web site serve.me.nus.edu.sg/limtt. Among fluid motion, vortex rings, as emitted by smokers or volcanoes, have often triggered the imagination. (See Figure 177.) One of the most famous examples of fluid motion is the leapfrogging of vortex rings, shown in Figure 178. Lim Tee Tai explains that more than two leapfrogs are extremely hard to achieve, because the slightest vortex ring misalignment leads to the collapse of

Challenge 516 e

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 178 Two leapfrogging vortex rings (QuickTime film © Lim Tee Tai)



FIGURE 179 How can you move the coin into the glass without touching anything?

Ref. 222 the system.

Curiosities and fun challenges about solids

Glass is a solid. Nevertheless, many textbooks say that glass is a liquid. This error has been propagated for about a hundred years, probably originating from a mistranslation of a sentence in a German textbook published in 1933 by Gustav Tamman, *Der Glaszustand*.

Challenge 517 s Can you give at least three reasons why glass is a solid and not a liquid?

* *

What is the maximum length of a vertically hanging wire? Could a wire be lowered from

Challenge 518 s a suspended geostationary satellite down to the Earth? This would mean we could realize a space 'lift'. How long would the cable have to be? How heavy would it be? How would you build such a system? What dangers would it face?

* *

Physics is often good to win bets. See Figure 179 for a way to do so, due to Wolfgang Stalla.

* *

Matter is made of atoms. Over the centuries the stubborn resistance of many people

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

to this idea has lead to the loss of many treasures. For over a thousand years, people thought that genuine pearls could be distinguished from false ones by hitting them with a hammer: only false pearls would break. However, *all* pearls break. (Also diamonds break in this situation.) Due to this belief, over the past centuries, all the most beautiful pearls in the world have been smashed to pieces.

* *

Comic books have difficulties with the concept of atoms. Could Asterix really throw Romans into the air using his fist? Are Lucky Luke's precise revolver shots possible? Can Spiderman's silk support him in his swings from building to building? Can the Roadrunner stop running in three steps? Can the Sun be made to stop in the sky by command? Can space-ships hover using fuel? Take any comic-book hero and ask yourself whether
Challenge 519 e matter made of atoms would allow him the feats he seems capable of. You will find that most cartoons are comic precisely because they assume that matter is not made of atoms, but continuous! In a sense, atoms make life a serious adventure.

* *

Can humans start earthquakes? What would happen if 1000 million Indians were to jump
Challenge 520 s at the same time from the kitchen table to the floor?

In fact, several strong earthquakes *have* been triggered by humans. This has happened when water dams have been filled, or when water has been injected into drilling holes. It has also been suggested that the extraction of deep underground water also causes earthquakes. If this is confirmed by future research, a sizeable proportion of all earthquakes could be human-triggered.

* *

Challenge 521 s How can a tip of a stalactite be distinguished from a tip of a stalagmite? Does the difference exist also for icicles?

* *

How much more weight would your bathroom scales show if you stood on them in a
Challenge 522 s vacuum?

* *

One of the most complex extended bodies is the human body. In modern simulations of the behaviour of humans in car accidents, the most advanced models include ribs, vertebrae, all other bones and the various organs. For each part, its specific deformation properties are taken into account. With such models and simulations, the protection of passengers and drivers in cars can be optimized.

* *

The deepest hole ever drilled into the Earth is 12 km deep. In 2003, somebody proposed to enlarge such a hole and then to pour millions of tons of liquid iron into it. He claimed that the iron would sink towards the centre of the Earth. If a measurement device communication were dropped into the iron, it could send its observations to the surface using
Challenge 523 s sound waves. Can you give some reasons why this would not work?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 39 Steel types, properties and uses

Ferritic steel	Austenitic steel	Martensitic steel
Definition		
'usual' steel	'soft' steel	hardened steel, brittle
body centred cubic (bcc)	face centred cubic (fcc)	body centred tetragonal (bct)
iron and carbon	iron, chromium, nickel, manganese, carbon	carbon steel and alloys
Examples		
construction steel	most stainless (18/8 Cr/Ni) steels	knife edges
car sheet steel	kitchenware	drill surfaces
ship steel	food industry	spring steel, crankshafts
12 % Cr stainless ferrite	Cr/V steels for nuclear reactors	
Properties		
phases described by the iron-carbon phase diagram	phases described by the Schaeffler diagram	phases described by the iron-carbon diagram and the TTT (time–temperature transformation) diagram
in equilibrium at RT	some alloys in equilibrium at RT	not in equilibrium at RT, but stable
mechanical properties and grain size depend on heat treatment	mechanical properties and grain size depend on thermo-mechanical pre-treatment	mechanical properties and grain size strongly depend on heat treatment
hardened by reducing grain size, by forging, by increasing carbon content or by nitration	hardened by cold working only	hard anyway – made by laser irradiation, induction heating, etc.
grains of ferrite and paerlite, with cementite (Fe_3C)	grains of austenite	grains of martensite
ferromagnetic	not magnetic or weakly magnetic	ferromagnetic

* *

The economic power of a nation has long been associated with its capacity to produce high-quality steel. Indeed, the Industrial Revolution started with the mass production of steel. Every scientist should know the basics facts about steel. *Steel* is a combination of iron and carbon to which other elements, mostly metals, may be added as well. One can distinguish three main types of steel, depending on the crystalline structure. *Ferritic steels* have a body-centred cubic structure, as shown in Figure 180, *austenitic steels* have a face-centred cubic structure, and *martensitic steels* have a body-centred tetragonal structure. Table 39 gives further details.

* *

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 180 Ferritic steels are bcc (body centred cubic), as shown by the famous *Atomium* in Brussels, a section of an iron crystal magnified to a height of over 100 m (photo and building are © Asbl Atomium Vzw – SABAM Belgium 2007)

A simple phenomenon which requires a complex explanation is the cracking of a whip. Since the experimental work of Peter Krehl it has been known that the whip cracks when the tip reaches a velocity of *twice* the speed of sound. Can you imagine why?

Ref. 223
Challenge 524 ny

* *

A bicycle chain is an extended object with no stiffness. However, if it is made to rotate rapidly, it acquires dynamical stiffness, and can roll down an inclined plane or along the floor. This surprising effect can be watched at the www.iwf.de/NR/rdonlyres/EEFA7FDC-DDDC-490C-9C49-4537A925EFE6/793/C148292.smil website.

* *

Mechanical devices are not covered in this text. There is a lot of progress in the area even at present. For example, people have built robots that are able to ride a unicycle. But even the physics of human unicycling is not simple. Try it; it is an excellent exercise to stay young.

Ref. 224
Ref. 225

* *

There are many arguments against the existence of atoms as hard balls. Thomson-Kelvin put it in writing: "the monstrous assumption of infinitely strong and infinitely rigid pieces of matter." Even though Thomson was right in his comment, atoms do exist. Why?

Ref. 226
Challenge 525 s

* *

Sand has many surprising ways to move, and new discoveries are still made regularly. In 2001, Sigurdur Thoroddsen and Amy Shen discovered that a steel ball falling on a bed of

Ref. 227

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 181 An example of motion of sand: granular jets (© Amy Shen)



FIGURE 182 Modern engineering highlights: a lithography machine for the production of integrated circuits and a paper machine (© ASML, Voith)

sand produces, after the ball has sunk in, a *granular jet* that jumps out upwards from the sand. Figure 181 shows a sequence of photographs of the effect. The discovery has led to a stream of subsequent research.

* *

Engineering is not a part of this text. Nevertheless, it is an interesting topic. A few exam-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

ples of what engineers do are shown in Figure 182.

Summary on extension

In the case of matter, there are no arbitrary small parts. Matter is made of countable components. This result has been confirmed for solids, liquids and gases. The discreteness of matter is one of the most important results of physics. Matter consists of atoms.

It will be shown later on that the discreteness is itself a consequence of the existence of a smallest change in nature.

What can move in nature? – Flows

Before we continue to the next way to describe motion globally, we will have a look at the possibilities of motion in everyday life. One overview is given in Table 40. The domains that belong to everyday life – motion of fluids, of matter, of matter types, of heat, of light and of charge – are the domains of continuum physics.

Within continuum physics, there are three domains we have not yet studied: the motion of charge and light, called electrodynamics, the motion of heat, called thermodynamics, and the motion of the vacuum. Once we have explored these domains, we will have completed the first step of our description of motion: continuum physics. In continuum physics, motion and moving entities are described with continuous quantities that can take any value, including arbitrarily small or arbitrarily large values.

But nature is *not* continuous. We have already seen that matter cannot be indefinitely divided into ever-smaller entities. In fact, we will discover that there are precise experiments that provide limits to the observed values for *every* domain of continuum physics. There is a limit to mass, to speed, to angular momentum, to force, to entropy and to change of charge. The consequences of these discoveries form the second step in our description of motion: quantum theory and relativity. Quantum theory is based on lower limits; relativity is based on upper limits. The third and last step of our description of motion will be formed by the unification of quantum theory and general relativity.

Every domain of physics, regardless of which one of the above steps it belongs to, describes change in terms two quantities: energy, and an extensive quantity characteristic of the domain. An observable quantity is called *extensive* if it increases with system size. Ref. 228 Table 40 provides an overview. The intensive and extensive quantities corresponding to what in everyday language is called 'heat' are *temperature* and *entropy*.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 40 Extensive quantities in nature, i.e., quantities that *flow* and *accumulate*

Domain	Extensive quantity (energy carrier)	Current (flow intensity)	Intensive quantity (driving strength)	Energy flow (power)	Resistance to transport (intensity of entropy generation)
Rivers	mass m	mass flow m/t	height difference gh	$P = gh\,m/t$	$R_m = ght/m$ $[m^2/s\,kg]$
Gases	volume V	volume flow V/t	pressure p	$P = pV/t$	$R_V = pt/V$ $[kg/s\,m^5]$
Mechanics	momentum $\boldsymbol{p}$	force $\boldsymbol{F} = d\boldsymbol{p}/dt$	velocity $\boldsymbol{v}$	$P = \boldsymbol{v}\,F$	$R_p = t/m$ $[s/kg]$
	angular momentum $\boldsymbol{L}$	torque $\boldsymbol{M} = d\boldsymbol{L}/dt$	angular velocity $\boldsymbol{\omega}$	$P = \boldsymbol{\omega}\,\boldsymbol{M}$	$R_L = t/mr^2$ $[s/kg\,m^2]$
Chemistry	amount of substance n	substance flow $I_n = dn/dt$	chemical potential μ	$P = \mu\,I_n$	$R_n = \mu t/n$ $[Js/mol^2]$
Thermodynamics	entropy S	entropy flow $I_S = dS/dt$	temperature T	$P = T\,I_S$	$R_S = Tt/S$ $[K^2/W]$
Light	like all massless radiation, it can flow but cannot accumulate				
Electricity	charge q	electrical current $I = dq/dt$	electrical potential U	$P = U\,I$	$R = U/I$ $[\Omega]$
Magnetism	no accumulable magnetic sources are found in nature				
Nuclear physics	extensive quantities exist, but do not appear in everyday life				
Gravitation	empty space can move and flow, but the motion is not observed in everyday life				

FIGURE 183 Sometimes unusual moving objects cross German roads (© RWE)

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 12

FROM HEAT TO TIME-INVARIANCE

Spilled milk never returns into its container by itself. Any hot object, left alone, cools down with time; it never heats up. These and many other observations show that numerous processes in nature are *irreversible*. Does this mean that motion is not time-reversal-invariant, as Nobel Prize winner Ilya Prigogine thought? We discuss the issue in this section.

All irreversible phenomena involve heat. Thus we need to know the basic facts about heat in order to discuss irreversibility. The main points that are taught in high school are almost sufficient.

Ref. 229

Temperature

Macroscopic bodies, i.e., bodies made of many atoms, have temperature. The temperature of a macroscopic body is an aspect of its state. It is observed that any two bodies in contact tend towards the *same* temperature: temperature is contagious. In other words, temperature describes an equilibrium situation. The existence and contagiousness of temperature is often called the *zeroth principle of thermodynamics*. Heating is the increase of temperature, cooling its decrease.

How is temperature measured? The eighteenth century produced the clearest answer: temperature is best defined and measured by the *expansion of gases*. For the simplest, so-called *ideal* gases, the product of pressure p and volume V is proportional to temperature:

$$pV \sim T \,. \tag{94}$$

The proportionality constant is fixed by the *amount* of gas used. (More about it shortly.) The ideal gas relation allows us to determine temperature by measuring pressure and volume. This is the way (absolute) temperature has been defined and measured for about a century. To define the *unit* of temperature, one only has to fix the amount of gas used. It is customary to fix the amount of gas at 1 mol; for oxygen this is 32 g. The proportionality constant, called the *ideal gas constant* R, is defined to be $R = 8.3145\,\mathrm{J/mol\,K}$. This number has been chosen in order to yield the best approximation to the independently defined Celsius temperature scale. Fixing the ideal gas constant in this way defines 1 K, or one Kelvin, as the unit of temperature. In simple terms, a temperature increase of one Kelvin is defined as the temperature increase that makes the volume of an ideal gas increase – keeping the pressure fixed – by a fraction of 1/273.15 or 0.3661 %.

Ref. 230
Page 909
Challenge 526 ny

In general, if one needs to determine the temperature of an object, one takes a mole of

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 184 Braking generates heat on the floor and in the tire (© Klaus-Peter Möllmann and Michael Vollmer)

FIGURE 185 Thermometers: a mercury thermometer, an infrared thermometer, the ...in the skin, a liquid crystal thermometer, and the pit organ of a pit snake

gas, puts it in contact with the object, waits a while, and then measures the pressure and the volume of the gas. The ideal gas relation (94) then gives the temperature. Most importantly, the ideal gas relation shows that there is a lowest temperature in nature, namely that temperature at which an ideal gas would have a vanishing volume. That would happen at $T = 0\,\mathrm{K}$, i.e., at $-273.15\,^\circ\mathrm{C}$. Obviously, other effects, like the volume of the atoms themselves, prevent the volume of the gas from ever reaching zero. In fact, the unattainability of absolute zero is called the *third principle of thermodynamics*.

The temperature achieved by a civilization can be used as a measure of its technological achievements. One can define the Bronze Age (1.1 kK, 3500 BCE) , the Iron Age (1.8 kK, 1000 BCE), the Electric Age (3 kK from *c.* 1880) and the Atomic Age (several MK, from 1944) in this way. Taking into account also the quest for lower temperatures, one can define the Quantum Age (4 K, starting 1908). But what exactly is heating and cooling?

Ref. 231

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 41 Some temperature values

Observation	Temperature
Lowest, but unattainable, temperature	0 K = −273.15°C
In the context of lasers, it sometimes makes (almost) sense to talk about negative temperature.	
Temperature a perfect vacuum would have at Earth's surface Page 1207	40 zK
Sodium gas in certain laboratory experiments – coldest matter system achieved by man and possibly in the universe	0.45 nK
Temperature of neutrino background in the universe	*c.* 2 K
Temperature of photon gas background (or background radiation) in the universe	2.7 K
Liquid helium	4.2 K
Oxygen triple point	54.3584 K
Liquid nitrogen	77 K
Coldest weather ever measured (Antarctic)	185 K = −88°C
Freezing point of water at standard pressure	273.15 K = 0.00°C
Triple point of water	273.16 K = 0.01°C
Average temperature of the Earth's surface	287.2 K
Smallest uncomfortable skin temperature	316 K (10 K above normal)
Interior of human body	310.0 ± 0.5 K = 36.8 ± 0.5°C
Hottest weather ever measured	343.8 K = 70.7°C
Boiling point of water at standard pressure	373.13 K or 99.975°C
Large wood fire	*c.* 1100 K
Liquid bronze	*c.* 1100 K
Freezing point of gold	1337.33 K
Liquid, pure iron	1810 K
Bunsen burner flame	up to 1870 K
Light bulb filament	2.9 kK
Earth's centre	4 kK
Melting point of hafnium carbide	4.16 kK
Sun's surface	5.8 kK
Air in lightning bolt	30 kK
Hottest star's surface (centre of NGC 2240)	250 kK
Space between Earth and Moon (no typo)	up to 1 MK
Centre of white dwarf	5 to 20 MK
Sun's centre	20 MK
Centre of the accretion disk in X-ray binary stars	10 to 100 MK
Inside the JET fusion tokamak	100 MK
Centre of hottest stars	1 GK
Maximum temperature of systems without electron–positron pair generation	ca. 6 GK
Universe when it was 1 s old	100 GK
Hagedorn temperature	1.9 TK
Heavy ion collisions – highest man-made value	up to 3.6 TK
Planck temperature – nature's upper temperature limit	10^{32} K

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Thermal energy

Heating and cooling is the flow of disordered energy. For example, friction heats up and slows down moving bodies. In the old days, the 'creation' of heat by friction was even tested experimentally. It was shown that heat could be generated from friction, just by
Ref. 232 continuous rubbing, without any limit; an example is shown in Figure 184. This 'creation' implies that heat is not a material fluid extracted from the body – which in this case would be consumed after a certain time – but something else. Indeed, today we know that heat, even though it behaves in some ways like a fluid, is due to disordered motion of particles. The conclusion of these studies is simple. Friction is the transformation of mechanical (i.e., ordered) energy into (disordered) *thermal energy*.

To heat 1 kg of water by 1 K by friction, 4.2 kJ of mechanical energy must be transformed through friction. The first to measure this quantity with precision was, in 1842, the German physician Julius Robert Mayer (1814–1878). He regarded his experimenst as proofs of the conservation of energy; indeed, he was the first person to state energy conservation! It is something of an embarrassment to modern physics that a medical doctor was the first to show the conservation of energy, and furthermore, that he was ridiculed by most physicists of his time. Worse, conservation of energy was accepted by scientists only when it was repeated many years later by two authorities: Hermann von Helmholtz – himself also a physician turned physicist – and William Thomson, who also cited similar, but later experiments by James Joule.* All of them acknowledged Mayer's priority. Publicity by William Thomson eventually led to the naming of the unit of energy after Joule.

In short, the sum of mechanical energy and thermal energy is constant. This is usually called the *first principle of thermodynamics*. Equivalently, it is impossible to produce mechanical energy without paying for it with some other form of energy. This is an important statement, because among others it means that humanity will stop living one day. Indeed, we live mostly on energy from the Sun; since the Sun is of finite size, its energy
Challenge 527 s content will eventually be consumed. Can you estimate when this will happen?

There is also a second (and the mentioned third) principle of thermodynamics, which will be presented later on. The study of these topics is called *thermostatics* if the systems concerned are at equilibrium, and *thermodynamics* if they are not. In the latter case, we distinguish situations *near* equilibrium, when equilibrium concepts such as temperature can still be used, from situations *far* from equilibrium, such as self-organization, where
Page 302 such concepts often cannot be applied.

Does it make sense to distinguish between thermal energy and heat? It does. Many older texts use the term 'heat' to mean the same as thermal energy. However, this is confusing; in this text, 'heat' is used, in accordance with modern approaches, as the everyday term for entropy. Both thermal energy and heat flow from one body to another, and both accumulate. Both have no measurable mass.** Both the amount of thermal energy and

* Hermann von Helmholtz (b. 1821 Potsdam, d. 1894 Berlin), important Prussian scientist. William Thomson (later William Kelvin) (1824–1907), important Irish physicist. James Prescott Joule (1818–1889), English physicist. Joule is pronounced so that it rhymes with 'cool', as his descendants like to stress. (The pronunciation of the name 'Joule' varies from family to family.)

** This might change in future, when mass measurements improve in precision, thus allowing the detection
Page 443 of relativistic effects. In this case, temperature increase may be detected through its related mass increase.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 42 Some measured entropy values

Process / System	Entropy value
Melting of 1 kg of ice	1.21 kJ/K kg = 21.99 J/K mol
Water under standard conditions	70.1 J/K mol
Boiling of 1 kg of liquid water at 101.3 kPa	6.03 kJ/K= 110 J/K mol
Iron under standard conditions	27.2 J/K mol
Oxygen under standard conditions	161.1 J/K mol

the amount of heat inside a body increase with increasing temperature. The precise relation will be given shortly. But heat has many other interesting properties and stories to tell. Of these, two are particularly important: first, heat is due to particles; and secondly, heat is at the heart of the difference between past and future. These two stories are intertwined.

Entropy

> – It's irreversible.
> – Like my raincoat!
>
> Mel Brooks, *Spaceballs*, 1987

Every domain of physics describes change in terms of two quantities: energy, and an extensive quantity characteristic of the domain. Even though heat is related to energy, the quantity physicists usually call heat is *not* an extensive quantity. Worse, what physicists call heat is not the same as what we call heat in our everyday speech. The extensive quantity corresponding to what we call 'heat' in everyday speech is called *entropy* in physics.* Entropy describes heat in the same way as momentum describes motion. When two objects differing in temperature are brought into contact, an entropy flow takes place between them, like the flow of momentum that take place when two objects of different speeds collide. Let us define the concept of entropy more precisely and explore its properties in some more detail.

Ref. 228

Entropy measures the degree to which energy is *mixed up* inside a system, that is, the degree to which energy is spread or shared among the components of a system. When a lamb is transformed into minced meat, the entropy increases. Therefore, entropy *adds up* when identical systems are composed into one. When two one-litre bottles of water at the same temperature are poured together, the entropy of the water adds up. Entropy is thus an extensive quantity.

Like any other extensive quantity, entropy can be accumulated in a body; it can flow into or out of bodies. When water is transformed into steam, the entropy added into the water is indeed contained in the steam. In short, entropy is what is called 'heat' in everyday speech.

However, such changes are noticeable only with twelve or more digits of precision in mass measurements.

* The term 'entropy' was invented by the German physicist Rudolph Clausius (1822–1888) in 1865. He formed it from the Greek ἐν 'in' and τρόπος 'direction', to make it sound similar to 'energy'. It has always had the meaning given here.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

In contrast to several other important extensive quantities, entropy is *not* conserved. The sharing of energy in a system can be increased, for example by heating it. However, entropy is 'half conserved': in closed systems, entropy never decreases; mixing cannot be undone. What is called equilibrium is simply the result of the highest possible mixing. In short, the entropy of a closed system increases until it reaches the maximum possible value.

When a piece of rock is detached from a mountain, it falls, tumbles into the valley, heating up a bit, and eventually stops. The opposite process, whereby a rock cools and tumbles upwards, is never observed. Why? The opposite motion does not contradict any rule or pattern about motion that we have deduced so far.

Challenge 528 ny

Rocks never fall upwards because mountains, valleys and rocks are made of many particles. Motions of many-particle systems, especially in the domain of thermostatics, are called *processes*. Central to thermostatics is the distinction between *reversible* processes, such as the flight of a thrown stone, and *irreversible* processes, such as the aforementioned tumbling rock. Irreversible processes are all those processes in which friction and its generalizations play a role. They are those which increase the sharing or mixing of energy. They are important: if there were no friction, shirt buttons and shoelaces would not stay fastened, we could not walk or run, coffee machines would not make coffee, and maybe most importantly of all, we would have no memory.

Ref. 233
Page 1088

Irreversible processes, in the sense in which the term is used in thermostatics, transform macroscopic motion into the disorganized motion of all the small microscopic components involved: they increase the sharing and mixing of energy. Irreversible processes are therefore not *strictly* irreversible – but their reversal is *extremely* improbable. We can say that entropy measures the 'amount of irreversibility': it measures the degree of mixing or decay that a collective motion has undergone.

Entropy is not conserved. Entropy – 'heat' – can appear out of nowhere, since energy sharing or mixing can happen by itself. For example, when two different liquids of the same temperature are mixed – such as water and sulphuric acid – the final temperature of the mix can differ. Similarly, when electrical current flows through material at room temperature, the system can heat up or cool down, depending on the material.

The *second principle of thermodynamics* states that 'entropy ain't what it used to be.' More precisely, *the entropy in a closed system tends towards its maximum*. Here, a *closed system* is a system that does not exchange energy or matter with its environment. Can you think of an example?

Challenge 529 ny

Entropy never decreases. Everyday life shows that in a closed system, the disorder increases with time, until it reaches some maximum. To reduce disorder, we need effort, i.e., work and energy. In other words, in order to reduce the disorder in a system, we need to connect the system to an energy source in some clever way. Refrigerators need electrical current precisely for this reason.

Because entropy never decreases, *white colour does not last*. Whenever disorder increases, the colour white becomes 'dirty', usually grey or brown. Perhaps for this reason white objects, such as white clothes, white houses and white underwear, are valued in our society. White objects defy decay.

Entropy allows to define the concept of *equilibrium* more precisely as the state of maximum entropy, or maximum energy sharing.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Flow of entropy

We know from daily experience that transport of an extensive quantity always involves friction. Friction implies generation of entropy. In particular, the flow of entropy itself produces additional entropy. For example, when a house is heated, entropy is produced in the wall. Heating means to keep a temperature difference ΔT between the interior and the exterior of the house. The heat flow J traversing a square metre of wall is given by

$$J = \kappa \Delta T = \kappa (T_\mathrm{i} - T_\mathrm{e}) \tag{95}$$

where κ is a constant characterizing the ability of the wall to conduct heat. While conducting heat, the wall also *produces* entropy. The entropy production σ is proportional to the difference between the interior and the exterior entropy flows. In other words, one has

$$\sigma = \frac{J}{T_\mathrm{e}} - \frac{J}{T_\mathrm{i}} = \kappa \frac{(T_\mathrm{i} - T_\mathrm{e})^2}{T_\mathrm{i} T_\mathrm{e}} \,. \tag{96}$$

Note that we have assumed in this calculation that everything is near equilibrium in each slice parallel to the wall, a reasonable assumption in everyday life. A typical case of a good wall has $\kappa = 1\,\mathrm{W/m^2K}$ in the temperature range between 273 K and 293 K. With this value, one gets an entropy production of

$$\sigma = 5 \cdot 10^{-3}\,\mathrm{W/m^2K} \,. \tag{97}$$

Challenge 530 ny

Can you compare the amount of entropy that is produced in the flow with the amount that is transported? In comparison, a good goose-feather duvet has $\kappa = 1.5\,\mathrm{W/m^2K}$, which in shops is also called 15 tog.*

Entropy can be transported in three ways: through *heat conduction*, as just mentioned, via *convection*, used for heating houses, and through *radiation*, which is possible also through empty space. For example, the Earth radiates about $1.2\,\mathrm{W/m^2K}$ into space, in total thus about 0.51 PW/K. The entropy is (almost) the same that the Earth receives from the Sun. If more entropy had to be radiated away than received, the temperature of the surface of the Earth would have to increase. This is called the *greenhouse effect* or *global warming*. Let's hope that it remains small in the near future.

Do isolated systems exist?

In all our discussions so far, we have assumed that we can distinguish the system under investigation from its environment. But do such *isolated* or *closed* systems, i.e., systems not interacting with their environment, actually exist? Probably our own human condition was the original model for the concept: we do experience having the possibility to

* That unit is not as bad as the official (not a joke) BthU · h/sqft/cm/°F used in some remote provinces of our galaxy.

The insulation power of materials is usually measured by the constant $\lambda = \kappa d$ which is independent of the thickness d of the insulating layer. Values in nature range from about 2000 W/K m for diamond, which is the best conductor of all, down to between 0.1 W/K m and 0.2 W/K m for wood, between 0.015 W/K m and 0.05 W/K m for wools, cork and foams, and the small value of $5 \cdot 10^{-3}$ W/K m for krypton gas.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 186 The basic idea of statistical mechanics about gases

FIGURE 187 What happened here? (© Johan de Jong)

act independently of our environment. An isolated system may be simply defined as a system not exchanging any energy or matter with its environment. For many centuries, scientists saw no reason to question this definition.

The concept of an isolated system had to be refined somewhat with the advent of quantum mechanics. Nevertheless, the concept provides useful and precise descriptions of nature also in that domain. Only in the final part of our walk will the situation change drastically. There, the investigation of whether the universe is an isolated system will lead to surprising results. (What do you think?)* We'll take the first steps towards the answer shortly.

Challenge 531 s

Why do balloons take up space? – The end of continuity

Heat properties are material-dependent. Studying them should therefore enable us to understand something about the constituents of matter. Now, the simplest materials of all are gases.** Gases need space: an amount of gas has pressure and volume. Indeed, it did

* A strange hint: your answer is almost surely wrong.

** By the way, the word *gas* is a modern construct. It was coined by the Brussels alchemist and physician Johan Baptista van Helmont (1579–1644), to sound similar to 'chaos'. It is one of the few words which have been invented by one person and then adopted all over the world.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 188 Which balloon wins when the tap is opened?

not take long to show that gases *could not* be continuous. One of the first scientists to think about gases as made up of atoms was Daniel Bernoulli. Bernoulli reasoned that if atoms are small particles, with mass and momentum, he should be able to make quantitative predictions about the behaviour of gases, and check them with experiment. If the particles fly around in a gas, then the *pressure* of a gas in a container is produced by the steady flow of particles hitting the wall. It was then easy to conclude that if the particles are assumed to behave as tiny, hard and perfectly elastic balls, the pressure p, volume V and temperature T must be related by

Challenge 532 ny

$$pV = kNT \tag{98}$$

where N is the number of particles contained in the gas. (The Boltzmann constant k, one of the fundamental constants of nature, is defined below.) A gas made of particles with such textbook behaviour is called an *ideal gas*. Relation (98) has been confirmed by experiments at room and higher temperatures, for all known gases.

Bernoulli thus derived the gas relation, with a specific prediction for the proportionality constant, from the single assumption that gases are made of small massive constituents. This derivation provides a clear argument for the existence of atoms and for their behaviour as normal, though small objects. (Can you imagine how N might be determined experimentally?)

Challenge 533 ny

The ideal gas model helps us to answer questions such as the one illustrated in Figure 188. Two *identical* rubber balloons, one filled up to a larger size than the other, are connected via a pipe and a valve. The valve is opened. Which one deflates?

Challenge 534 s

The ideal gas relation states that hotter gases, at given pressure, need more volume. The relation thus explains why winds and storms exist, why hot air balloons rise, why car engines work, why the ozone layer is destroyed by certain gases, or why during the extremely hot summer of 2001 in the south of Turkey, oxygen masks were necessary to walk outside during the day.

Challenge 535 e

Now you can also take up the following challenge: how can you measure the weight of a car or a bicycle with a ruler only?

Challenge 536 s

The picture of gases as being made of hard constituents without any long-distance interactions breaks down at very low temperatures. However, the ideal gas relation (98) can be improved to overcome these limitations by taking into account the deviations due to interactions between atoms or molecules. This approach is now standard practice and allows us to measure temperatures even at extremely low values. The effects observed below 80 K, such as the solidification of air, frictionless transport of electrical current, or

Ref. 234

Ref. 235

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Page 1170, page 1176

frictionless flow of liquids, form a fascinating world of their own, the beautiful domain of low-temperature physics; it will be explored later on.

Challenge 537 e

You are now able to explain why balloons change in size as they rise high up in the atmosphere. The largest balloon built so far had a diameter, at high altitude, of 170 m, but only a fraction of that value at take-off.

Brownian motion

If fluids are made of particles moving randomly, this random motion should have observable effects. Indeed, under a microscope it is easy to observe that small particles (such as pollen) in a liquid never come to rest. An example is shown in Figure 189. The pollen particles seem to follow a random zigzag movement. In 1827, the English botanist Robert Brown (1773–1858) showed with a series of experiments that this observation is independent of the type of particle and of the type of liquid. In other words, Brown had discovered a fundamental form of *noise* in nature. Around 1860, this motion was attributed to the molecules of the liquid colliding with the particles. In 1905 and 1906, Marian von Smoluchowski and, independently, Albert Einstein argued that this attribution could be tested experimentally, even though at that time nobody was able to observe molecules directly. The test makes use of the specific properties of thermal noise.

Ref. 236

It had already been clear for a long time that if molecules, i.e., indivisible matter particles, really existed, then thermal energy had to be disordered motion of these constituents and temperature had to be the average energy per degree of freedom of the constituents. Bernoulli's model of Figure 186 implies that for monatomic gases the kinetic energy T_{kin} per particle is given by

Challenge 538 ny

$$T_{\text{kin}} = \frac{3}{2} k T \tag{99}$$

where T is temperature. The so-called *Boltzmann constant* $k = 1.4 \cdot 10^{-23}\,\text{J/K}$ is the standard conversion factor between temperature and energy.* At a room temperature of 293 K, the kinetic energy is thus 6 zJ.

Challenge 539 e

Using relation (99) to calculate the speed of air molecules at room temperature yields values of several hundred metres per second. Given this large speed, why does smoke from a candle take so long to diffuse through a room? Rudolph Clausius (1822–1888) answered this question in the mid-nineteenth century: smoke diffusion is slowed by the collisions with air molecules, in the same way as pollen particles collide with molecules in liquids.

At first sight, one could guess that the average distance the pollen particle has moved after n collisions should be zero, because the molecule velocities are random. However,

* The Boltzmann constant k was discovered and named by Max Planck, in the same work in which he also discovered what is now called Planck's constant $\hbar$, the quantum of action. For more details on Max Planck, see page 768.

Planck named the Boltzmann constant after the important Austrian physicist Ludwig Boltzmann (b. 1844 Vienna, d. 1906 Duino), who is most famous for his work on thermodynamics. Boltzmann he explained all thermodynamic phenomena and observables, above all entropy itself, as results of the behaviour of molecules. It is said that Boltzmann committed suicide partly because of the animosities of his fellow physicists towards his ideas and himself. Nowadays, his work is standard textbook material.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 189 Example paths for particles in Brownian motion and their displacement distribution

this is wrong, as experiment shows.

An increasing average *square* displacement, written $\langle d^2 \rangle$, is observed for the pollen particle. It cannot be predicted in which direction the particle will move, but it does move. If the distance the particle moves after one collision is l, the average square displacement after n collisions is given, as you should be able to show yourself, by

Challenge 540 ny

$$\langle d^2 \rangle = nl^2 \,. \tag{100}$$

For molecules with an average velocity v over time t this gives

$$\langle d^2 \rangle = nl^2 = vlt \,. \tag{101}$$

In other words, the average square displacement increases proportionally with time. Of course, this is only valid because the liquid is made of separate molecules. Repeatedly measuring the position of a particle should give the distribution shown in Figure 189 for the probability that the particle is found at a given distance from the starting point. This is called the *(Gaussian) normal distribution*. In 1908, Jean Perrin* performed extensive experiments in order to test this prediction. He found that equation (101) corresponded completely with observations, thus convincing everybody that Brownian motion is indeed due to collisions with the molecules of the surrounding liquid, as had been expected.** Perrin received the 1926 Nobel Prize for these experiments.

Ref. 237

Einstein also showed that the same experiment could be used to determine the number of molecules in a litre of water (or equivalently, the Boltzmann constant k). Can you work out how he did this?

Challenge 541 d

* Jean Perrin (1870–1942), important French physicist, devoted most of his career to the experimental proof of the atomic hypothesis and the determination of Avogadro's number; in pursuit of this aim he perfected the use of emulsions, Brownian motion and oil films. His Nobel Prize speech (nobelprize.org/physics/laureates/1926/perrin-lecture.html) tells the interesting story of his research. He wrote the influential book *Les atomes* and founded the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. He was also the first to speculate, in 1901, that an atom is similar to a small solar system.

** In a delightful piece of research, Pierre Gaspard and his team showed in 1998 that Brownian motion is also chaotic, in the strict physical sense given later on.

Ref. 238

Page 308

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 43 Some typical entropy values per particle at *standard* temperature and pressure as multiples of the Boltzmann constant

Material	Entropy per particle
Monatomic solids	0.3 k to 10 k
Diamond	0.29 k
Graphite	0.68 k
Lead	7.79 k
Monatomic gases	15-25 k
Helium	15.2 k
Radon	21.2 k
Diatomic gases	15 k to 30 k
Polyatomic solids	10 k to 60 k
Polyatomic liquids	10 k to 80 k
Polyatomic gases	20 k to 60 k
Icosane	112 k

Entropy and particles

Once it had become clear that heat and temperature are due to the motion of microscopic particles, people asked what entropy *was* microscopically. The answer can be formulated in various ways. The two most extreme answers are:

— Entropy is the expected number of yes-or-no questions, multiplied by $k \ln 2$, the answers of which would tell us everything about the system, i.e., about its microscopic state.
— Entropy measures the (logarithm of the) number W of possible microscopic states. A given macroscopic state can have many microscopic realizations. The logarithm of this number, multiplied by the Boltzmann constant k, gives the entropy.*

In short, the higher the entropy, the more microstates are possible. Through either of these definitions, entropy measures the quantity of randomness in a system. In other words, it measures the transformability of energy: higher entropy means lower transformability. Alternatively, entropy measures the *freedom* in the choice of microstate that a system has. High entropy means high freedom of choice for the microstate. For example, when a molecule of glucose (a type of sugar) is produced by photosynthesis, about 40 bits of entropy are released. This means that after the glucose is formed, 40 additional yes-or-no questions must be answered in order to determine the full microscopic state of the system. Physicists often use a macroscopic unit; most systems of interest are large, and thus an entropy of 10^{23} bits is written as 1 J/K. (This is only approximate. Can you find the precise value?)

Challenge 542 ny

* When Max Planck went to Austria to search for the anonymous tomb of Boltzmann in order to get him buried in a proper grave, he inscribed the formula $S = k \ln W$ on the tombstone. (Which physicist would

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

To sum up, entropy is thus a specific measure for the characterization of disorder of thermal systems. Three points are worth making here. First of all, entropy is not *the* measure of disorder, but *one* measure of disorder. It is therefore *not* correct to use entropy as a *synonym* for the concept of disorder, as is often done in the popular literature. Entropy is only defined for systems that have a temperature, in other words, only for systems that are in or near equilibrium. (For systems far from equilibrium, no measure of disorder has been found yet; probably none is possible.) In fact, the use of the term entropy has degenerated so much that sometimes one has to call it *thermodynamic* entropy for clarity.

Ref. 239

Secondly, entropy is related to information *only if* information is defined also as $-k \ln W$. To make this point clear, take a book with a mass of one kilogram. At room temperature, its entropy content is about 4 kJ/K. The printed information inside a book, say 500 pages of 40 lines with each containing 80 characters out of 64 possibilities, corresponds to an entropy of $4 \cdot 10^{-17}$ J/K. In short, what is usually called 'information' in everyday life is a negligible fraction of what a physicist calls information. Entropy is defined using the *physical* concept of information.

Finally, entropy is also *not* a measure for what in normal life is called the *complexity* of a situation. In fact, nobody has yet found a quantity describing this everyday notion. The task is surprisingly difficult. Have a try!

Ref. 240

Challenge 543 ny

In summary, if you hear the term entropy used with a different meaning than $S = k \ln W$, beware. Somebody is trying to get you, probably with some ideology.

The minimum entropy of nature – the quantum of information

Before we complete our discussion of thermostatics we must point out in another way the importance of the Boltzmann constant k. We have seen that this constant appears whenever the granularity of matter plays a role; it expresses the fact that matter is made of small basic entities. The most striking way to put this statement is the following: *There is a smallest entropy in nature.* Indeed, for all systems, the entropy obeys

$$S \geqslant \frac{k}{2} \,. \tag{102}$$

This result is almost 100 years old; it was stated most clearly (with a different numerical factor) by the Hungarian–German physicist Leo Szilard. The same point was made by the French physicist Léon Brillouin (again with a different numerical factor). The statement can also be taken as the *definition* of the Boltzmann constant.

Ref. 241

Ref. 242

The existence of a smallest entropy in nature is a strong idea. It eliminates the possibility of the continuity of matter and also that of its fractality. A smallest entropy implies that matter is made of a finite number of small components. The limit to entropy expresses the fact that matter is made of particles.* The limit to entropy also shows that Galilean physics cannot be correct: Galilean physics assumes that arbitrarily small quantities do exist. The entropy limit is the first of several limits to motion that we will encounter until

finance the tomb of another, nowadays?)

* The minimum entropy implies that matter is made of tiny spheres; the minimum *action*, which we will encounter in quantum theory, implies that these spheres are actually small clouds.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

we complete the quantum part of our ascent. After we have found all limits, we can start the final part, leading to unification.

The existence of a smallest quantity implies a limit on the precision of measurement. Measurements cannot have infinite precision. This limitation is usually stated in the form of an indeterminacy relation. Indeed, the existence of a smallest entropy can be rephrased as an indeterminacy relation between the temperature T and the inner energy U of a system:

$$\Delta\frac{1}{T}\,\Delta U \geqslant \frac{k}{2}\,. \tag{103}$$

Ref. 244 This relation* was given by Niels Bohr; it was discussed by Werner Heisenberg, who Page 1470 called it one of the basic indeterminacy relations of nature. The Boltzmann constant (di- Ref. 245 vided by 2) thus fixes the smallest possible entropy value in nature. For this reason, Gilles Ref. 242 Cohen-Tannoudji calls it the *quantum of information* and Herbert Zimmermann calls it the *quantum of entropy*.

The relation (103) points towards a more general pattern. For every minimum value for an observable, there is a corresponding indeterminacy relation. We will come across this several times in the rest of our adventure, most importantly in the case of the quan- Page 976 tum of action and Heisenberg's indeterminacy relation.

The existence of a smallest entropy has numerous consequences. First of all, it sheds light on the third principle of thermodynamics. A smallest entropy implies that absolute zero temperature is not achievable. Secondly, a smallest entropy explains why entropy values are finite instead of infinite. Thirdly, it fixes the absolute value of entropy for every system; in continuum physics, entropy, like energy, is only defined up to an additive constant. The entropy limit settles all these issues.

The existence of a minimum value for an observable implies that an indeterminacy relation appears for any two quantities whose product yields that observable. For example, entropy production rate and time are such a pair. Indeed, an indeterminacy relation connects the entropy production rate $P = \mathrm{d}S/\mathrm{d}t$ and the time t:

$$\Delta P\,\Delta t \geqslant \frac{k}{2}\,. \tag{104}$$

From this and the previous relation (103) it is possible to deduce all of statistical physics, Ref. 245, Ref. 243 i.e., the precise theory of thermostatics and thermodynamics. We will not explore this further here. (Can you show that the zeroth and third principle follows from the existence Challenge 544 ny of a smallest entropy?) We will limit ourselves to one of the cornerstones of thermodynamics: the second principle.

Why can't we remember the future?

> It's a poor sort of memory which only works backwards.
>
> Lewis Carroll, *Alice in Wonderland*

Ref. 243 * It seems that the historical value for the right hand side, given by k, has to be corrected to $k/2$.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 44 Some minimum flow values found in nature

Observation	Minimum value
Matter flow	one molecule or one atom or one particle
Volume flow	one molecule or one atom or one particle
Momentum flow	Planck's constant divided by wavelength
Angular momentum flow	Planck's constant
Chemical amount of substance	one molecule, one atom or one particle
Entropy flow	minimum entropy
Charge flow	elementary charge
Light flow	Planck's constant divided by wavelength

Page 45 When we first discussed time, we ignored the difference between past and future. But obviously, a difference exists, as we do not have the ability to remember the future. This is not a limitation of our brain alone. All the devices we have invented, such as tape recorders, photographic cameras, newspapers and books, only tell us about the past. Is there a way to build a video recorder with a 'future' button? Such a device would have to Challenge 545 ny solve a deep problem: how would it distinguish between the near and the far future? It does not take much thought to see that any way to do this would conflict with the second principle of thermodynamics. That is unfortunate, as we would need precisely the same Challenge 546 ny device to show that there is faster-than-light motion. Can you find the connection?

In summary, the future cannot be remembered because entropy in closed systems tends towards a maximum. Put even more simply, memory exists because the brain is made of many particles, and so the brain is limited to the past. However, for the most simple types of motion, when only a few particles are involved, the difference between past and future disappears. For few-particle systems, there is no difference between times gone by and times approaching. We could say that the future differs from the past only in our brain, or equivalently, only because of friction. Therefore the difference between the past and the future is not mentioned frequently in this walk, even though it is an essential part of our human experience. But the fun of the present adventure is precisely to overcome our limitations.

Is everything made of particles?

> A physicist is the atom's way of knowing about atoms.
>
> George Wald

Ref. 246

Historically, the study of statistical mechanics has been of fundamental importance for physics. It provided the first demonstration that physical objects are made of interacting particles. The story of this topic is in fact a long chain of arguments showing that all the properties we ascribe to objects, such as size, stiffness, colour, mass density, magnetism, thermal or electrical conductivity, result from the interaction of the many particles they consist of. The discovery that *all objects are made of interacting particles* has often been called the main result of modern science.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 190 A 111 surface of a gold single crystal, every bright dot being an atom, with a surface dislocation (© CNRS)

Page 277

How was this discovery made? Table 40 listed the main extensive quantities used in physics. Extensive quantities are able to flow. It turns out that all flows in nature are *composed* of elementary processes, as shown in Table 44. We have seen that the flow of mass, volume, charge, entropy and substance are composed. Later, quantum theory will show the same for the flow of linear and angular momentum. *All flows are made of particles.*

This success of this idea has led many people to generalize it to the statement: 'Everything we observe is made of parts.' This approach has been applied with success to chemistry with molecules, materials science and geology with crystals, electricity with electrons, atoms with elementary particles, space with points, time with instants, light with photons, biology with cells, genetics with genes, neurology with neurons, mathematics with sets and relations, logic with elementary propositions, and even to linguistics with morphemes and phonemes. All these sciences have flourished on the idea that everything is made of related *parts*. The basic idea seems so self-evident that we find it difficult even to formulate an alternative. Just try!

Ref. 247

Challenge 547 ny

However, in the case of the *whole* of nature, the idea that nature is a sum of related parts is incorrect. It turns out to be a prejudice, and a prejudice so entrenched that it retarded further developments in physics in the latter decades of the twentieth century. In particular, it does *not* apply to elementary particles or to space-time. Finding the correct description for the whole of nature is the biggest challenge of our adventure, as it requires a complete change in thinking habits. There is a lot of fun ahead.

Page 1440

> Jede Aussage über Komplexe läßt sich in eine Aussage über deren Bestandteile und in diejenigen Sätze zerlegen, welche die Komplexe vollständig beschreiben.*
>
> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 2.0201

Why stones can be neither smooth nor fractal, nor made of little hard balls

The exploration of temperature yields another interesting result. Researchers first studied gases, and measured how much energy was needed to heat them by 1 K. The result

* 'Every statement about complexes can be resolved into a statement about their constituents and into the propositions that describe the complexes completely.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 191 The fire pump

is simple: all gases share only a few values, when the number of molecules N is taken into account. Monatomic gases (in a container with constant volume) require $3Nk/2$, diatomic gases (and those with a linear molecule) $5Nk/2$, and almost all other gases $3Nk$, where $k = 1.4 \cdot 10^{-23}$ J/K is the Boltzmann constant.

Page 287

The explanation of this result was soon forthcoming: each thermodynamic degree of freedom* contributes the energy $kT/2$ to the total energy, where T is the temperature. So the number of degrees of freedom in physical bodies is finite. Bodies are not continuous, nor are they fractals: if they were, their specific thermal energy would be infinite. Matter is indeed made of small basic entities.

All degrees of freedom contribute to the specific thermal energy. At least, this is what classical physics predicts. Solids, like stones, have 6 thermodynamic degrees of freedom and should show a specific thermal energy of $3Nk$. At high temperatures, this is indeed observed. But measurements of solids at room temperature yield lower values, and the lower the temperature, the lower the values become. Even gases show values lower than those just mentioned, when the temperature is sufficiently low. In other words, molecules and atoms behave differently at low energies: atoms are not immutable little hard balls. The deviation of these values is one of the first hints of quantum theory.

Curiosities and fun challenges about heat and reversibility

Compression of air increases its temperature. This is shown directly by the fire pump, a variation of a bicycle pump, shown in Figure 191. (For a working example, see the website www.tn.tudelft.nl/cdd). A match head at the bottom of an air pump made of transparent material is easily ignited by the compression of the air above it. The temperature of the air after compression is so high that the match head ignites spontaneously.

* A *thermodynamic degree of freedom* is, for each particle in a system, the number of dimensions in which it can move plus the number of dimensions in which it is kept in a potential. Atoms in a solid have six, particles in monatomic gases have only three; particles in diatomic gases or rigid linear molecules have five. The number of degrees of freedom of larger molecules depends on their shape.

Ref. 248

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

Running backwards is an interesting sport. The 2006 world records for running backwards can be found on www.recordholders.org/en/list/backwards-running.html. You will be astonished how much these records are faster than your best personal *forward*-running time. Challenge 548 e

* *

If heat really is disordered motion of atoms, a big problem appears. When two atoms collide head-on, in the instant of smallest distance, neither atom has velocity. Where does the kinetic energy go? Obviously, it is transformed into potential energy. But that implies that atoms can be deformed, that they have internal structure, that they have parts, and thus that they can in principle be split. In short, if heat is disordered atomic motion, *atoms are not indivisible*! In the nineteenth century this argument was put forward in order to show that heat cannot be atomic motion, but must be some sort of fluid. But since we know that heat really is kinetic energy, atoms must indeed be divisible, even though their name means 'indivisible'. We do not need an expensive experiment to show this.

* *

Ref. 249 In 1912, Emile Borel noted that if a gram of matter on Sirius was displaced by one centimetre, it would change the gravitational field on Earth by a tiny amount only. But this tiny change would be sufficient to make it impossible to calculate the path of molecules in a gas after a fraction of a second.

* *

Not only gases, but also most other materials expand when the temperature rises. As a result, the electrical wires supported by pylons hang much lower in summer than in winter. True? Challenge 549 s

* *

Ref. 250 The following is a famous problem asked by Fermi. Given that a human corpse cools down in four hours after death, what is the minimum number of calories needed per day in our food? Challenge 550 ny

* *

The energy contained in thermal motion is not negligible. A 1 g bullet travelling at the speed of sound has a kinetic energy of only 0.01 kcal.

* *

Challenge 551 s How does a typical, 1500 m^3 hot-air balloon work?

* *

If you do not like this text, here is a proposal. You can use the paper to make a cup, as shown in Figure 192, and boil water in it over an open flame. However, to succeed, you have to be a little careful. Can you find out in what way? Challenge 552 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 192 Can you boil water in this paper cup?

* *

Challenge 553 ny Mixing 1 kg of water at 0°C and 1 kg of water at 100°C gives 2 kg of water at 50°C. What is the result of mixing 1 kg of *ice* at 0°C and 1 kg of water at 100°C?

* *

Ref. 251 The highest recorded air temperature in which a man has survived is 127°C. This was tested in 1775 in London, by the secretary of the Royal Society, Charles Blagden, together with a few friends, who remained in a room at that temperature for 45 minutes. Interestingly, the raw steak which he had taken in with him was cooked ('well done') when he and his friends left the room. What condition had to be strictly met in order to avoid Challenge 554 s cooking the people in the same way as the steak?

* *

Challenge 555 s Why does water boil at 99.975°C instead of 100°C?

* *

Challenge 556 s Can you fill a bottle precisely with 1 ± 10^{-30} kg of water?

* *

One gram of fat, either butter or human fat, contains 38 kJ of chemical energy (or, in ancient units more familiar to nutritionists, 9 kcal). That is the same value as that of petrol. Challenge 557 s Why are people and butter less dangerous than petrol?

* *

In 1992, the Dutch physicist Martin van der Mark invented a loudspeaker which works by heating air with a laser beam. He demonstrated that with the right wavelength and with a suitable modulation of the intensity, a laser beam in air can generate sound. The effect at the basis of this device, called the *photoacoustic effect*, appears in many materials. The best laser wavelength for air is in the infrared domain, on one of the few absorption lines of water vapour. In other words, a properly modulated infrared laser beam that shines through the air generates sound. Such light can be emitted from a small matchbox-sized semiconductor laser hidden in the ceiling and shining downwards. The sound is emitted in all directions perpendicular to the beam. Since infrared laser light is not visible, Martin van der Mark thus invented an invisible loudspeaker! Unfortunately, the efficiency of

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 193 The invisible loudspeaker

present versions is still low, so that the power of the speaker is not yet sufficient for practical applications. Progress in laser technology should change this, so that in the future we should be able to hear sound that is emitted from the centre of an otherwise empty room.

* *

Challenge 558 s A famous exam question: How can you measure the height of a building with a barometer, a rope and a ruler? Find at least six different ways.

* *

Challenge 559 ny What is the approximate probability that out of one million throws of a coin you get exactly 500 000 heads and as many tails? You may want to use Stirling's formula $n! \approx \sqrt{2\pi n}(n/e)^n$ to calculate the result.*

* *

Challenge 560 s Does it make sense to talk about the entropy of the universe?

* *

Challenge 561 ny Can a helium balloon lift the tank which filled it?

* *

All friction processes, such as osmosis, diffusion, evaporation, or decay, are *slow*. They take a characteristic time. It turns out that any (macroscopic) process with a time-scale is irreversible. This is no real surprise: we know intuitively that undoing things always takes more time than doing them. That is again the second principle of thermodynamics.

* *

It turns out that *storing* information is possible with negligible entropy generation. How-

* There are many improvements to Stirling's formula. A simple one is Gosper's formula $n! \approx \sqrt{(2n+1/3)\pi}(n/e)^n$. Another is $\sqrt{2\pi n}(n/e)^n e^{1/(12n+1)} < n! < \sqrt{2\pi n}(n/e)^n e^{1/(12n)}$.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Ref. 252 ever, *erasing* information requires entropy. This is the main reason why computers, as well as brains, require energy sources and cooling systems, even if their mechanisms would otherwise need no energy at all.

* *

When mixing hot rum and cold water, how does the increase in entropy due to the mix-
Challenge 562 ny ing compare with the entropy increase due to the temperature difference?

* *

Why aren't there any small humans, say 10 mm in size, as in many fairy tales? In fact,
Challenge 563 s there are no warm-blooded animals of that size at all. Why not?

* *

Shining a light onto a body and repeatedly switching it on and off produces sound. This is called the *photoacoustic effect*, and is due to the thermal expansion of the material. By changing the frequency of the light, and measuring the intensity of the noise, one reveals a characteristic photoacoustic spectrum for the material. This method allows us to detect gas concentrations in air of one part in 10^9. It is used, among other methods, to study the gases emitted by plants. Plants emit methane, alcohol and acetaldehyde in small quantities; the photoacoustic effect can detect these gases and help us to understand the processes behind their emission.

* *

What is the rough probability that all oxygen molecules in the air would move away from
Challenge 564 ny a given city for a few minutes, killing all inhabitants?

* *

If you pour a litre of water into the sea, stir thoroughly through all the oceans and then
Challenge 565 ny take out a litre of the mixture, how many of the original atoms will you find?

* *

Challenge 566 ny How long would you go on breathing in the room you are in if it were airtight?

* *

Challenge 567 ny What happens if you put some ash onto a piece of sugar and set fire to the whole? (Warning: this is dangerous and not for kids.)

* *

Entropy calculations are often surprising. For a system of N particles with two states each, there are $W_{\text{all}} = 2^N$ states. For its most probable configuration, with exactly half the particles in one state, and the other half in the other state, we have $W_{\text{max}} = N!/((N/2)!)^2$. Now, for a macroscopic system of particles, we might typically have $N = 10^{24}$. That gives $W_{\text{all}} \gg W_{\text{max}}$; indeed, the former is 10^{12} times larger than the latter. On the other hand,
Challenge 568 ny we find that $\ln W_{\text{all}}$ and $\ln W_{\text{max}}$ agree for the first 20 digits! Even though the configuration with exactly half the particles in each state is much more rare than the general case,
Challenge 569 ny where the ratio is allowed to vary, the entropy turns out to be the same. Why?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

If heat is due to motion of atoms, our built-in senses of heat and cold are simply detectors of motion. How could they work? Challenge 570 ny

By the way, the senses of smell and taste can also be seen as motion detectors, as they signal the presence of molecules flying around in air or in liquids. Do you agree? Challenge 571 ny

* *

The Moon has an atmosphere, although an extremely thin one, consisting of sodium (Na) and potassium (K). This atmosphere has been detected up to nine Moon radii from its surface. The atmosphere of the Moon is generated at the surface by the ultraviolet radiation from the Sun. Can you estimate the Moon's atmospheric density? Challenge 572 s

* *

Does it make sense to add a line in Table 40 for the quantity of physical action? A column? Why? Challenge 573 ny

* *

Diffusion provides a length scale. For example, insects take in oxygen through their skin. As a result, the interiors of their bodies cannot be much more distant from the surface than about a centimetre. Can you list some other length scales in nature implied by diffusion processes? Challenge 574 s

* *

Rising warm air is the reason why many insects are found in tall clouds in the evening. Many insects, especially that seek out blood in animals, are attracted to warm and humid air.

* *

Thermometers based on mercury can reach 750 °C. How is this possible, given that mercury boils at 357 °C? Challenge 575 s

* *

What does a burning candle look like in weightless conditions? Challenge 576 s

* *

It is possible to build a power station by building a large chimney, so that air heated by the Sun flows upwards in it, driving a turbine as it does so. It is also possible to make a power station by building a long vertical tube, and letting a gas such as ammonia rise into it which is then liquefied at the top by the low temperatures in the upper atmosphere; as it falls back down a second tube as a liquid – just like rain – it drives a turbine. Why are such schemes, which are almost completely non-polluting, not used yet? Challenge 577 s

* *

One of the most surprising devices ever invented is the *Wirbelrohr* or Ranque–Hilsch vortex tube. By blowing compressed air at room temperature into it at its midpoint, two flows of air are formed at its ends. One is extremely cold, easily as low as −50 °C, and one

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 194 The Wirbelrohr or Ranque–Hilsch vortex tube

extremely hot, up to 200 °C. No moving parts and no heating devices are found inside. How does it work? Challenge 578 s

* *

It is easy to cook an egg in such a way that the white is hard but the yolk remains liquid. Can you achieve the opposite? Challenge 579 s

* *

Thermoacoustic engines, pumps and refrigerators provide many strange and fascinating applications of heat. For example, it is possible to use loud sound in closed metal chambers to move heat from a cold place to a hot one. Such devices have few moving parts and are being studied in the hope of finding practical applications in the future. Ref. 253

* *

Does a closed few-particle system contradict the second principle of thermodynamics? Challenge 580 ny

* *

What happens to entropy when gravitation is taken into account? We carefully left gravitation out of our discussion. In fact, gravitation leads to many new problems – just try to think about the issue. For example, Jacob Bekenstein has discovered that matter reaches its highest possible entropy when it forms a black hole. Can you confirm this? Challenge 581 ny

* *

The numerical values (but not the units!) of the Boltzmann constant $k = 1.38 \cdot 10^{-23}\,\mathrm{J/K}$ and the combination h/ce agree in their exponent and in their first three digits, where h is Planck's constant and e is the electron charge. Can you dismiss this as mere coincidence? Challenge 582 ny

* *

Mixing is not always easy to perform. The experiment of Figure 195 gives completely different results with water and glycerine. Can you guess them? Challenge 583 s

* *

There are less-well known arguments about atoms. In fact, two everyday prove the existence of atoms: sex and memory. Why? Challenge 584 ny

In the context of lasers and of spin systems, it is fun to talk about negative temperature.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 195 What happens to the ink stripe if the inner cylinder is turned a few times in one direction, and then turned back by the same amount?

Challenge 585 s Why is this not really sensible?

Summary on heat and time-invariance

Microscopic motion due to gravity and electric interactions, thus all microscopic motion in everyday life, is *reversible*: such motion can occur backwards in time. In other words, motion due to gravity and electromagnetism is time-reversal-invariant or motion-reversal-invariant.

Nevertheless, everyday motion is *irreversible*, because there are no completely closed systems in everyday life. Equivalently, irreversibility results from the extremely low probabilities required to perform a motion inversion. Macroscopic irreversibility does not contradict microscopic reversibility.

For these reasons, in everyday life, entropy in closed systems always increases. This leads to a famous issue: how can evolution be reconciled with entropy increase? Let us have a look.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 13

SELF-ORGANIZATION AND CHAOS – THE SIMPLICITY OF COMPLEXITY

> To speak of non-linear physics is like calling zoology the study of non-elephant animals.
>
> Stanislaw Ulam

Ref. 254

In our list of global descriptions of motion, the high point is the study of self-organization. Self-organization is the appearance of order. *Order* is a term that includes *shapes*, such as the complex symmetry of snowflakes; *patterns*, such as the stripes of zebras; and *cycles*, such as the creation of sound when singing. Indeed, every example of what we call *beauty* is a combination of shapes, patterns and cycles. (Do you agree?) Self-organization can thus be called the study of the origin of beauty.

Ref. 255

Challenge 586 s

The appearance of order is a general observation across nature. Fluids in particular exhibit many phenomena where order appears and disappears. Examples include the more or less regular flickering of a burning candle, the flapping of a flag in the wind, the regular stream of bubbles emerging from small irregularities in the surface of a champagne glass, and the regular or irregular dripping of a water tap.

The appearance of order is found from the cell differentiation in an embryo inside a woman's body; the formation of colour patterns on tigers, tropical fish and butterflies; the symmetrical arrangements of flower petals; the formation of biological rhythms; and so on.

All growth processes are self-organization phenomena. Have you ever pondered the incredible way in which teeth grow? A practically inorganic material forms shapes in the upper and the lower rows fitting exactly into each other. How this process is controlled is still a topic of research. Also the formation, before and after birth, of neural networks in the brain is another process of self-organization. Even the physical processes at the basis of thinking, involving changing electrical signals, is to be described in terms of self-organization.

Page 794

Biological evolution is a special case of growth. Take the evolution of animal shapes. It turns out that snake tongues are forked because that is the most efficient shape for following chemical trails left by prey and other snakes of the same species. (Snakes smell with help of the tongue.) The fixed numbers of fingers in human hands or of petals of flowers are also consequences of self-organization.

Ref. 256

Page 948

Many problems of self-organization are mechanical problems: for example, the formation of mountain ranges when continents move, the creation of earthquakes, or the creation of regular cloud arrangements in the sky. It can be fascinating to ponder, during an otherwise boring flight, the mechanisms behind the formation of the clouds you see

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 196 Examples of self-organization for sand: spontaneous appearance of a temporal cycle (a and b), spontaneous appearance of a periodic pattern (b and c), spontaneous appearance of a spatiotemporal pattern, namely solitary waves (right) (© Ernesto Altshuler et al.)

Challenge 587 e from the aeroplane.

Studies into the conditions required for the appearance or disappearance of order have shown that their description requires only a few common concepts, independently of the details of the physical system. This is best seen looking at a few examples.

All the richness of self-organization reveals itself in the study of plain sand. Why do sand dunes have ripples, as does the sand floor at the bottom of the sea? We can also study how avalanches occur on steep heaps of sand and how sand behaves in hourglasses, in mixers, or in vibrating containers. The results are often surprising. For example, as recently as 2006, the Cuban research group of Ernesto Altshuler and his colleagues Ref. 257 discovered solitary waves on sand flows (shown in Figure 196). They had already discov-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 45 Patterns on horizontal sand surfaces in the sea and on land

Pattern	Period	Amplitude	Origin
Under water			
Ribbles	5 cm	5 mm	water waves
Megaribbles	1 m	0.1 m	tides
Sand waves	100 to 800 m	5 m	tides
Sand banks	2 to 10 km	2 to 20 m	tides
In air			
Ribbles	0.1 m	0.05 m	wind
Singing sand	95 to 105 Hz	up to 105 dB	wind on sand dunes, avalanches making the dune vibrate
Road corrugations	0.3 to 0.9 m	0.05 m	wheels
Elsewhere			
On Mars	a few km	few tens of m	wind

FIGURE 197 Road corrugations (courtesy David Mays)

ered the revolving river effect on sand piles, shown in the same figure, in 2002. Even more surprisingly, these effects occur only for Cuban sand, and a few rare other types of sand. The reasons are still unknown.

Ref. 258 Similarly, in 1996 Paul Umbanhowar and his colleagues found that when a flat container holding tiny bronze balls (around 0.165 mm in diameter) is shaken up and down in vacuum at certain frequencies, the surface of this bronze 'sand' forms stable heaps. They are shown in Figure 198. These heaps, so-called *oscillons*, also bob up and down. Oscillons can move and interact with one another.

Oscillons in sand are a simple example for a general effect in nature: *discrete* systems with nonlinear interactions can exhibit localized excitations. This fascinating topic is just Ref. 259 beginning to be researched. It might well be that it will yield results relevant to our understanding of elementary particles.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 198 Oscillons formed by shaken bronze balls; horizontal size is about 2 cm (© Paul Umbanhowar)



FIGURE 199 Magic numbers: 21 spheres, when swirled in a dish, behave differently from non-magic numbers, like 23, of spheres (redrawn from photographs, © Karsten Kötter)

Sand shows many other pattern-forming processes. A mixture of sand and sugar, when poured onto a heap, forms regular layered structures that in cross section look like zebra stripes. Horizontally rotating cylinders with binary mixtures inside them separate the mixture out over time. Or take a container with two compartments separated by a 1 cm wall. Fill both halves with sand and rapidly shake the whole container with a machine. Over time, all the sand will spontaneously accumulate in one half of the container. As another example of self-organization in sand, people have studied the various types of sand dunes that 'sing' when the wind blows over them. Finally, the corrugations formed by traffic on roads without tarmac are an example of self-organization that is not completely explored; it is still unclear, for example, why these corrugation patterns move against the traffic direction over time. (Can you find out?) In fact, the behaviour of sand and dust is proving to be such a beautiful and fascinating topic that the prospect of each human returning dust does not look so grim after all.

Ref. 260

Ref. 261

Another simple and beautiful example of self-organization is the effect discovered in 1999 by Karsten Kötter and his group. They found that the behaviour of a set of spheres swirled in a dish depends on the number of spheres used. Usually, all the spheres get continuously mixed up. But for certain 'magic' numbers, such as 21, stable ring patterns emerge, for which the outside spheres remain outside and the inside ones remain inside. The rings, best seen by colouring the spheres, are shown in Figure 199.

Ref. 262

These and many other studies of self-organizing systems have changed our understanding of nature in a number of ways. First of all, they have shown that patterns and shapes are similar to cycles: all are due to motion. Without motion, and thus without history, there is no order, neither patterns nor shapes. Every pattern has a history; every pattern is a result of motion. An example is shown in Figure 200.

Ref. 263

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 200 Self-organization: a growing snow flake (QuickTime film © Kenneth Libbrecht)

Secondly, patterns, shapes and cycles are due to the organized motion of large numbers of small constituents. Systems which self-organize are always composite: they are *cooperative structures*.

Thirdly, all these systems obey evolution equations which are *nonlinear* in the configuration variables. Linear systems do not self-organize. Many self-organizing systems also show *chaotic* motion.

Fourthly, the appearance and disappearance of order depends on the strength of a driving force, the so-called *order parameter*. Often, chaotic motion appears when the driving is increased beyond the value necessary for the appearance of order. An example of chaotic motion is turbulence, which appears when the order parameter, which is proportional to the speed of the fluid, is increased to high values.

Moreover, all order and all structure appears when two general types of motion compete with each other, namely a 'driving', energy-adding process, and a 'dissipating', braking mechanism. Thermodynamics plays a role in all self-organization. Self-organizing systems are always *dissipative systems*, and are always far from equilibrium. When the driving and the dissipation are of the same order of magnitude, and when the key behaviour of the system is not a linear function of the driving action, order may appear.*

All self-organizing systems at the onset of order appearance can be described by equations for the pattern amplitude A of the general form

$$\frac{\partial A(t,x)}{\partial t} = \lambda A - \mu |A|^2 A + \kappa \, \Delta A + \text{higher orders} \,. \tag{105}$$

Here, the – possibly complex – observable A is the one that appears when order appears,

* To describe the 'mystery' of human life, terms like 'fire', 'river' or 'tree' are often used as analogies. These are all examples of self-organized systems: they have many degrees of freedom, have competing driving and braking forces, depend critically on their initial conditions, show chaos and irregular behaviour, and sometimes show cycles and regular behaviour. Humans and human life resemble them in all these respects; thus there is a solid basis to their use as metaphors. We could even go further and speculate that pure beauty *is* pure self-organization. The lack of beauty indeed often results from a disturbed equilibrium between external braking and external driving.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 201 Examples of different types of motion in configuration space

such as the oscillation amplitude or the pattern amplitude. The first term λA is the driving term, in which λ is a parameter describing the strength of the driving. The next term is a typical nonlinearity in A, with μ a parameter that describes its strength, and the third term $\kappa \Delta A = \kappa(\partial^2 A/\partial x^2 + \partial^2 A/\partial y^2 + \partial^2 A/\partial z^2)$ is a typical diffusive and thus dissipative term.

One can distinguish two main situations. In cases where the dissipative term plays no role ($\kappa = 0$), one finds that when the driving parameter λ increases above zero, a *temporal* oscillation appears, i.e., a stable cycle with non-vanishing amplitude. In cases where the diffusive term does play a role, equation (105) describes how an amplitude for a *spatial* oscillation appears when the driving parameter λ becomes positive, as the solution $A = 0$ then becomes spatially unstable.

Challenge 588 ny

Challenge 589 ny

In both cases, the onset of order is called a *bifurcation*, because at this critical value of the driving parameter λ the situation with amplitude zero, i.e., the homogeneous (or unordered) state, becomes unstable, and the ordered state becomes stable. *In nonlinear systems, order is stable.* This is the main conceptual result of the field. Equation (105) and its numerous variations allow us to describe many phenomena, ranging from spirals, waves, hexagonal patterns, and topological defects, to some forms of turbulence. For every physical system under study, the main task is to distil the observable A and the parameters λ, μ and κ from the underlying physical processes.

Ref. 264

Self-organization is a vast field which is yielding new results almost by the week. To discover new topics of study, it is often sufficient to keep one's eye open; most effects are comprehensible without advanced mathematics. Good hunting!

Challenge 590 ny

Most systems that show self-organization also show another type of motion. When the driving parameter of a self-organizing system is increased to higher and higher values, order becomes more and more irregular, and in the end one usually finds chaos. For physicists, chaotic motion is the most irregular type of motion.* Chaos can be defined independently of self-organization, namely as that motion of systems for which

* On the topic of chaos, see the beautiful book by H.-O. Peitgen, H. Jürgens & D. Saupe, *Chaos and Fractals*, Springer Verlag, 1992. It includes stunning pictures, the necessary mathematical background, and some computer programs allowing personal exploration of the topic. 'Chaos' is an old word: according

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 202 Chaos as sensitivity to initial conditions: the general case, and a simple chaotic system: a metal pendulum over three magnets (fractal © Paul Nylander)

small changes in initial conditions evolve into large changes of the motion (exponentially with time), as shown in Figure 202. More precisely, *chaos* is irregular motion characterized by a positive *Lyapounov exponent* in the presence of a strictly valid evolution.

A simple chaotic system is the damped pendulum above three magnets. Figure 202 shows how regions of predictability (around the three magnet positions) gradually change to region of unpredictability, for higher initial amplitudes. The weather is also a chaotic system, as are dripping water-taps, the fall of dice, and many other everyday systems. For example, research on the mechanisms by which the heart beat is generated has shown that the heart is not an oscillator, but a chaotic system with irregular cycles. This allows the heart to be continuously ready for demands for changes in beat rate which arise once the body needs to increase or decrease its efforts. Ref. 265

Incidentally, can you give a simple argument to show that the so-called *butterfly effect* does not exist? This 'effect' is often cited in newspapers. The claim is that nonlinearities imply that a small change in initial conditions can lead to large effects; thus a butterfly wing beat is alleged to be able to induce a tornado. Even though nonlinearities do indeed lead to growth of disturbances, the butterfly 'effect' has *never* been observed. Thus it does *not* exist. This 'effect' exists only to sell books and to get funding. Challenge 591 s

There is chaotic motion also in machines: chaos appears in the motion of trains on the rails, in gear mechanisms, and in fire-fighter's hoses. The precise study of the motion in a zippo cigarette lighter will probably also yield an example of chaos. The mathematical Challenge 592 ny

to Greek mythology, the first goddess, Gaia, i.e., the Earth, emerged from the chaos existing at the beginning.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

description of chaos – simple for some textbook examples, but extremely involved for others – remains an important topic of research.

All the steps from disorder to order, quasiperiodicity and finally to chaos, are examples of self-organization. These types of motion, illustrated in Figure 201, are observed in many fluid systems. Their study should lead, one day, to a deeper understanding of the mysteries of turbulence. Despite the fascination of this topic, we will not explore it further, because it does not lead towards the top of Motion Mountain.

Ref. 266

But self-organization is of interest also for a more general reason. It is sometimes said that our ability to formulate the patterns or rules of nature from observation does not imply the ability to predict *all* observations from these rules. According to this view, so-called 'emergent' properties exist, i.e., properties appearing in complex systems as something *new* that cannot be deduced from the properties of their parts and their interactions. (The ideological backdrop to this view is obvious; it is the last attempt to fight the determinism.) The study of self-organization has definitely settled this debate. The properties of water molecules do allow us to predict Niagara Falls.* Similarly, the diffusion of signal molecules do determine the development of a single cell into a full human being: in particular, cooperative phenomena determine the places where arms and legs are formed; they ensure the (approximate) right–left symmetry of human bodies, prevent mix-ups of connections when the cells in the retina are wired to the brain, and explain the fur patterns on zebras and leopards, to cite only a few examples. Similarly, the mechanisms at the origin of the heart beat and many other cycles have been deciphered.

Self-organization provides general principles which allow us in principle to predict the behaviour of complex systems of any kind. They are presently being applied to the most complex system in the known universe: the human brain. The details of how it learns to coordinate the motion of the body, and how it extracts information from the images in the eye, are being studied intensely. The ongoing work in this domain is fascinating. (A neglected case of self-organization is *humour*.) If you plan to become a scientist, consider taking this path.

Ref. 268

Challenge 594 ny

Self-organization research provided the final arguments that confirmed what J. Offrey de la Mettrie stated and explored in his famous book *L'homme machine* in 1748: humans are complex machines. Indeed, the lack of understanding of complex systems in the past was due mainly to the restrictive teaching of the subject of motion, which usually concentrated – as we do in this walk – on examples of motion in *simple* systems. The concepts of self-organization allow us to understand and to describe what happens during the functioning and the growth of organisms.

Even though the subject of self-organization provides fascinating insights, and will do so for many years to come, we now leave it. We continue with our own adventure, namely

---

She then gave birth to the other gods, the animals and the first humans.

* Already small versions of Niagara Falls, namely dripping water taps, show a large range of cooperative phenomena, including the chaotic, i.e., non-periodic, fall of water drops. This happens when the water flow has the correct value, as you can verify in your own kitchen. Several cooperative fluid phenomena have been simulated even on the molecular level.

Ref. 267

Challenge 593 ny

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 203 The wavy surface of icicles



FIGURE 204 Water pearls



FIGURE 205 A braiding water stream (© Vakhtang Putkaradze)

to explore the *basics* of motion.

> Ich sage euch: man muss noch Chaos in sich haben, um einen tanzenden Stern gebären zu können. Ich sage euch: ihr habt noch Chaos in euch.
>
> Friedrich Nietzsche, *Also sprach Zarathustra*.

Curiosities and fun challenges about self-organization

All icicles have a wavy surface, with a crest-to-crest distance of about 1 cm, as shown in Figure 203. The distance is determined by the interplay between water flow and surface cooling. How?

Challenge 595 ny

* *

When wine is made to swirl in a wine glass, after the motion has calmed down, the wine flowing down the glass walls forms little arcs. Can you explain in a few words what forms them?

Challenge 596 ny

* *

How does the average distance between cars parked along a street change over time, assuming a constant rate of cars leaving and arriving?

Challenge 597 ny

* *

When a fine stream of water leaves a water tap, putting a finger in the stream leads to a

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 206 The Belousov-Zhabotinski reaction: the liquid periodically changes colour, both in space and time. (© Yamaguchi University)

Challenge 598 ny wavy shape, as shown in Figure 204. Why?

* *

When water emerges from a oblong opening, the stream forms a braid pattern, as shown in Figure 205. This effect results from the interplay and competition between inertia and Ref. 269 surface tension: inertia tends to widen the stream, while surface tension tends to narrow it. Predicting the distance from one narrow region to the next is still a topic of research.

If the experiment is done in free air, without a plate, one usually observes an additional effect: there is a *chiral* braiding at the narrow regions, induced by the asymmetries of the water flow. You can observe this effect in the toilet! Scientific curiosity knows no limits: Challenge 599 e are you a right-turner or a left-turner, or both? On every day?

* *

A famous case of order appearance is the *Belousov-Zhabotinski reaction*. This mixture of chemicals spontaneously produces spatial and temporal patterns. Thin layers produce slowly rotating spiral patterns, as shown in Figure 206; Large, stirred volumes oscillate back and forth between two colours. A beautiful movie of the oscillations can be found on www.uni-r.de/Fakultaeten/nat_Fak_IV/Organische_Chemie/Didaktik/Keusch/D-oscill-d.htm. The exploration of this reaction led to the Nobel Prize in Chemistry for Ilya Prigogine in 1997.

* *

Gerhard Müller has discovered a simple but beautiful way to observe self-organization in solids. His system also provides a model for a famous geological process, the formation of hexagonal columns in basalt, such as the Giant's Causeway in Northern Ireland. Similar formations are found in many other places of the Earth. Just take some rice flour or Ref. 270 corn starch, mix it with about half the same amount of water, put the mixture into a Challenge 600 e pan and dry it with a lamp: hexagonal columns form. The analogy with basalt structures is possible because the drying of starch and the cooling of lava are diffusive processes governed by the same equations, because the boundary conditions are the same, and because both materials respond to cooling with a small reduction in volume.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 207 A famous correspondence: on the left, hexagonal columns in starch, grown in a kitchen pan (the red lines are 1 cm in length), and on the right, hexagonal columns in basalt, grown from lava in Northern Ireland (top right, view of around 300 m, and middle right, view of around 40 m) and in Iceland (view of about 30 m, bottom right) (© Gerhard Müller, Raphael Kessler - www.raphaelk.co.uk, Bob Pohlad, and Cédric Hüsler)

* *

Water flow in pipes can be laminar (smooth) or turbulent (irregular and disordered). The transition depends on the diameter d of the pipe and the speed v of the water. The transition usually happens when the so-called *Reynolds number* – defined as $R = vd/\eta$ (η being the kinematic viscosity of the water, around $1\,mm^2/s$) – becomes greater than about 2000. However, careful experiments show that with proper handling, laminar flows can be produced up to $R = 100\,000$. A linear analysis of the equations of motion of the fluid, the Navier–Stokes equations, even predicts stability of laminar flow for *all* Reynolds numbers. This riddle was solved only in the years 2003 and 2004. First, a complex mathematical analysis showed that the laminar flow is not always stable, and that the transition to turbulence in a long pipe occurs with travelling waves. Then, in 2004, careful experiments showed that these travelling waves indeed appear when water is flowing through a pipe at large Reynolds numbers. Ref. 271

* *

For some beautiful pictures on self-organization in fluids, see the serve.me.nus.edu.sg/

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

limtt website. Among others, it shows that a circular vortex can 'suck in' a second one behind it, and that the process can then repeat.

* *

Also *dance* is an example of self-organization. Self-organization takes part in the brain. Like for all complex movements, learning them is often a challenge. Nowadays there are beautiful books that tell how physics can help you improve your dancing skills and the grace of your movements. Ref. 272

* *

Do you want to enjoy working on your PhD? Go into a scientific toy shop, and look for a toy that moves in a complex way. There are high chances that the motion is chaotic; explore the motion and present a thesis about it. For example, go to the extreme: explore the motion of a hanging rope whose upper end is externally driven. The system is fascinating.

* *

A famous example of self-organisation whose mechanisms are not well-known so far, is the *hiccup*. It is known that the vagus nerve plays a role in it. Like for many other examples of self-organisation, it takes quite some energy to get rid of a hiccup. Modern experimental research has shown that orgasms, which strongly stimulate the vagus nerve, are excellent ways to overcome hiccups. One of these researchers has won the 2006 IgNobel Prize for medicine for his work.

* *

Another important example of self-organisation is the *weather*. If you want to know more about the known connections between the weather and the quality of human life on Earth, free of any ideology, read the wonderful book by Reichholf. It explains how the weather between the continents is connected and describes how and why the weather changed in the last one thousand years. Ref. 273

Summary on self-organization and chaos

Appearance of order, in form of patterns, shapes and cycles, is not due to a decrease in entropy, but to a competition between driving causes and diffusive effects in open systems. Such appearance of order is predictable with (quite) simple equations. Chaos, the sensitivity to initial conditions, is common in strongly driven open systems, is at the basis of everyday chance, and often is described by simple equations. In nature, complexity is usually apparent: motion is simple.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 14

FROM THE LIMITATIONS OF PHYSICS TO THE LIMITS OF MOTION

> I only know that I know nothing.
> Socrates, as cited by Plato

Despite the general success of Galilean in engineering and in the description of everyday life, Socrates' saying still applies to Galilean physics. Let us see why.

Research topics in classical dynamics

Even though the science of mechanics is now several hundred years old, research into its details is still continuing.

We have already mentioned above the issue of the stability of the solar system. The long-term future of the planets is unknown. In general, the behaviour of few-body systems interacting through gravitation is still a research topic of mathematical physics. Answering the simple question of how long a given set of bodies gravitating around each other will stay together is a formidable challenge. The history of this so-called *many-body problem* is long and involved. Interesting progress has been achieved, but the final answer still eludes us.

Ref. 274

Many challenges remain in the fields of self-organization, of nonlinear evolution equations, and of chaotic motion; turbulence is the most famous example. These challenges motivate numerous researchers in mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, medicine and the other sciences.

But apart from these research topics, classical physics leaves unanswered several basic questions.

What is contact?

> Democritus declared that there is a unique sort of motion: that ensuing from collision.
> Simplicius, *Commentary on the Physics of Aristotle*, 42, 10

Ref. 275

Of the questions unanswered by classical physics, the details of contact and collisions are among the most pressing. Indeed, we defined mass in terms of velocity changes during collisions. But why do objects change their motion in such instances? Why are collisions between two balls made of chewing gum different from those between two stainless-steel balls? What happens during those moments of contact?

Page 91

Contact is related to material properties, which in turn influence motion in a complex

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 46 Examples of errors in state-of-the art measurements (numbers in brackets give one standard deviation in the last digits), partly taken from physics.nist.gov/constants

Observation	Measurement	Precision / accuracy
Highest precision achieved: gyromagnetic ratio of the electron μ_e/μ_B	-1.001 159 652 181 11(74)	$7.4 \cdot 10^{-13}$
High precision: Rydberg constant	10 973 731.568 537(73) m^{-1}	$6.6 \cdot 10^{-12}$
High precision: astronomical unit	149 597 870.691(30) km	$2.0 \cdot 10^{-10}$
Industrial precision: part dimension tolerance in an automobile engine	1 µm of 20 cm	$5 \cdot 10^{-6}$
Low precision: gravitational constant G	$6.674\,28(67) \cdot 10^{-11}$ Nm^2/kg^2	$1.0 \cdot 10^{-4}$
Everyday precision: human circadian clock governing sleep	15 to 75 h	2

way. The complexity is such that the sciences of material properties developed independently from the rest of physics for a long time; for example, the techniques of metallurgy (often called the oldest science of all), of chemistry and of cooking were related to the properties of motion only in the twentieth century, after having been independently pursued for thousands of years. Since material properties determine the essence of contact, we *need* knowledge about matter and about materials to understand the notion of mass, and thus of motion. The parts of our mountain ascent that deal with quantum theory will reveal these connections.

Precision and accuracy

Challenge 601 e

Precision has its own fascination. How many digits of π, the ratio between circumference an diameter of a circle, do you know by heart? What is the largest number of digits of π you have calculated yourself?

When we started climbing Motion Mountain, we explained that gaining height means increasing the *precision* of our description of nature. To make even this statement itself more precise, we distinguish between two terms: *precision* is the degree of reproducibility; *accuracy* is the degree of correspondence to the actual situation. Both concepts apply to measurements,* to statements and to physical concepts.

Appendix C

At present, the record number of reliable digits ever measured for a physical quantity is between 12 and 13. Why so few? Classical physics doesn't provide an answer. What is the maximum number of digits we can expect in measurements; what determines it; and how can we achieve it? These questions are still open at this point in our ascent; they will be covered in the parts on quantum theory.

Challenge 602 s

On the other hand, statements with false accuracy abound. What should we think of a car company – Ford – who claim that the drag coefficient c_w of a certain model is 0.375? Or of the official claim that the world record in fuel consumption for cars is 2315.473 km/l? Or of the statement that 70.3 % of all citizens share a certain opinion?

* For measurements, both precision and accuracy are best described by their *standard deviation*, as explained in Appendix C, on page 920.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

One lesson we learn from investigations into measurement errors is that we should never provide more digits for a result than we can put our hand into fire for.

Challenge 603 s

Is it possible to draw or produce a rectangle for which the ratio of lengths is a real number, e.g. of the form 0.131520091514001315211420010914..., whose digits encode a book? (A simple method would code a space as 00, the letter 'a' as 01, 'b' as 02, 'c' as 03, etc. Even more interestingly, could the number be printed inside its own book?)

In our walk we aim for precision and accuracy, while avoiding false accuracy. Therefore, concepts have mainly to be *precise*, and descriptions have to be *accurate*. Any inaccuracy is a proof of lack of understanding. To put it bluntly, 'inaccurate' means *wrong*. Increasing the accuracy and precision of our description of nature implies leaving behind us all the mistakes we have made so far. That is our aim in the following.

Can all of nature be described in a book?

Let us have some fun with a puzzle related to our adventure. Could the perfect physics publication, one that describes all of nature, exist? If it does, it must also describe itself, its own production – including its readers and its author – and most important of all, its own contents. Is such a book possible? Using the concept of information, we can state that such a book should contain all information contained in the universe. Is this possible? Let us check the options.

If nature requires an *infinitely* long book to be fully described, such a publication obviously cannot exist. In this case, only approximate descriptions of nature are possible and a perfect physics book is impossible.

If nature requires a *finite* amount of information for its description, there are two options. One is that the information of the universe cannot be summarized in a book; then a perfect physics book is again impossible. The other option is that the universe does contain a finite amount of information and that it can be summarized in a few small statements. This would imply that the rest of the universe would not add to the information already contained in the perfect physics book. In this case, it seems that the entropy of the book and the entropy of the universe must be similar. This seems quite unlikely.

We note that the answer to this puzzle also implies the answer to another puzzle: whether a brain can contain a full description of nature. In other words, the real question is: can we understand nature? Is our hike to the top of motion mountain possible? We usually believe this. In short, we believe something which is rather unlikely: we believe that the universe does not contain more information than what our brain could contain or even contains already.

Page 1443
Challenge 604 e

Do we have an error in our arguments? Yes, we do. The terms 'universe' and 'information' are not used correctly in the above reasoning, as you might want to verify. We will solve this puzzle later in our adventure. Until then, do make up your own mind.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Something is wrong about our description of motion

> Darum kann es in der Logik auch *nie* Überraschungen geben.*
>
> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 6.1251

We described nature in a rather simple way. *Objects* are permanent and massive entities localized in space-time. *States* are changing properties of objects, described by position in space and instant in time, by energy and momentum, and by their rotational equivalents. *Time* is the relation between events measured by a clock. *Clocks* are devices in undisturbed motion whose position can be observed. *Space* and position is the relation between objects measured by a metre stick. *Metre sticks* are devices whose shape is subdivided by some marks, fixed in an invariant and observable manner. *Motion* is change of position with time (times mass); it is determined, does not show surprises, is conserved (even in death), and is due to gravitation and other interactions.

Even though this description works rather well, it contains a circular definition. Can you spot it? Each of the two central concepts of motion is defined with the help of the other. Physicists worked for about 200 years on classical mechanics without noticing or wanting to notice the situation. Even thinkers with an interest in discrediting science did not point it out. Can an exact science be based on a circular definition? Obviously, physics has done quite well so far. Some even say the situation is unavoidable in principle. Despite these opinions, undoing this logical loop is one of the aims of the rest of our walk. To achieve it, we need to increase substantially the level of precision in our description of motion.

Challenge 605 s

Challenge 606 s

Whenever precision is increased, imagination is restricted. We will discover that many types of motion that seem possible are not. Motion is limited. Nature limits speed, size, acceleration, mass, force, power and many other quantities. Continue reading the other parts of this adventure only if you are prepared to exchange fantasy for precision. It will be no loss, as you will gain something else: exploring the workings of nature will fascinate you even more.

Why is measurement possible?

In the description of gravity given so far, the one that everybody learns – or should learn – at school, acceleration is connected to mass and distance via $a = GM/r^2$. That's all. But this simplicity is deceiving. In order to check whether this description is correct, we have to measure lengths and times. However, it is *impossible* to measure lengths and time intervals with any clock or any ruler based on the gravitational interaction alone! Try to conceive such an apparatus and you will be inevitably be disappointed. You always need a non-gravitational method to start and stop the stopwatch. Similarly, when you measure length, e.g. of a table, you have to hold a ruler or some other device near it. The interaction necessary to line up the ruler and the table cannot be gravitational.

Challenge 607 s

A similar limitation applies even to mass measurements. Try to measure mass using gravitation alone. Any scale or balance needs other – usually mechanical, electromagnetic or optical – interactions to achieve its function. Can you confirm that the same applies to speed and to angle measurements? In summary, whatever method we use, *in*

Challenge 608 s

Challenge 609 s

* 'Hence there can *never* be surprises in logic.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

order to measure velocity, length, time, and mass, interactions other than gravity are needed. Our ability to measure shows that gravity is not all there is.

Page 317 In addition, we still have the open problem, mentioned above, that our measurement recipes define space and time measurements with help of objects and measurements on objects with help of space and time.

Galilean physics does not explain the ability to measure. In fact, it does not even explain the existence of standards. Why do objects have fixed lengths? Why do clocks work with regularity? Galilean physics cannot explain these observations.

Is motion unlimited?

Galilean physics suggests that motion could go on forever. In fact, Galilean physics makes no clear statements on the universe as a whole. It seems to suggest that it is infinite. Finitude does not fit with the Galilean description of motion. On the other hand, we know

Challenge 610 e that the universe is *not* infinite: if it were infinite, the night would not be dark. Galilean physics is thus limited in its explanations because it disregards the limits of motion.

Galilean physics also suggests that speeds can have any value. But the existence of infinite speeds in nature would not allow us to define time sequences. Clocks would be impossible. In other words, a description of nature that allows unlimited speeds is not precise. Precision requires limits. To achieve the highest possible precision, we need to discover all limits to motion. So far, we have discovered only one: there is a smallest entropy. We now turn to another, more striking one: the limit for speed. To understand this limit, we will explore the most rapid motion we know: the motion of light.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Appendix A

NOTATION AND CONVENTIONS

Newly introduced and defined concepts in this text are indicated by *italic typeface*. New definitions are also referred to in the index by italic page numbers. We naturally use SI units throughout the text; these are defined in Appendix C. Experimental results are cited with limited precision, usually only two digits, as this is almost always sufficient for our purposes. High-precision reference values can be found in Appendices C and E.

In relativity we use the time convention, where the metric has the signature $(+---)$. This is used in about 70 % of the literature worldwide. We use indices i, j, k for 3-vectors and indices a, b, c, etc. for 4-vectors. Other conventions specific to general relativity are explained as they arise in the text.

Ref. 276

The Latin alphabet

> What is written without effort is in general read without pleasure.
>
> Samuel Johnson

Ref. 277

Books are collections of symbols. *Writing* was probably invented between 3400 and 3300 BCE by the Sumerians in Mesopotamia (though other possibilities are also discussed). It then took over a thousand years before people started using symbols to represent sounds instead of concepts: this is the way in which the first alphabet was created. This happened between 2000 and 1600 BCE (possibly in Egypt) and led to the Semitic alphabet. The use of an alphabet had so many advantages that it was quickly adopted in all neighbouring cultures, though in different forms. As a result, the Semitic alphabet is the forefather of all alphabets used in the world.

This text is written using the Latin alphabet. At first sight, this seems to imply that its pronunciation *cannot* be explained in print, in contrast to the pronunciation of other alphabets or of the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA). (They can be explained using the alphabet of the main text.) However, it *is* in principle possible to write a text that describes exactly how to move lips, mouth and tongue for each letter, using physical concepts where necessary. The descriptions of pronunciations found in dictionaries make indirect use of this method: they refer to the memory of pronounced words or sounds found in nature.

Historically, the Latin alphabet was derived from the Etruscan, which itself was a derivation of the Greek alphabet. There are two main forms.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The *ancient* Latin alphabet,
used from the sixth century BCE onwards:

A B C D E F Z H I K L M N O P Q R S T V X

The *classical* Latin alphabet,
used from the second century BCE until the eleventh century:

A B C D E F G H I K L M N O P Q R S T V X Y Z

The letter G was added in the third century BCE by the first Roman to run a fee-paying school, Spurius Carvilius Ruga. He added a horizontal bar to the letter C and substituted the letter Z, which was not used in Latin any more, for this new letter. In the second century BCE, after the conquest of Greece, the Romans included the letters Y and Z from the Greek alphabet at the end of their own (therefore effectively reintroducing the Z) in order to be able to write Greek words. This classical Latin alphabet was stable for the next thousand years.*

The classical Latin alphabet was spread around Europe, Africa and Asia by the Romans during their conquests; due to its simplicity it began to be used for writing in numerous other languages. Most modern 'Latin' alphabets include a few other letters. The letter W was introduced in the eleventh century in French and was then adopted in most European languages.** The letter U was introduced in the mid fifteenth century in Italy,
Ref. 278 the letter J at the end of that century in Spain, to distinguish certain sounds which had previously been represented by V and I. The distinction proved a success and was already common in most European languages in the sixteenth century. The contractions æ and œ date from the Middle Ages. Other Latin alphabets include more letters, such as the German *sharp s*, written ß, a contraction of 'ss' or 'sz', or the Nordic letters *thorn*, written
Ref. 279 Þ or þ, and *eth*, written Đ or ð, taken from the futhorc,*** and other signs.

Lower-case letters were not used in classical Latin; they date only from the Middle Ages, from the time of Charlemagne. Like most accents, such as ê, ç or ä, which were also first used in the Middle Ages, lower-case letters were introduced to save the then expensive paper surface by shortening written words.

> Outside a dog, a book is a man's best friend.
> Inside a dog, it's too dark to read.
>
> Groucho Marx

* To meet Latin speakers and writers, go to www.alcuinus.net.

** In Turkey, still in 2008, you can be convoked in front of a judge if you use the letters w, q or x in an official letter; these letters only exist in the Kurdish language, not in Turkish. Using them is 'unturkish' behaviour and punishable by law. It is not known to the author how physics teachers cope with this situation.

*** The Runic script, also called *Futhark* or *Futhorc*, a type of alphabet used in the Middle Ages in Germanic, Anglo–Saxon and Nordic countries, probably also derives from the Etruscan alphabet. The name derives from the first six letters: f, u, th, a (or o), r, k (or c). The third letter is the letter thorn mentioned above; it is often written 'Y' in Old English, as in 'Ye Olde Shoppe.' From the runic alphabet Old English also took the
Ref. 280 letter *wyn* to represent the 'w' sound, and the already mentioned eth. (The other letters used in Old English – not from futhorc – were the *yogh*, an ancient variant of g, and the ligatures æ or Æ, called *ash*, and œ or Œ, called *ethel*.)

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 47 The ancient and classical Greek alphabets, and the correspondence with Latin and Indian digits

Anc.	Class.	Name	Corresp.		Anc.	Class.	Name	Corresp.	
A	A α	alpha	a	1	N	N ν	nu	n	50
B	B β	beta	b	2	Ξ	Ξ ξ	xi	x	60
Γ	Γ γ	gamma	g, n[1]	3	O	O o	omicron	o	70
Δ	Δ δ	delta	d	4	Π	Π π	pi	p	80
E	E ε	epsilon	e	5	Ϙ ϙ, ϟ		qoppa[3]	q	90
F ϝ, ς		digamma, stigma[2]	w	6	P	P ρ	rho	r, rh	100
					Σ	Σ σ, ς	sigma[4]	s	200
Z	Z ζ	zeta	z	7	T	T τ	tau	t	300
H	H η	eta	e	8		Υ υ	upsilon	y, u[5]	400
Θ	Θ θ	theta	th	9		Φ φ	phi	ph, f	500
I	I ι	iota	i, j	10		X χ	chi	ch	600
K	K κ	kappa	k	20		Ψ ψ	psi	ps	700
Λ	Λ λ	lambda	l	30		Ω ω	omega	o	800
M	M μ	mu	m	40	Ϡ ϡ		sampi[6]	s	900

The regional archaic letters yot, sha and san are not included in the table. The letter san was the ancestor of sampi.

1. Only if before velars, i.e., before kappa, gamma, xi and chi.
2. 'Digamma' is the name used for the F-shaped form. It was mainly used as a letter (but also sometimes, in its lower-case form, as a number), whereas the shape and name 'stigma' is used only for the number. Both names were derived from the respective shapes; in fact, the stigma is a medieval, uncial version of the digamma. The name 'stigma' is derived from the fact that the letter looks like a sigma with a tau attached under it – though unfortunately not in all modern fonts. The original letter name, also giving its pronunciation, was 'waw'.
3. The version of qoppa that looks like a reversed and rotated z is still in occasional use in modern Greek. Unicode calls this version 'koppa'.
4. The second variant of sigma is used only at the end of words.
5. Uspilon corresponds to 'u' only as the second letter in diphthongs.
6. In older times, the letter sampi was positioned between pi and qoppa.

The Greek alphabet

The Latin alphabet was derived from the Etruscan; the Etruscan from the Greek. The Greek alphabet was itself derived from the Phoenician or a similar northern Semitic alphabet in the tenth century BCE. The Greek alphabet, for the first time, included letters also for vowels, which the Semitic alphabets lacked (and often still lack). In the Phoenician alphabet and in many of its derivatives, such as the Greek alphabet, each letter has a proper name. This is in contrast to the Etruscan and Latin alphabets. The first two Greek letter names are, of course, the origin of the term *alphabet* itself.

Ref. 281

In the tenth century BCE, the Ionian or *ancient* (eastern) Greek alphabet consisted of the upper-case letters only. In the sixth century BCE several letters were dropped, while a few new ones and the lower-case versions were added, giving the *classical* Greek alphabet.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Still later, accents, subscripts and breathings were introduced. Table 47 also gives the values signified by the letters took when they were used as numbers. For this special use, the obsolete ancient letters were kept during the classical period; thus they also acquired lower-case forms.

The Latin correspondence in the table is the standard classical one, used for writing Greek words. The question of the correct *pronunciation* of Greek has been hotly debated in specialist circles; the traditional *Erasmian* pronunciation does not correspond either to the results of linguistic research, or to modern Greek. In classical Greek, the sound that sheep make was βη–βη. (Erasmian pronunciation wrongly insists on a narrow η; modern Greek pronunciation is different for β, which is now pronounced 'v', and for η, which is now pronounced as 'i:' – a long 'i'.) Obviously, the pronunciation of Greek varied from region to region and over time. For Attic Greek, the main dialect spoken in the classical period, the question is now settled. Linguistic research has shown that chi, phi and theta were less aspirated than usually pronounced in English and sounded more like the initial sounds of 'cat', 'perfect' and 'tin'; moreover, the zeta seems to have been pronounced more like 'zd' as in 'buzzed'. As for the vowels, contrary to tradition, epsilon is closed and short whereas eta is open and long; omicron is closed and short whereas omega is wide and long, and upsilon is really a 'u' sound as in 'boot', not like a French 'u' or German 'ü.'

The Greek vowels can have rough or smooth *breathings*, *subscripts*, and acute, grave, circumflex or diaeresis *accents*. Breathings – used also on ρ – determine whether the letter is aspirated. Accents, which were interpreted as stresses in the Erasmian pronunciation, actually represented pitches. Classical Greek could have up to three of these added signs per letter; modern Greek never has more than one.

Another descendant of the Greek alphabet* is the *Cyrillic alphabet*, which is used with slight variations, in many Slavic languages, such as Russian and Bulgarian. However, there is no standard transcription from Cyrillic to Latin, so that often the same Russian name is spelled differently in different countries or even in the same country on different occasions.

TABLE 48 The beginning of the Hebrew abjad

Letter	Name	Correspondence	
א	aleph	a	1
ב	beth	b	2
נ	gimel	g	3
ד	daleth	d	4
etc.			

* The Greek alphabet is also the origin of the *Gothic alphabet*, which was defined in the fourth century by Wulfila for the Gothic language, using also a few signs from the Latin and futhorc scripts.

The Gothic alphabet is not to be confused with the so-called *Gothic letters*, a style of the *Latin* alphabet used all over Europe from the eleventh century onwards. In Latin countries, Gothic letters were replaced in the sixteenth century by the *Antiqua*, the ancestor of the type in which this text is set. In other countries, Gothic letters remained in use for much longer. They were used in type and handwriting in Germany until 1941, when the National Socialist government suddenly abolished them, in order to comply with popular demand. They remain in sporadic use across Europe. In many physics and mathematics books, Gothic letters are used to denote vector quantities.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The Hebrew alphabet and other scripts

The phoenician alphabet is also the origin of the Hebrew consonant alphabet or *abjad*. Its first letters are given in Table 48. Only the letter aleph is commonly used in mathematics, though others have been proposed.

Ref. 282
Page 825

Around one hundred writing systems are in use throughout the world. Experts classify them into five groups. *Phonemic alphabets*, such as Latin or Greek, have a sign for each consonant and vowel. *Abjads* or consonant alphabets, such as Hebrew or Arabic, have a sign for each consonant (sometimes including some vowels, such as aleph), and do not write (most) vowels; most abjads are written from right to left. *Abugidas*, also called syllabic alphabets or alphasyllabaries, such as Balinese, Burmese, Devanagari, Tagalog, Thai, Tibetan or Lao, write consonants and vowels; each consonant has an inherent vowel which can be changed into the others by diacritics. *Syllabaries*, such as Hiragana or Ethiopic, have a sign for each syllable of the language. Finally, complex scripts, such as Chinese, Mayan or the Egyptian hieroglyphs, use signs which have both sound and meaning. Writing systems can have text flowing from right to left, from bottom to top, and can count book pages in the opposite sense to this book.

Even though there are about 7000 languages on Earth, there are only about one hundred writing systems used today. About fifty other writing systems have fallen out of use. * For physical and mathematical formulae, though, the sign system used in this text, based on Latin and Greek letters, written from left to right and from top to bottom, is a standard the world over. It is used independently of the writing system of the text containing it.

Ref. 283

Digits and numbers

Both the digits and the method used in this text to write numbers originated in India. They were brought to the Mediterranean by Arabic mathematicians in the Middle Ages. The number system used in this text is thus much younger than the alphabet.** The Indian numbers were made popular in Europe by Leonardo of Pisa, called Fibonacci,*** in his book *Liber Abaci* or 'Book of Calculation', which he published in 1202. That book revolutionized mathematics. Anybody with paper and a pen (the pencil had not yet been invented) was now able to calculate and write down numbers as large as reason allowed, or even larger, and to perform calculations with them. Fibonacci's book started:

> Novem figure indorum he sunt 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1. Cum his itaque novem fig-

* A well-designed website on the topic is www.omniglot.com. The main present and past writing systems are encoded in the Unicode standard, which at present contains 52 writing systems. See www.unicode.org.

** The story of the development of the numbers is told most interestingly by G. Ifrah, *Histoire universelle des chiffres*, Seghers, 1981, which has been translated into several languages. He sums up the genealogy in ten beautiful tables, one for each digit, at the end of the book. However, the book contains many factual errors, as explained in the www.ams.org/notices/200201/rev-dauben.pdf and www.ams.org/notices/200202/rev-dauben.pdf review.

It is not correct to call the digits 0 to 9 *Arabic*. Both the actual Arabic digits and the digits used in Latin texts such as this one derive from the Indian digits. Only the digits 0, 2, 3 and 7 resemble those used in Arabic writing, and then only if they are turned clockwise by 90°.

*** Leonardo di Pisa, called Fibonacci (b. *c.* 1175 Pisa, d. 1250 Pisa), Italian mathematician, and the most important mathematician of his time.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

> uris, et cum hoc signo 0, quod arabice zephirum appellatur, scribitur quilibet numerus, ut inferius demonstratur.*

The Indian method of writing numbers consists of a large innovation, the *positional system*, and a small one, the digit zero. The positional system, as described by Fibonacci, was so much more efficient that it completely replaced the previous *Roman number system*, which writes 1996 as IVMM or MCMIVC or MCMXCVI, as well as the *Greek number system*, in which the Greek letters were used for numbers in the way shown in Table 47, thus writing 1996 as ,αϡϙς′. Compared to these systems, the Indian numbers are a much better technology. Indeed, the Indian system proved so practical that calculations done on paper completely eliminated the need for the *abacus*, which therefore fell into disuse. The abacus is still in use only in those countries which do not use a positional system to write numbers. (The Indian system also eliminated the need for systems to represent numbers with fingers. Such systems, which could show numbers up to 10 000 and more, have left only one trace: the term 'digit' itself, which derives from the Latin word for finger.) Similarly, only the positional number system allows mental calculations and made – and still makes – calculating prodigies possible.**

The symbols used in the text

> To avoide the tediouse repetition of these woordes: is equalle to: I will sette as I doe often in woorke use, a paire of paralleles, or Gemowe lines of one lengthe, thus: = , bicause noe .2. thynges, can be moare equalle.
>
> Robert Recorde***

Besides text and numbers, physics books contain other symbols. Most symbols have been developed over hundreds of years, so that only the clearest and simplest are now in use. In this mountain ascent, the symbols used as abbreviations for *physical* quantities are all taken from the Latin or Greek alphabets and are always defined in the context where they are used. The symbols designating units, constants and particles are defined in Appendices C and E. There is an international standard for them (ISO 31), but it is virtually inaccessible; the symbols used in this text are those in common use. Ref. 282

The *mathematical* symbols used in this text, in particular those for operations and relations, are given in the following list, together with their origins. The details of their history have been extensively studied in the literature. Ref. 285

* 'The nine figures of the Indians are: 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1. With these nine figures, and with this sign 0 which in Arabic is called zephirum, any number can be written, as will be demonstrated below.'

** Currently, the shortest time for finding the thirteenth (integer) root of a hundred-digit number, a result with 8 digits, is 11.8 seconds. For more about the stories and the methods of calculating prodigies, see the bibliography. Ref. 284

*** Robert Recorde (*c.* 1510–1558), English mathematician and physician; he died in prison because of debts. The quotation is from his *The Whetstone of Witte*, 1557. An image showing the quote in manuscript can be found at the members.aol.com/jeff94100/witte.jpg website. It is usually suggested that the quote is the first introduction of the equal sign; claims that Italian mathematicians used the equal sign before Recorde are not backed up by convincing examples. Ref. 285

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Symbol	Meaning	Origin
$+, -$	plus, minus	J. Regiomontanus 1456; the plus sign is derived from Latin 'et'
$\sqrt{}$	read as 'square root'	used by C. Rudolff in 1525; the sign stems from a deformation of the letter 'r', initial of the Latin *radix*
$=$	equal to	R. Recorde 1557
$\{\}, [\,], (\,)$	grouping symbols	use starts in the sixteenth century
$>, <$	larger than, smaller than	T. Harriot 1631
$\times$	multiplied with, times	W. Oughtred 1631
$:$	divided by	G. Leibniz 1684
$\cdot$	multiplied with, times	G. Leibniz 1698
a^n	power	R. Descartes 1637
x, y, z	coordinates, unknowns	R. Descartes 1637
$ax+by+c=0$	constants and equations for unknowns	R. Descartes 1637
$\mathrm{d}/\mathrm{d}x$, $\mathrm{d}x$, $\int y\,\mathrm{d}x$	derivative, differential, integral	G. Leibniz 1675
φx	function of x	J. Bernoulli 1718
$fx, f(x)$	function of x	L. Euler 1734
$\Delta x, \sum$	difference, sum	L. Euler 1755
$\neq$	is different from	L. Euler eighteenth century
$\partial/\partial x$	partial derivative, read like 'd/dx'	it was derived from a cursive form of 'd' or of the letter 'dey' of the Cyrillic alphabet by A. Legendre in 1786
Δ	Laplace operator	R. Murphy 1833
$\lvert x\rvert$	absolute value	K. Weierstrass 1841
∇	read as 'nabla' (or 'del')	introduced by William Hamilton in 1853 and P.G. Tait in 1867, named after the shape of an old Egyptian musical instrument
$[x]$	the measurement unit of a quantity x	twentieth century
∞	infinity	J. Wallis 1655
π	$4\arctan 1$	H. Jones 1706
e	$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n!} = \lim_{n\to\infty}(1+1/n)^n$	L. Euler 1736
i	$+\sqrt{-1}$	L. Euler 1777
$\cup, \cap$	set union and intersection	G. Peano 1888
$\in$	element of	G. Peano 1888
$\varnothing$	empty set	André Weil as member of the N. Bourbaki group in the early twentieth century
$\langle\psi\rvert, \lvert\psi\rangle$	bra and ket state vectors	Paul Dirac 1930
$\otimes$	dyadic product or tensor product or outer product	unknown

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Other signs used here have more complicated origins. The & sign is a contraction of Latin
Ref. 286 *et* meaning 'and', as is often more clearly visible in its variations, such as *&*, the common italic form.

Each of the punctuation signs used in sentences with modern Latin alphabets, such as , . ; : ! ? ‘ ’ » « – ( ) ... has its own history. Many are from ancient Greece, but the
Ref. 287 question mark is from the court of Charlemagne, and exclamation marks appear first in the sixteenth century.* The @ or *at-sign* probably stems from a medieval abbreviation
Ref. 288 of Latin *ad*, meaning 'at', similarly to how the & sign evolved from Latin *et*. In recent years, the *smiley* :-) and its variations have become popular. The smiley is in fact a new version of the 'point of irony' which had been formerly proposed, without success, by A. de Brahm (1868–1942).

The section sign § dates from the thirteenth century in northern Italy, as was shown
Ref. 289 by the German palaeographer Paul Lehmann. It was derived from ornamental versions of the capital letter C for *capitulum*, i.e., 'little head' or 'chapter.' The sign appeared first in legal texts, where it is still used today, and then spread into other domains.

The paragraph sign ¶ was derived from a simpler ancient form looking like the Greek letter Γ, a sign which was used in manuscripts from ancient Greece until well into the Middle Ages to mark the start of a new text paragraph. In the Middle Ages it took the modern form, probably because a letter c for *caput* was added in front of it.

Ref. 290 One of the most important signs of all, the *white space* separating words, was due to Celtic and Germanic influences when these people started using the Latin alphabet. It became commonplace between the ninth and the thirteenth century, depending on the language in question.

Calendars

The many ways to keep track of time differ greatly from civilization to civilization. The most common calendar, and the one used in this text, is also one of the most absurd, as it is a compromise between various political forces who tried to shape it.

In ancient times, independent localized entities, such as tribes or cities, preferred *lunar* calendars, because lunar timekeeping is easily organized locally. This led to the use of the month as a calendar unit. Centralized states imposed *solar* calendars, based on the year. Solar calendars require astronomers, and thus a central authority to finance them. For various reasons, farmers, politicians, tax collectors, astronomers, and some, but not all, religious groups wanted the calendar to follow the solar year as precisely as possible. The compromises necessary between days and years are the origin of leap days. The compromises necessary between months and year led to the varying lengths are different in different calendars. The most commonly used year–month structure was organized over 2000 years ago by Gaius Julius Ceasar, and is thus called the *Julian calendar*.

The system was destroyed only a few years later: August was lengthened to 31 days when it was named after Augustus. Originally, the month was only 30 days long; but in order to show that Augustus was as important as Caesar, after whom July is named, all month lengths in the second half of the year were changed, and February was shortened by an additional day.

Ref. 291 The *week* is an invention of Babylonia. One day in the Babylonian week was 'evil' or

* On the parenthesis see the beautiful book by J. Lennard, *But I Digress*, Oxford University Press, 1991.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

'unlucky', so it was better to do nothing on that day. The modern week cycle with its resting day descends from that superstition. (The way astrological superstition and astronomy cooperated to determine the order of the weekdays is explained in the section on gravitation.) Although about three thousand years old, the week was fully included into the Julian calendar only around the year 300, towards the end of the Western Roman Empire. The final change in the Julian calendar took place between 1582 and 1917 (depending on the country), when more precise measurements of the solar year were used to set a new method to determine leap days, a method still in use today. Together with a reset of the date and the fixation of the week rhythm, this standard is called the *Gregorian calendar* or simply the *modern calendar*. It is used by a majority of the world's population.

Page 174

Despite its complexity, the modern calendar does allow you to determine the day of the week of a given date in your head. Just execute the following six steps:

1. take the last two digits of the year, and divide by 4, discarding any fraction;
2. add the last two digits of the year;
3. subtract 1 for January or February of a leap year;
4. add 6 for 2000s or 1600s, 4 for 1700s or 2100s,
   2 for 1800s and 2200s, and 0 for 1900s or 1500s;
5. add the day of the month;
6. add the month key value, namely 144 025 036 146 for JFM AMJ JAS OND.

The remainder after division by 7 gives the day of the week, with the correspondence 1-2-3-4-5-6-0 meaning Sunday-Monday-Tuesday-Wednesday-Thursday-Friday-Saturday.*

When to start counting the years is a matter of choice. The oldest method not attached to political power structures was that used in ancient Greece, when years were counted from the first Olympic games. People used to say, for example, that they were born in the first year of the twenty-third Olympiad. Later, political powers always imposed the counting of years from some important event onwards.** Maybe reintroducing the Olympic

* Remembering the intermediate result for the current year can simplify things even more, especially since the dates 4.4, 6.6, 8.8, 10.10, 12.12, 9.5, 5.9, 7.11, 11.7 and the last day of February all fall on the same day of the week, namely on the year's intermediate result plus 4.

** The present counting of years was defined in the Middle Ages by setting the date for the foundation of Rome to the year 753 BCE, or 753 *before the Common Era*, and then counting backwards, so that the BCE years behave almost like negative numbers. However, the year 1 follows directly after the year 1 BCE: there was no year 0.

Some other standards set by the Roman Empire explain several abbreviations used in the text:
- *c.* is a Latin abbreviation for *circa* and means 'roughly';
- i.e. is a Latin abbreviation for *id est* and means 'that is';
- e.g. is a Latin abbreviation for *exempli gratia* and means 'for the sake of example';
- ibid. is a Latin abbreviation for *ibidem* and means 'at that same place';
- inf. is a Latin abbreviation for *infra* and means '(see) below';
- op. cit. is a Latin abbreviation for *opus citatum* and means 'the cited work';
- et al. is a Latin abbreviation for *et alii* and means 'and others'.

By the way, *idem* means 'the same' and *passim* means 'here and there' or 'throughout'. Many terms used in physics, like frequency, acceleration, velocity, mass, force, momentum, inertia, gravitation and temperature, are derived from Latin. In fact, it is arguable that the language of science has been Latin for over two thousand years. In Roman times it was Latin vocabulary with Latin grammar, in modern times it switched to Latin vocabulary with French grammar, then for a short time to Latin vocabulary with German grammar, after which it changed to Latin vocabulary with British/American grammar.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

counting is worth considering?

People Names

In the Far East, such as *Corea*, *Japan* or *China*, family names are put in front of the given name. For example, the first Japanese winner of the Nobel Prize in Physics was Yukawa Hideki. In *India*, often, but not always, there is no family name; in those cases, the father's first name is used. In *Russia*, the family name is never used, but the first name of the father. For example, Lev Landau was called Lev Davidovich ('son of David') in Russia. In addition, Russian translitteration is not standardized; it varies from country to country and from tradition to tradition. For example, one finds the spelling Tarski, Tarskii and Tarsky for the same person. In the *Netherlands*, the official given names are never used; every person has a semi-official first name by which he is called. For example, Gerard 't Hooft's official first name is Gerardus. In *Germany*, some family names have special pronounciations. For example, Voigt is pronounced 'Fohgt'. In *Italy*, during the Middle Age and the Renaissance, people were called by their first name only, such as Michelangelo or Galileo, or often by first name plus a personal surname that was not their family name, but was used like one, such as Niccolò Tartaglia or Leonardo Fibonacci. In *ancient Rome*, the name by which people are known is usually their surname. The family name was the middle name. For example, Cicero's family name was Tullius. The law introduced by Cicero was therefore known as 'lex Tullia'. In *ancient Greece*, there were no family names. People had only one name. In the English language, the Latin version of the name is used, such as Democritus.

Abbreviations and eponyms or concepts?

Sentences like the following are the scourge of modern physics:

> The EPR paradox in the Bohm formulation can perhaps be resolved using the GRW approach, using the WKB approximation of the Schrödinger equation.

Using such vocabulary is the best way to make language unintelligible to outsiders. First of all, it uses abbreviations, which is a shame. On top of this, the sentence uses people's names to characterize concepts, i.e., it uses *eponyms*. Originally, eponyms were intended as tributes to outstanding achievements. Today, when formulating radical new laws or variables has become nearly impossible, the spread of eponyms intelligible to a steadily decreasing number of people simply reflects an increasingly ineffective drive to fame.

Eponyms are a proof of scientist's lack of imagination. We avoid them as much as possible in our walk and give *common* names to mathematical equations or entities wherever possible. People's names are then used as appositions to these names. For example, 'Newton's equation of motion' is never called 'Newton's equation'; 'Einstein's field equations' is used instead of 'Einstein's equations'; and 'Heisenberg's equation of motion' is used instead of 'Heisenberg's equation'.

Ref. 292 Many units of measurement also date from Roman times, as explained in the next appendix. Even the infatuation with Greek technical terms, as shown in coinages such as 'gyroscope', 'entropy' or 'proton', dates from Roman times.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

However, some exceptions are inevitable: certain terms used in modern physics have no real alternatives. The Boltzmann constant, the Planck scale, the Compton wavelength, the Casimir effect, Lie groups and the Virasoro algebra are examples. In compensation, the text makes sure that you can look up the definitions of these concepts using the index. In addition, it tries to provide pleasurable reading.

Ref. 293

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



BIBLIOGRAPHY

> Aiunt enim multum legendum esse, non multa.
> Plinius, *Epistulae*.*

1 For a history of science in antiquity, see Lucio Russo, *La rivoluzione dimenticata*, Feltrinelli 1996, also available in several other languages. Cited on page 22.

2 A beautiful book explaining physics and its many applications in nature and technology vividly and thoroughly is Paul G. Hewitt, John Suchocki & Leslie A. Hewitt, *Conceptual Physical Science*, Bejamin/Cummings, 1999.

A book famous for its passion for curiosity is Richard P. Feynman, Robert B. Leighton & Matthew Sands, *The Feynman Lectures on Physics*, Addison Wesley, 1977.

A lot can be learned about motion from quiz books. One of the best is the well-structured collection of beautiful problems that require no mathematics, written by Jean-Marc Lévy-Leblond, *La physique en questions – mécanique*, Vuibert, 1998.

Another excellent quiz collection is Yakov Perelman, *Oh, la physique*, Dunod, 2000, a translation from the Russian original.

A good problem book is W. G. Rees, *Physics by Example: 200 Problems and Solutions*, Cambridge University Press, 1994.

A good history of physical ideas is given in the excellent text by David Park, *The How and the Why*, Princeton University Press, 1988.

An excellent introduction into physics is Robert Pohl, *Pohl's Einführung in die Physik*, Klaus Lüders & Robert O. Pohl editors, Springer, 2004, in two volumes with CDs. It is a new edition of a book that is over 70 years old; but the didactic quality, in particular of the experimental side of physics, is unsurpassed.

Another excellent Russian physics problem book, the so-called *Saraeva*, seems to exist only as Portuguese translation: B.B. Bújovtsev, V.D. Krívchenkov, G.Ya. Miákishev & I.M. Saráeva *Problemas seleccionados de física elemental*, Mir, 1979.

Another good physics problem book is Giovanni Tonzig, *Cento errori di fisica pronti per l'uso*, Sansoni, third edition, 2006. See also his www.giovannitonzig.it website. Cited on pages 22, 107, 173, and 246.

3 An overview of motion illusions can be found on the excellent website www.michaelbach.de/ot. The complex motion illusion figure is found on www.michaelbach.de/ot/mot_rotsnake/index.html; it is a slight variation of the original by Kitaoka Akiyoshi at www.ritsumei.ac.jp/~akitaoka/rotsnake.gif, published as A. Kitaoka & H. Ashida,

* 'Read much, but not anything.' Ep. 7, 9, 15. Gaius Plinius Secundus (b. 23/4 Novum Comum, d. 79 Vesuvius eruption), Roman writer, especially famous for his large, mainly scientific work *Historia naturalis*, which has been translated and read for almost 2000 years.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Phenomenal characteristics of the peripheral drift illusion, *Vision* **15**, pp. 261–262, 2003. A famous scam is to pretend that the illusion is due to or depends on stress. Cited on page 23.

4 These and other fantastic illusions are also found in Akiyoshi Kitaoka, *Trick Eyes*, Barnes & Noble, 2005. Cited on page 23.

5 A well-known principle in the social sciences states that, given a question, for every possible answer, however weird it may seem, there is somebody – and often a whole group – who holds it as his opinion. One just has to go through literature (or the internet) to confirm this.

About group behaviour in general, see R. Axelrod, *The Evolution of Cooperation*, Harper Collins, 1984. The propagation and acceptance of ideas, such as those of physics, are also an example of human cooperation, with all its potential dangers and weaknesses. Cited on page 23.

6 All the known texts by Parmenides and Heraclitus can be found in Jean-Paul Dumont, *Les écoles présocratiques*, Folio-Gallimard, 1988. Views about the non-existence of motion have also been put forward by much more modern and much more contemptible authors, such as in 1710 by Berkeley. Cited on page 24.

Page 857

7 An example of people worried by Zeno is given by William McLaughlin, Resolving Zeno's paradoxes, *Scientific American* pp. 66–71, November 1994. The actual argument was not about a hand slapping a face, but about an arrow hitting the target. See also Ref. 53. Cited on page 24.

8 The full text of *La Beauté* and the other poems from *Les fleurs du mal*, one of the finest books of poetry ever written, can be found at the hypermedia.univ-paris8.fr/bibliotheque/Baudelaire/Spleen.html website. Cited on page 25.

9 The most famous text is Jearl Walker, *The Flying Circus of Physics*, Wiley, 1975. For more interesting physical effects in everyday life, see Erwein Flachsel, *Hundertfünfzig Physikrätsel*, Ernst Klett Verlag, 1985. The book also covers several clock puzzles, in puzzle numbers 126 to 128. Cited on page 25.

10 A concise and informative introduction into the history of classical physics is given in the first chapter of the book by F. K. Richtmeyer, E. H. Kennard & J. N. Cooper, *Introduction to Modern Physics*, McGraw–Hill, 1969. Cited on page 26.

11 An introduction into perception research is Bruce Goldstein, *Perception*, Books/Cole, 5th edition, 1998. Cited on pages 27 and 32.

12 A good overview over the arguments used to prove the existence of god from motion is given by Michael Buckley, *Motion and Motion's God*, Princeton University Press, 1971. The intensity of the battles waged around these failed attempts is one of the tragicomic chapters of history. Cited on page 27.

13 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* or *Summa Theologica*, 1265–1273, online in Latin at www.newadvent.org/summa, in English on several other servers. Cited on page 27.

14 For an exploration of 'inner' motions, see the beautiful text by Richard Schwartz, *Internal Family Systems Therapy*, The Guilford Press, 1995. Cited on page 27.

15 For an authoritative description of proper motion development in babies and about how it leads to a healthy character see Emmi Pikler, *Laßt mir Zeit - Die selbstständige Bewegungsentwicklung des Kindes bis zum freien Gehen*, Pflaum Verlag, 2001, and her other books. See also the website www.pikler.org. Cited on page 27.

16 See e.g. the fascinating text by David G. Chandler, *The Campaigns of Napoleon - The Mind and Method of History's Greatest Soldier*, Macmillan, 1966. Cited on page 27.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

17 Richard Marcus, *American Roulette*, St Martin's Press, 2003, a thriller and a true story. Cited on page 27.

18 A good and funny book on behaviour change is the well-known text by R. Bandler, *Using Your Brain for a Change*, Real People Press, 1985. See also Richard Bandler & John Grinder, *Frogs into princes – Neuro Linguistic Programming*, Eden Grove Editions, 1990. Cited on pages 28 and 38.

19 A beautiful book about the mechanisms of human growth from the original cell to full size is Lewis Wolpert, *The Triumph of the Embryo*, Oxford University Press, 1991. Cited on page 28.

20 On the topic of grace and poise, see e.g. the numerous books on the Alexander technique, such as M. Gelb, *Body Learning – An Introduction to the Alexander Technique*, Aurum Press, 1981, and Richard Brennan, *Introduction to the Alexander Technique*, Little Brown and Company, 1996. Among others, the idea of the Alexander technique is to return to the situation that the muscle groups for sustention and those for motion are used only for their respective function, and not vice versa. Any unnecessary muscle tension, such as neck stiffness, is a waste of energy due to the use of sustention muscles for movement and of motion muscles for sustention. The technique teaches the way to return to the natural use of muscles.

Motion of animals was discussed extensively already in the seventeenth century by G. Borelli, *De motu animalium*, 1680. An example of a more modern approach is J. J. Collins & I. Stewart, Hexapodal gaits and coupled nonlinear oscillator models, *Biological Cybernetics* **68**, pp. 287–298, 1993. See also I. Stewart & M. Golubitsky, *Fearful Symmetry*, Blackwell, 1992. Cited on pages 29 and 108.

21 The results on the development of children mentioned here and in the following have been drawn mainly from the studies initiated by Jean Piaget; for more details on child development, see an upcoming chapter, on page 807. At www.piaget.org you can find the website maintained by the Jean Piaget Society. Cited on pages 30, 45, and 46.

22 The reptilian brain (eat? flee? ignore?), also called the R-complex, includes the brain stem, the cerebellum, the basal ganglia and the thalamus; the old mammalian (emotions) brain, also called the limbic system, contains the amygdala, the hypothalamus and the hippocampus; the human (and primate) (rational) brain, called the neocortex, consists of the famous grey matter. For images of the brain, see the atlas by John Nolte, *The Human Brain: An Introduction to its Functional Anatomy*, Mosby, fourth edition, 1999. Cited on page 31.

23 The lower left corner film can be reproduced on a computer after typing the following lines in the Mathematica software package: Cited on page 31.

```
    « Graphics'Animation'
Nxpixels=72; Nypixels=54; Nframes=Nxpixels 4/3;
Nxwind=Round[Nxpixels/4]; Nywind=Round[Nypixels/3];
front=Table[Round[Random[]],{y,1,Nypixels},{x,1,Nxpixels}];
back =Table[Round[Random[]],{y,1,Nypixels},{x,1,Nxpixels}];
frame=Table[front,{nf,1,Nframes}];
Do[ If[ x>n-Nxwind && x<n && y>Nywind && y<2Nywind,
  frame[[n,y,x]]=back[[y,x-n]] ],
     {x,1,Nxpixels}, {y,1,Nypixels}, {n,1,Nframes}];
film=Table[ListDensityPlot[frame[[nf]], Mesh-> False,
  Frame-> False, AspectRatio-> N[Nypixels/Nxpixels],
  DisplayFunction-> Identity],   {nf,1,Nframes}]
ShowAnimation[film]
```

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

But our motion detection system is much more powerful than the example shown in the lower left corners. The following, different film makes the point.

```
    « Graphics'Animation'
Nxpixels=72; Nypixels=54; Nframes=Nxpixels 4/3;
Nxwind=Round[Nxpixels/4]; Nywind=Round[Nypixels/3];
front=Table[Round[Random[]],{y,1,Nypixels},{x,1,Nxpixels}];
back =Table[Round[Random[]],{y,1,Nypixels},{x,1,Nxpixels}];
frame=Table[front,{nf,1,Nframes}];
Do[ If[ x>n-Nxwind && x<n && y>Nywind && y<2Nywind,
  frame[[n,y,x]]=back[[y,x]] ],
     {x,1,Nxpixels}, {y,1,Nypixels}, {n,1,Nframes}];
film=Table[ListDensityPlot[frame[[nf]], Mesh-> False,
  Frame-> False, AspectRatio-> N[Nypixels/Nxpixels],
  DisplayFunction-> Identity],   {nf,1,Nframes}]
ShowAnimation[film]
```

Similar experiments, e.g. using randomly changing random patterns, show that the eye perceives motion even in cases where all Fourier components of the image are practically zero; such image motion is called *drift-balanced* or *non-Fourier* motion. Several examples are presented in J. Zanker, Modelling human motion perception I: Classical stimuli, *Naturwissenschaften* **81**, pp. 156–163, 1994, and J. Zanker, Modelling human motion perception II: Beyond Fourier motion stimuli, *Naturwissenschaften* **81**, pp. 200–209, 1994.

24 All fragments from Heraclitus are from John Mansley Robinson, *An Introduction to Early Greek Philosophy*, Houghton Muffin 1968, chapter 5. Cited on page 33.

25 An introduction to Newton the alchemist are the two books by Betty Jo Teeter Dobbs, *The Foundations of Newton's Alchemy*, Cambridge University Press, 1983, and *The Janus Face of Genius*, Cambridge University Press, 1992. Newton is found to be a sort of highly intellectual magician, desperately looking for examples of processes where gods interact with the material world. An intense but tragic tale. A good overview is provided by R. G. Keesing, Essay Review: Newton's Alchemy, *Contemporary Physics* **36**, pp. 117–119, 1995.

Newton's infantile theology, typical for god seekers who grew up without a father, can be found in the many books summarizing the letter exchanges between Clarke, his secretary, and Leibniz, Newton's rival for fame. Cited on page 39.

26 An introduction to the story of classical mechanics, which also destroys a few of the myths surrounding it – such as the idea that Newton could solve differential equations or that he introduced the expression $F = ma$ – is given by Clifford A. Truesdell, *Essays in the History of Mechanics*, Springer, 1968. Cited on pages 39, 152, and 179.

27 C. Liu, Z. Dutton, C. H. Behroozi & L. Vestergaard Hau, Observation of coherent optical information storage in an atomic medium using halted light pulses, *Nature* **409**, pp. 490–493, 2001. There is also a comment on the paper by E. A. Cornell, Stopping light in its track, **409**, pp. 461–462, 2001. However, despite the claim, the light pulses of course have *not* been halted. Can you give at least two reasons without even reading the paper, and maybe a third after reading it? Challenge 611 s

The work was an improvement on the previous experiment where a group velocity of light of 17 m/s had been achieved, in an ultracold gas of sodium atoms, at nanokelvin temperatures. This was reported by L. Vestergaard Hau, S. E. Harris, Z. Dutton & C. H. Behroozi, Light speed reduction to 17 meters per second in an ultracold atomic gas, *Nature* **397**, pp. 594–598, 1999. Cited on pages 41 and 634.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

28 Rainer Flindt, *Biologie in Zahlen – Eine Datensammlung in Tabellen mit über 10.000 Einzelwerten*, Spektrum Akademischer Verlag, 2000. Cited on page 41.

29 Two jets with that speed have been observed by I. F. Mirabel & L. F. Rodríguez, A superluminal source in the Galaxy, *Nature* **371**, pp. 46–48, 1994, as well as the comments on p. 18. Cited on page 41.

30 A beautiful introduction to the slowest motions in nature, the changes in landscapes, is Detlev Busche, Jürgen Kempf & Ingrid Stengel, *Landschaftsformen der Erde – Bildatlas der Geomorphologie*, Primus Verlag, 2005. Cited on page 42.

31 An introduction to the sense of time as a result of clocks in the brain is found in R. B. Ivry & R. Spencer, The neural representation of time, *Current Opinion in Neurobiology* **14**, pp. 225–232, 2004. The chemical clocks in our body are described in John D. Palmer, *The Living Clock*, Oxford University Press, 2002, or in A. Ahlgren & F. Halberg, *Cycles of Nature: An Introduction to Biological Rhythms*, National Science Teachers Association, 1990. See also the www.msi.umn.edu/~halberg/introd website. Cited on page 47.

32 This has been shown among others by the work of Anna Wierzbicka mentioned in more detail in an upcoming chapter, on page 819. The passionate best seller by the Chomskian author Steven Pinker, *The Language Instinct – How the Mind Creates Language*, Harper Perennial, 1994, also discusses issues related to this matter, refuting amongst others on page 63 the often repeated false statement that the *Hopi* language is an exception. Cited on page 47.

33 For more information, see the excellent and freely downloadable books on biological clocks by Wolfgang Engelmann on the website www.uni-tuebingen.de/plantphys/bioclox. Cited on page 48.

34 B. Günther & E. Morgado, Allometric scaling of biological rhythms in mammals, *Biological Research* **38**, pp. 207–212, 2005. Cited on page 48.

35 Aristotle rejects the idea of the flow of time in chapter IV of his *Physics*. See the full text on the classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/physics.4.iv.html website. Cited on page 52.

36 Perhaps the most informative of the books about the 'arrow of time' is Hans Dieter Zeh, *The Physical Basis of the Direction of Time*, Springer Verlag, 4th edition, 2001. It is still the best book on the topic. Most other texts exist – have a look on the internet – but lack clarity of ideas.

A typical conference proceeding is J. J. Halliwell, J. Pérez-Mercader & Wojciech H. Zurek, *Physical Origins of Time Asymmetry*, Cambridge University Press, 1994. Cited on page 52.

37 On the issue of absolute and relative motion there are many books about few issues. Examples are John Barbour, *Absolute or Relative Motion? Vol. 1: A Study from the Machian Point of View of the Discovery and the Structure of Spacetime Theories*, Cambridge University Press, 1989, John Barbour, *Absolute or Relative Motion? Vol. 2: The Deep Structure of General Relativity*, Oxford University Press, 2005, or John Earman, *World Enough and Spacetime: Absolute vs Relational Theories of Spacetime*, MIT Press, 1989. Cited on page 57.

38 Coastlines and other fractals are beautifully presented in Heinz-Otto Peitgen, Hartmut Jürgens & Dietmar Saupe, *Fractals for the Classroom*, Springer Verlag, 1992, pp. 232–245. It is also available in several other languages. Cited on page 58.

39 R. Dougherty & M. Foreman, Banach–Tarski decompositions using sets with the property of Baire, *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* **7**, pp. 75–124, 1994. See also Alan L. T. Paterson, *Amenability*, American Mathematical Society, 1998, and Robert M. French, The Banach–Tarski theorem, *The Mathematical Intelli-*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

gencer **10**, pp. 21–28, 1998. Finally, there are the books by Bernard R. Gelbaum & John M. H. Olmsted, *counter-examples in Analysis*, Holden–Day, 1964, and their *Theorems and counter-examples in Mathematics*, Springer, 1993. Cited on page 60.

40 The beautiful but not easy text is Stan Wagon, *The Banach Tarski Paradox*, Cambridge University Press, 1993. Cited on pages 60 and 359.

41 About the shapes of salt water bacteria, see the corresponding section in the interesting book by Bernard Dixon, *Power Unseen – How Microbes Rule the World*, W.H. Freeman, 1994. The book has about 80 sections, in which as many microorganisms are vividly presented. Cited on page 61.

42 Olaf Medenbach & Harry Wilk, *Zauberwelt der Mineralien*, Sigloch Edition, 1977. It combines beautiful photographs with an introduction into the science of crystals, minerals and stones. About the largest crystals, see P. C. Rickwood, The largest crystals, **66**, pp. 885–908, 1981, also available on www.minsocam.org/MSA/collectors_corner/arc/large_crystals.htm. For an impressive example, the Naica cave in Mexico, see www.naica.com.mx/ingles/index.htm Cited on page 61.

43 The smallest distances are probed in particle accelerators; the distance can be determined from the energy of the particle beam. In 1996, the value of 10^{-19} m (for the upper limit of the size of quarks) was taken from the experiments described in F. Abe & al., Measurement of dijet angular distributions by the collider detector at Fermilab, *Physical Review Letters* 77, pp. 5336–5341, 1996. Cited on page 67.

44 These puzzles are taken from the puzzle collection at www.mathematische-basteleien.de. Cited on page 70.

45 Alexander K. Dewdney, *The Planiverse – Computer Contact with a Two-dimensional World*, Poseidon Books/Simon & Schuster, 1984. See also Edwin A. Abbott, *Flatland: A romance of many dimensions*, 1884. Several other fiction authors had explored the option of a two-dimensional universe before, always answering, incorrectly, in the affirmative. Cited on page 72.

46 On the world of fireworks, see the frequently asked questions list of the usenet group rec.pyrotechnics, or search the web. A simple introduction is the article by J. A. Conkling, Pyrotechnics, *Scientific American* pp. 66–73, July 1990. Cited on page 73.

47 There is a whole story behind the variations of g. It can be discovered in Chuji Tsuboi, *Gravity*, Allen & Unwin, 1979, or in Wolfgang Torge, *Gravimetry*, de Gruyter, 1989, or in Milan Burša & Karel Pěč, *The Gravity Field and the Dynamics of the Earth*, Springer, 1993. The variation of the height of the soil by up to 0.3 m due to the Moon is one of the interesting effects found by these investigations. Cited on pages 74 and 159.

48 Andrea Frova, *La fisica sotto il naso – 44 pezzi facili*, Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli, Milano, 2001. Cited on page 74.

49 On the other hands, other sciences enjoy studying usual paths in all detail. See, for example, Heini Hediger, editor, *Die Straßen der Tiere*, Vieweg & Sohn, 1967. Cited on page 75.

50 This was discussed in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 2nd of August, 1997, at the time of the world athletics championship. The values are for the fastest part of the race of a 100 m sprinter; the exact values cited were called the running speed world records in 1997, and were given as 12.048 m/s = 43.372 km/h by Ben Johnson for men, and 10.99 m/s = 39.56 km/h for women. Cited on page 75.

51 Long jump data and literature can be found in three articles all entitled Is a good long jumper a good high jumper?, in the *American Journal of Physics* **69**, pp. 104–105, 2001. In particular, world class long jumpers run at 9.35 ± 0.15 m/s, with vertical take-off speeds of

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

3.35 ± 0.15 m/s, giving take-off angles of about (only) 20°. A new technique for achieving higher take-off angles would allow the world long jump record to increase dramatically. Cited on page 76.

52 The study of shooting faeces (i.e., shit) and its mechanisms is a part of modern biology. The reason that caterpillars do this was determined by M. Weiss, Good housekeeping: why do shelter-dwelling caterpillars fling their frass?, *Ecology Letters* **6**, pp. 361–370, 2003, who also gives the present record of 1.5 m for the 24 mg pellets of *Epargyreus clarus*. The picture of the flying frass is from S. Caveney, H. McLean & D. Surry, Faecal firing in a skipper caterpillar is pressure-driven, *The Journal of Experimental Biology* **201**, pp. 121–133, 1998. Cited on page 76.

53 The arguments of Zeno can be found in Aristotle, *Physics*, VI, 9. It can be found translated in almost any language. The classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/physics.6.vi.html website provides an online version in English. Cited on pages 80 and 331.

54 Etymology can be a fascinating topic, e.g. when research discovers the origin of the German word 'Weib' ('woman', related to English 'wife'). It was discovered, via a few texts in Tocharian – an extinct Indo-European language from a region inside modern China – to mean originally 'shame'. It was used for the female genital region in an expression meaning 'place of shame'. With time, this expression became to mean 'woman' in general, while being shortened to the second term only. This connection was discovered by the German linguist Klaus T. Schmidt; it explains in particular why the word is not feminine but neutral, i.e., why it uses the article 'das' instead of 'die'. Julia Simon, private communication.

Etymology can also be simple and plain fun, for example when one discovers in the *Oxford English Dictionary* that 'testimony' and 'testicle' have the same origin; indeed in Latin the same word 'testis' was used for both concepts. Cited on pages 83 and 92.

55 An overview of the latest developments is given by J. T. Armstrong, D. J. Hunter, K. J. Johnston & D. Mozurkewich, Stellar optical interferometry in the 1990s, *Physics Today* pp. 42–49, May 1995. More than 100 stellar diameters were known already in 1995. Several dedicated powerful instruments are being planned. Cited on page 83.

56 A good biology textbook on growth is Arthur F. Hopper & Nathan H. Hart, *Foundations of Animal Deveopment*, Oxford University Press, 2006. Cited on page 84.

57 This is discussed for example in C. L. Stong, The amateur scientist – how to supply electric power to something which is turning, *Scientific American* pp. 120–125, December 1975. It also discusses how to make a still picture of something rotating simply by using a few prisms, the so-called *Dove prisms*. Other examples of attaching something to a rotating body are given by E. Rieflin, Some mechanisms related to Dirac's strings, *American Journal of Physics* **47**, pp. 379–381, 1979. Cited on page 85.

58 James A. Young, Tumbleweed, *Scientific American* **264**, pp. 82–87, March 1991. The tumbleweed is in fact quite rare, except in in Hollywood westerns, where all directors feel obliged to give it a special appearance. Cited on page 85.

59 About N. decemspinosa, see R. L. Caldwell, A unique form of locomotion in a stomatopod – backward somersaulting, *Nature* **282**, pp. 71–73, 1979, and R. Full, K. Earls, M. Wong & R. Caldwell, Locomotion like a wheel?, *Nature* **365**, p. 495, 1993. About rolling caterpillars, see J. Brackenbury, Caterpillar kinematics, *Nature* **330**, p. 453, 1997, and J. Brackenbury, Fast locomotion in caterpillars, *Journal of Insect Physiology* **45**, pp. 525–533, 1999. More images around legs can be found on rjf9.biol.berkeley.edu/twiki/bin/view/PolyPEDAL/LabPhotographs. Cited on page 85.

60 The first experiments to prove the rotation of the flagella were by M. Silverman & M. I. Simon, Flagellar rotation and the mechanism of bacterial motility, *Nature* **249**,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

pp. 73–74, 1974. For some pretty pictures of the molecules involved, see K. Namba, A biological molecular machine: bacterial flagellar motor and filament, *Wear* **168**, pp. 189–193, 1993, or the website www.nanonet.go.jp/english/mailmag/2004/011a.html. The present record speed of rotation, 1700 rotations per second, is reported by Y. Magariyama, S. Sugiyama, K. Muramoto, Y. Maekawa, I. Kawagishi, Y. Imae & S. Kudo, Very fast flagellar rotation, *Nature* **371**, p. 752, 1994.

More on bacteria can be learned from David Dusenbery, *Life at a Small Scale*, Scientific American Library, 1996. Cited on page 86.

61 M. P. Brenner, S. Hilgenfeldt & D. Lohse, Single bubble sonoluminescence, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **74**, pp. 425–484, 2002. Cited on page 88.

62 K. R. Weninger, B. P. Barber & S. J. Putterman, Pulsed Mie scattering measurements of the collapse of a sonoluminescing bubble, *Physical Review Letters* **78**, pp. 1799–1802, 1997. Cited on page 88.

63 On shadows, see the agreeable popular text by Roberto Casati, *Alla scoperta dell'ombra – Da Platone a Galileo la storia di un enigma che ha affascinato le grandi menti dell'umanità*, Oscar Mondadori, 2000, and his websites located at www.shadowmill.com and roberto.casati.free.fr/casati/roberto.htm. Cited on page 89.

64 There is also the beautiful book by Penelope Farrant, *Colour in Nature*, Blandford, 1997. Cited on page 89.

65 The 'laws' of cartoon physics can easily be found using any search engine on the internet. Cited on page 89.

66 For the curious, an overview of the illusions used in the cinema and in television, which lead to some of the strange behaviour of images mentioned above, is given in Bernard Wilkie, *The Technique of Special Effects in Television*, Focal Press, 1993, and his other books, or in the *Cinefex* magazine. On digital cinema techniques, see Peter C. Slansky, editor, *Digitaler film – dgitales Kino*, UVK Verlag, 2004. Cited on page 90.

67 Aetius, Opinions, I, XXIII, 3. See Jean-Paul Dumont, *Les écoles présocratiques*, Folio Essais, Gallimard, p. 426, 1991. Cited on page 90.

68 Giuseppe Fumagalli, *Chi l'ha detto?*, Hoepli, 1983. Cited on pages 91 and 185.

69 See www.straightdope.com/classics/a5_262.html and the more dubious en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Guillotine. Cited on page 92.

70 For the role and chemistry of adenosine triphosphate (ATP) in cells and in living beings, see any chemistry book, or search the internet. The uncovering of the mechanisms around ATP has led to Nobel Prizes in Chemistry in 1978 and in 1997. Cited on page 99.

71 A picture of this unique clock can be found in the article by A. Garrett, Perpetual motion – a delicious delirium, *Physics World* pp. 23–26, December 1990. Cited on page 99.

72 A Shell study estimated the world's total energy consumption in 2000 to be 500 EJ. The US Department of Energy estimated it to be around 416 EJ. We took the lower value here. A discussion and a breakdown into electricity usage (14 EJ) and other energy forms, with variations per country, can be found in S. Benka, The energy challenge, *Physics Today* **55**, pp. 38–39, April 2002, and in E. J. Monitz & M. A. Kenderdine, Meeting energy challenges: technology and policy, *Physics Today* **55**, pp. 40–46, April 2002. Cited on page 102.

73 For an overview, see the paper by J. F. Mulligan & H. G. Hertz, An unpublished lecture by Heinrich Hertz: 'On the energy balance of the Earth', *American Journal of Physics* **65**, pp. 36–45, 1997. Cited on page 103.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

74 For a beautiful photograph of this feline feat, see the cover of the journal and the article of J. Darius, A tale of a falling cat, *Nature* **308**, p. 109, 1984. Cited on page 107.

75 Natthi L. Sharma, A new observation about rolling motion, *European Journal of Physics* **17**, pp. 353–356, 1996. Cited on page 108.

76 C. Singh, When physical intuition fails, *American Journal of Physics* **70**, pp. 1103–1109, 2002. Cited on page 108.

77 Serge Gracovetsky, *The Spinal Engine*, Springer Verlag, 1990. It is now also knon that human gait is chaotic. This is explained by M. Perc, The dynamics of human gait, *European Journal of Physics* **26**, pp. 525–534, 2005. Cited on page 109.

78 Duncan MacDougall, Hypothesis concerning soul substance together with experimental evidence of the existence of such substance, *American Medicine* **2**, pp. 240–243, April 1907, and Duncan MacDougall, Hypothesis concerning soul substance, *American Medicine* **2**, pp. 395–397, July 1907. Reading the papers shows that the author has little practice in performing reliable weight and time measurements. Cited on page 110.

79 A good roulette prediction story from the 1970s is told by Thomas A. Bass, *The Eudaemonic Pie* also published under the title *The Newtonian Casino*, Backinprint, 2000. An overview up to 1998 is given in the paper Edward O. Thorp, The invention of the first wearable computer, *Proceedings of the Second International Symposium on Wearable Computers* (ISWC 1998), 19-20 October 1998, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA (IEEE Computer Society), pp. 4–8, 1998, downloadable at csdl.computer.org/comp/proceedings/iswc/1998/9074/00/9074toc.htm. Cited on pages 111 and 1087.

80 This and many other physics surprises are described in the beautiful lecture script by Josef Zweck, *Physik im Alltag*, the notes of his lectures held in 1999/2000 at the Universität Regensburg. Cited on pages 111 and 136.

81 The equilibrium of ships, so important in car ferries, is an interesting part of shipbuilding; an introduction was already given by Leonhard Euler, Scientia navalis, 1749. Cited on page 112.

82 Thomas Heath, *Aristarchus of Samos – the Ancient Copernicus*, Dover, 1981, reprinted from the original 1913 edition. Aristarchos' treaty is given in Greek and English. Aristarchos was the first proposer of the heliocentric system. Aristarchos had measured the length of the day (in fact, by determining the number of days per year) to the astonishing precision of less than one second. This excellent book also gives an overview of Greek astronomy before Aristarchos, explained in detail for each Greek thinker. Aristarchos' text is also reprinted in Aristarchos, On the sizes and the distances of the Sun and the Moon, *c.* 280 BCE in Michael J. Crowe, *Theories of the World From Antiquity to the Copernican Revolution*, Dover, 1990, especially on pp. 27–29. Cited on page 116.

83 The influence of the Coriolis effect on icebergs was studied most thoroughly by the Swedish physicist turned oceanographer Walfrid Ekman (1874–1954); the topic was suggested by the great explorer Fridtjof Nansen, who also made the first observations. In his honour, one speaks of the Ekman layer, Ekman transport and Ekman spirals. Any text on oceanography or physical geography will give more details about them. Cited on page 118.

84 An overview of the effects of the Coriolis acceleration $\boldsymbol{a} = -2\boldsymbol{\omega} \times \boldsymbol{v}$ in the rotating frame is given by Edward A. Desloge, *Classical Mechanics*, Volume 1, John Wiley & Sons, 1982. Even the so-called *Gulf Stream*, the current of warm water flowing from the Caribbean to the North Sea, is influenced by it. Cited on page 118.

85 The original publication is by A. H. Shapiro, Bath-tub vortex, *Nature* **196**, pp. 1080–1081, 1962. He also produced two films of the experiment. The experiment has been repeated

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

many times in the northern and in the southern hemisphere, where the water drains clockwise; the first southern hemisphere test was L.M. Trefethen & al., The bath-tub vortex in the southern hemisphere, *Nature* **201**, pp. 1084–1085, 1965. A complete literature list is found in the letters to the editor of the *American Journal of Physics* **62**, p. 1063, 1994. Cited on page 118.

86 The tricks are explained by Richard Crane, Short Foucault pendulum: a way to eliminate the precession due to ellipticity, *American Journal of Physics* **49**, pp. 1004–1006, 1981, and particularly in Richard Crane, Foucault pendulum wall clock, *American Journal of Physics* **63**, pp. 33–39, 1993. The Foucault pendulum was also the topic of the thesis of Heike Kamerling Onnes, Nieuwe bewijzen der aswenteling der aarde, Universiteit Groningen, 1879. Cited on page 119.

87 The reference is J. G. Hagen, La rotation de la terre : ses preuves mécaniques anciennes et nouvelles, *Sp. Astr. Vaticana Second. App.* Rome, 1910. His other experiment is published as J. G. Hagen, How Atwood's machine shows the rotation of the Earth even quantitatively, International Congress of Mathematics, Aug. 1912. Cited on page 121.

88 The original papers are A. H. Compton, A laboratory method of demonstrating the Earth's rotation, *Science* **37**, pp. 803–806, 1913, A. H. Compton, Watching the Earth revolve, *Scientific American Supplement* no. 2047, pp. 196–197, 1915, and A. H. Compton, A determination of latitude, azimuth and the length of the day independent of astronomical observations, *Physical Review* (second series) **5**, pp. 109–117, 1915. Cited on page 121.

89 R. Anderson, H.R. Bilger & G.E. Stedman, The Sagnac-effect: a century of Earth-rotated interferometers, *American Journal of Physics* **62**, pp. 975–985, 1994.

See also the clear and extensive paper by G.E. Stedman, Ring laser tests of fundamental physics and geophysics, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **60**, pp. 615–688, 1997. Cited on page 121.

90 About the length of the day, see the maia.usno.navy.mil website, or the books by K. Lambeck, *The Earth's Variable Rotation: Geophysical Causes and Consequences*, Cambridge University Press, 1980, and by W. H. Munk & G. J. F. MacDonald, *The Rotation of the Earth*, Cambridge University Press, 1960. About a modern ring laser set-up, see www.wettzell.ifag.de. Cited on pages 122 and 160.

91 H. Bucka, Zwei einfache Vorlesungsversuche zum Nachweis der Erddrehung, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **126**, pp. 98–105, 1949, and H. Bucka, Zwei einfache Vorlesungsversuche zum Nachweis der Erddrehung. II. Teil, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **128**, pp. 104–107, 1950. Cited on page 122.

92 One example of data is by C. P. Sonett, E. P. Kvale, A. Zakharian, M. A. Chan & T. M. Demko, Late proterozoic and paleozoic tides, retreat of the moon, and rotation of the Earth, *Science* **273**, pp. 100–104, 5 July 1996. They deduce from tidal sediment analysis that days were only 18 to 19 hours long in the Proterozoic, i.e., 900 million years ago; they assume that the year was 31 million seconds long from then to today. See also C. P. Sonett & M. A. Chan, Neoproterozoic Earth-Moon dynamics – rework of the 900 MA Big Cottonwood canyon tidal laminae, *Geophysical Research Letters* **25**, pp. 539–542, 1998. Another determination was by G. E. Williams, Precambrian tidal and glacial clastic deposits: implications for precambrian Earth–Moon dynamics and palaeoclimate, *Sedimentary Geology* **120**, pp. 55–74, 1998. Using a geological formation called *tidal rhythmites*, he deduced that about 600 million years ago there were 13 months per year and a day had 22 hours. Cited on page 123.

93 The story of this combination of history and astronomy is told in Richard Stephenson, *Historical Eclispes and Earth's Rotation*, Cambridge University Press, 1996. Cited on

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

page 123.

94 On the rotation and history of the solar system, see S. Brush, Theories of the origin of the solar system 1956–1985, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **62**, pp. 43–112, 1990. Cited on page 123.

95 The website http://hpiers.obspm.fr/eop-pc shows the motion of the Earth's axis over the last ten years. The International Latitude Service founded by Küstner is now part of the International Earth Rotation Service; more information can be found on the www.iers.org website. The latest idea is that two-thirds of the circular component of the polar motion, which in the USA is called 'Chandler wobble' after the person who attributed to himself the discovery by Küstner, is due to fluctuations of the ocean pressure at the bottom of the oceans and one-third is due to pressure changes in the atmosphere of the Earth. This is explained by R. S. Gross, The excitation of the Chandler wobble, *Geophysical Physics Letters* **27**, pp. 2329–2332, 2000. Cited on page 125.

96 S. B. Lambert, C. Bizouard & V. Dehant, Rapid variations in polar motion during the 2005-2006 winter season, *Geophysical Research Letters* **33**, p. L13303, 2006. Cited on page 126.

97 For more information about Alfred Wegener, see the (simple) text by Klaus Rohrbach, *Alfred Wegener – Erforscher der wandernden Kontinente*, Verlag Freies Geistesleben, 1993; about plate tectonics, see the www.scotese.com website. About earthquakes, see the www.geo.ed.ac.uk/quakexe/quakes and the www.iris.edu/seismon website. See the vulcan.wr.usgs.gov and the www.dartmouth.edu/~volcano websites for information about volcanoes. Cited on page 126.

98 J. Jouzel & al., Orbital and millennial Antarctic climate variability over the past 800,000 years, *Science* **317**, pp. 793–796, 2007, takes the data from isotope concentrations in ice cores. In contrast, J. D. Hays, J. Imbrie & N. J. Shackleton, Variations in the Earth's orbit: pacemaker of the ice ages, *Science* **194**, pp. 1121–1132, 1976, confirmed the connection with orbital parameters by literally digging in the mud that covers the ocean floor in certain places. Note that the web is full of information on the ice ages. Just look up 'Milankovitch' in a search engine. Cited on page 130.

99 R. Humphreys & J. Larsen, The sun's distance above the galactic plane, *Astronomical Journal* **110**, pp. 2183–2188, November 1995. Cited on page 131.

100 C. L. Bennet, M. S. Turner & M. White, The cosmic rosetta stone, *Physics Today* **50**, pp. 32–38, November 1997. Cited on page 132.

101 On www.sff.net/people/geoffrey.landis/vacuum.html you can read a description of what happened. See also the www.sff.net/people/geoffrey.landis/ebullism.html and imagine.gsfc.nasa.gov/docs/ask_astro/answers/970603.html websites. They all give details on the effects of vacuum on humans. Cited on page 134.

102 R. McN. Alexander, Leg design and jumping technique for humans, other vertebrates and insects, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society in London B* **347**, pp. 235–249, 1995. Cited on page 139.

103 J. W. Glasheen & T. A. McMahon, A hydrodynamic model of locomotion in the basilisk lizard, *Nature* **380**, pp. 340–342, For pictures, see also *New Scientist*, p. 18, 30 March 1996, or *Scientific American*, pp. 48–49, September 1997, or the website by the author at rjf2.biol.berkeley.edu/Full_Lab/FL_Personnel/J_Glasheen/J_Glasheen.html.

Several shore birds also have the ability to run over water, using the same mechanism. Cited on page 140.

104 A. Fernandez-Nieves & F. J. de las Nieves, About the propulsion system of a

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

kayak and of Basiliscus basiliscus, *European Journal of Physics* **19**, pp. 425–429, 1998. Cited on page 140.

105 Y. S. Song, S. H. Suhr & M. Sitti, Modeling of the supporting legs for designing biomimetic water strider robot, Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation, Orlando, USA, 2006. S. H. Suhr, Y. S. Song, S. J. Lee & M. Sitti, Biologically inspired miniature water strider robot, Proceedings of the Robotics: Science and Systems I, Boston, USA, 2005. See also the website www.me.cmu.edu/faculty1/sitti/nano/projects/waterstrider. Cited on page 140.

106 M. Wittlinger, R. Wehner & H. Wolf, The ant odometer: stepping on stilts and stumps, *Science* **312**, pp. 1965–1967, 2006. Cited on page 141.

107 P. G. Weyand, D. B. Sternlight, M. J. Bellizzi & S. Wright, Faster top running speeds are achieved with greater ground forces not more rapid leg movements, *Journal of Applied Physiology* **89**, pp. 1991–1999, 2000. Cited on page 141.

108 The material on the shadow discussion is from the book by Robert M. Pryce, *Cook and Peary*, Stackpole Books, 1997. See also the details of Peary's forgeries in Wally Herbert, *The Noose of Laurels*, Doubleday 1989. The sad story of Robert Peary is also told in the centenary number of *National Geographic*, September 1988. Since the National Geographic Society had financed Peary in his attempt and had supported him until the US Congress had declared him the first man at the Pole, the (partial) retraction is noteworthy. (The magazine then changed its mind again later on, to sell more copies, and now again claims that Peary reached the Noth Pole.) By the way, the photographs of Cook, who claimed to have been at the North Pole even before Peary, have the same problem with the shadow length. Both men have a history of cheating about their 'exploits'. As a result, the first man at the North Pole was probably Roald Amundsen, who arrived there a few years later, and who was also the first man at the South Pole. Cited on page 142.

109 The story is told in M. Nauenberg, Hooke, orbital motion, and Newton's Principia, *American Journal of Physics* **62**, 1994, pp. 331–350. Cited on page 143.

110 More details are given by D. Rawlins, in Doubling your sunsets or how anyone can measure the Earth's size with wristwatch and meter stick, *American Journal of Physics* **47**, 1979, pp. 126–128. Another simple measurement of the Earth radius, using only a sextant, is given by R. O'Keefe & B. Ghavimi-Alagha, in The World Trade Centre and the distance to the world's centre, *American Journal of Physics* **60**, pp. 183–185, 1992. Cited on page 144.

111 More details on astronomical distance measurements can be found in the beautiful little book by van Helden, *Measuring the Universe*, University of Chicago Press, 1985, and in Nigel Henbest & Heather Cooper, *The Guide to the Galaxy*, Cambridge University Press, 1994. Cited on page 144.

112 A lot of details can be found in M. Jammer, *Concepts of Mass in Classical and Modern Physics*, reprinted by Dover, 1997, and in *Concepts of Force, a Study in the Foundations of Mechanics*, Harvard University Press, 1957. These eclectic and thoroughly researched texts provide numerous details and explain various philosophical viewpoints, but lack clear statements and conclusions on the accurate description of nature; thus are not of help on fundamental issues.

Jean Buridan (*c.* 1295 to *c.* 1366) criticizes the distinction of sublunar and translunar motion in his book *De Caelo*, one of his numerous works. Cited on page 144.

113 D. Topper & D. E. Vincent, An analysis of Newton's projectile diagram, *European Journal of Physics* **20**, pp. 59–66, 1999. Cited on page 145.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

114 The absurd story of the metre is told in the historical novel by KEN ALDER, *The Measure of All Things : The Seven-Year Odyssey and Hidden Error that Transformed the World*, The Free Press, 2003. Cited on page 147.

115 About the measurement of spatial dimensions via gravity – and the failure to find any hint for a number different from three – see the review by E. G. ADELBERGER, B. R. HECKEL & A. E. NELSON, Tests of the gravitational inverse-square law, *Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science* **53**, pp. 77–121, 2003, also arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0307284, or the review by J. A. HEWETT & M. SPIROPULU, Particle physics probes of extra spacetime dimensions, *Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science* **52**, pp. 397–424, 2002, arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0205106. Cited on page 149.

116 There are many books explaining the origin of the precise shape of the Earth, such as the pocket book S. ANDERS, *Weil die Erde rotiert*, Verlag Harri Deutsch, 1985. Cited on page 149.

117 The shape of the Earth is described most precisely with the World Geodetic System. For an extensive presentation, see the www.eurocontrol.be/projects/eatchip/wgs84/start.html website. See also the website of the *International Earth Rotation Service* at hpiers.obspm.fr. Cited on page 149.

118 W. K. HARTMAN, R. J. PHILLIPS & G. J. TAYLOR, editors, *Origin of the Moon*, Lunar and Planetary Institute, 1986. Cited on page 154.

119 If you want to read about the motion of the Moon in all its fascinating details, have a look at MARTIN C. GUTZWILLER, Moon–Earth–Sun: the oldest three body problem, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **70**, pp. 589–639, 1998. Cited on page 154.

120 DIETRICH NEUMANN, Physiologische Uhren von Insekten – Zur Ökophysiologie lunarperiodisch kontrollierter Fortpflanzungszeiten, *Naturwissenschaften* **82**, pp. 310–320, 1995. Cited on page 154.

121 The origin of the duration of the menstrual cycle is not yet settled; however, there are explanations on how it becomes synchronized with other cycles. For a general explanation see ARKADY PIKOVSKY, MICHAEL ROSENBLUM & JÜRGEN KURTHS, *Synchronization: A Universal Concept in Nonlinear Science*, Cambridge University Press, 2002. Cited on page 154.

122 J. LASKKAR, F. JOUTEL & P. ROBUTEL, Stability of the Earth's obliquity by the moon, *Nature* **361**, pp. 615–617, 1993. However, the question is not completely settled, and other opinions exist. Cited on page 154.

123 NEIL F. COMINS, *What if the Moon Did not Exist? – Voyages to Earths that Might Have Been*, Harper Collins, 1993. Cited on page 154.

124 PAUL A. WIEGERT, KIMMO A. INNANEN & SEPPO MIKKOLA, An asteroidal companion to the Earth, *Nature* **387**, pp. 685–686, 12 June 1997, together with the comment on pp. 651–652. Details on the orbit and on the fact that Lagrangian points do not always form equilateral triangles can be found in F. NAMOUNI, A. A. CHRISTOU & C. D. MURRAY, Coorbital dynamics at large eccentricity and inclination, *Physical Review Letters* **83**, pp. 2506–2509, 1999. Cited on page 157.

125 SIMON NEWCOMB, *Astronomical Papers of the American Ephemeris* **1**, p. 472, 1882. Cited on page 158.

126 For an animation of the tides, have a look at www.jason.oceanobs.com/html/applications/marees/m2_atlantique_fr.html. Cited on page 158.

127 A beautiful introduction is the classic G. FALK & W. RUPPEL, *Mechanik, Relativität, Gravitation – ein Lehrbuch*, Springer Verlag, Dritte Auflage, 1983. Cited on page 159.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

128 J. Soldner, *Berliner Astronomisches Jahrbuch auf das Jahr 1804*, 1801, p. 161. Cited on page 162.

129 The equality was first tested with precision by R. von Eötvös, *Annalen der Physik & Chemie* **59**, p. 354, 1896, and by R. von Eötvös, V. Pekár, E. Fekete, Beiträge zum Gesetz der Proportionalität von Trägheit und Gravität, *Annalen der Physik 4, Leipzig* **68**, pp. 11–66, 1922. He found agreement to 5 parts in 10^9. More experiments were performed by P. G. Roll, R. Krotkow & R. H. Dicke, The equivalence of inertial and passive gravitational mass, *Annals of Physics (NY)* **26**, pp. 442–517, 1964, one of the most interesting and entertaining research articles in experimental physics, and by V. B. Braginsky & V. I. Panov, *Soviet Physics – JETP* **34**, pp. 463–466, 1971. Modern results, with errors less than one part in 10^{12}, are by Y. Su & al., New tests of the universality of free fall, *Physical Review* **D50**, pp. 3614–3636, 1994. Several experiments have been proposed to test the equality in space to less than one part in 10^{16}. Cited on page 163.

130 H. Edelmann, R. Napiwotzki, U. Heber, N. Christlieb & D. Reimers, HE 0437-5439: an unbound hyper-velocity B-type star, *The Astrophysical Journal* **634**, pp. L181–L184, 2005. Cited on page 168.

131 This is explained for example by D.K. Firpić & I.V. Aniçin, The planets, after all, may run only in perfect circles – but in the velocity space!, *European Journal of Physics* **14**, pp. 255–258, 1993. Cited on pages 168 and 379.

132 See L. Hodges, Gravitational field strength inside the Earth, *American Journal of Physics* **59**, pp. 954–956, 1991. Cited on page 168.

133 P. Mohazzabi & M. C. James, Plumb line and the shape of the Earth, *American Journal of Physics* **68**, pp. 1038–1041, 2000. Cited on page 169.

134 From Neil de Gasse Tyson, *The Universe Down to Earth*, Columbia University Press, 1994. Cited on page 170.

135 G. D. Quinlan, Planet X: a myth exposed, *Nature* **363**, pp. 18–19, 1993. Cited on page 171.

136 See en.wikipedia.org/wiki/90377_Sedna. Cited on page 171.

137 See R. Matthews, Not a snowball's chance ..., *New Scientist* 12 July 1997, pp. 24–27. The original claim is by Louis A. Frank, J. B. Sigwarth & J. D. Craven, On the influx of small comets into the Earth's upper atmosphere, parts I and II, *Geophysical Research Letters* **13**, pp. 303–306, pp. 307–310, 1986. The latest observations have disproved the claim. Cited on page 171.

138 The ray form is beautifully explained by J. Evans, The ray form of Newton's law of motion, *American Journal of Physics* **61**, pp. 347–350, 1993. Cited on page 172.

139 This is a small example from the beautiful text by Mark P. Silverman, *And Yet It Moves: Strange Systems and Subtle Questions in Physics*, Cambridge University Press, 1993. It is a treasure chest for anybody interested in the details of physics. Cited on page 173.

140 G. -L. Lesage, Lucrèce Newtonien, *Nouveaux mémoires de l'Académie Royale des Sciences et Belles Lettres* pp. 404–431, 1747, or www3.bbaw.de/bibliothek/digital/struktur/03-nouv/1782/jpg-0600/00000495.htm. Cited on page 173.

141 J. Laskar, A numerical experiment on the chaotic behaviour of the solar system, *Nature* **338**, pp. 237–238, 1989, and J. Laskar, The chaotic motion of the solar system - A numerical estimate of the size of the chaotic zones, *Icarus* **88**, pp. 266–291, 1990. The work by Laskar was later expanded by Jack Wisdom, using specially built computers, following only the planets, without taking into account the smaller objects. For more details, see G. J. Sussman & J. Wisdom, Chaotic Evolution of the Solar System, *Science* **257**, pp. 56–62, 1992.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Today, such calculations can be performed on your home PC with computer code freely available on the internet. Cited on page 174.

142 B. Dubrulle & F. Graner, Titius-Bode laws in the solar system. 1: Scale invariance explains everything, *Astronomy and Astrophysics* **282**, pp. 262–268, 1994, and Titius-Bode laws in the solar system. 2: Build your own law from disk models, *Astronomy and Astrophysics* **282**, pp. 269–-276, 1994. Cited on page 174.

143 M. Lecar, Bode's Law, *Nature* **242**, pp. 318–319, 1973, and M. Henon, A comment on "The resonant structure of the solar system" by A.M. Molchanov, *Icarus* **11**, pp. 93–94, 1969. Cited on page 174.

144 Cassius Dio, *Historia Romana*, *c.* 220, book 37, 18. For an English translation, see the site penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Cassius_Dio/37*.html. Cited on page 175.

145 M. Bevis, D. Alsdorf, E. Kendrick, L. P. Fortes, B. Forsberg, R. Malley & J. Becker, Seasonal fluctuations in the mass of the Amazon River system and Earth's elastic response, *Geophysical Research Letters* **32**, p. L16308, 2005. Cited on page 176.

146 D. Hestenes, M. Wells & G. Swackhamer, Force concept inventory, *Physics Teacher* **30**, pp. 141–158, 1982. The authors developed tests to check the understanding of the concept of physical force in students; the work has attracted a lot of attention in the field of physics teaching. Cited on page 180.

147 For a general overview on friction, from physics to economics, architecture and organizational theory, see N. Åkerman, editor, *The Necessity of Friction – Nineteen Essays on a Vital Force*, Springer Verlag, 1993. Cited on page 181.

148 See M. Hirano, K. Shinjo, R. Kanecko & Y. Murata, Observation of superlubricity by scanning tunneling microscopy, *Physical Review Letters* **78**, pp. 1448–1451, 1997. See also the discussion of their results by Serge Fayeulle, Superlubricity: when friction stops, *Physics World* pp. 29–30, May 1997. Cited on page 181.

149 Donald Ahrens, *Meteorology Today: An Introduction to the Weather, Climate, and the Environment*, West Publishing Company, 1991. Cited on page 183.

150 This topic is discussed with lucidity by J. R. Mureika, What really are the best 100 m performances?, *Athletics: Canada's National Track and Field Running Magazine*, July 1997. It can also be found as arxiv.org/abs/physics/9705004, together with other papers on similar topics by the same author. Cited on page 184.

151 F. P. Bowden & D. Tabor, *The Friction and Lubrication of Solids*, Oxford University Press, Part I, revised edition, 1954, and part II, 1964. Cited on page 184.

152 A powerful book on human violence is James Gilligan, *Violence – Our Deadly Epidemic and its Causes*, Grosset/Putnam, 1992. Cited on page 185.

153 The main tests of randomness of number series – among them the gorilla test – can be found in the authoritative paper by G. Marsaglia & W. W. Tsang, Some difficult-to-pass tests of randomness, *Journal of Statistical Software* 7, p. 8, 2002. It can also be downloaded from the www.jstatsoft.org/v07/i03/tuftests.pdf website. Cited on page 187.

154 For one aspect of the issue, see for example the captivating book by Bert Hellinger, *Zweierlei Glück*, Carl Auer Systeme Verlag, 1997. The author explains how to live serenely and with the highest possible responsibility for one's actions, by reducing entanglements with the destiny of others. He describes a powerful technique to realise this goal.

A completely different viewpoint is given by Nobel Peace Price winner Aung San Suu Kyi, *Freedom from Fear*, Penguin, 1991. Cited on page 189.

155 Henrik Walter, *Neurophilosophie der Willensfreiheit*, Mentis Verlag, Paderborn 1999. Also available in English translation. Cited on page 189.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

156 Giuseppe Fumagalli, *Chi l'ha detto?*, Hoepli, 1983. Cited on page 190.

157 The beautiful story of the south-pointing carriage is told in Appendix B of James Foster & J. D. Nightingale, *A Short Course in General Relativity*, Springer Verlag, 2nd edition, 1998. Such carriages have existed in China, as told by the great sinologist Joseph Needham, but their construction is unknown. The carriage described by Foster and Nightingale is the one reconstructed in 1947 by George Lancaster, a British engineer. Cited on page 191.

158 See for example Z. Ghahramani, Building blocks of movement, *Nature* **407**, pp. 682–683, 2000. Researchers in robot control are also interested in such topics. Cited on page 191.

159 G. Gutierrez, C. Fehr, A. Calzadilla & D. Figueroa, Fluid flow up the wall of a spinning egg, *American Journal of Physics* **66**, pp. 442–445, 1998. Cited on page 192.

160 A historical account is given in Wolfgang Yourgray & Stanley Mandelstam, *Variational Principles in Dynamics and Quantum Theory*, Dover, 1968. Cited on pages 194 and 202.

161 C. G. Gray & E. F. Taylor, When action is not least, *American Journal of Physics* **75**, pp. 434–458, 2007. Cited on page 198.

162 Max Päsler, *Prinzipe der Mechanik*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1968. Cited on page 199.

163 The relations between possible Lagrangians are explained by Herbert Goldstein, *Classical Mechanics*, 2nd edition, Addison-Wesley, 1980. Cited on page 200.

164 C. G. Gray, G. Karl & V. A. Novikov, From Maupertius to Schrödinger. Quantization of classical variational principles, *American Journal of Physics* **67**, pp. 959–961, 1999. Cited on page 202.

165 The Hemingway statement is quoted by Marlene Dietrich in Aaron E. Hotchner, *Papa Hemingway*, Random House, 1966, in part 1, chapter 1. Cited on page 200.

166 J. A. Moore, An innovation in physics instruction for nonscience majors, *American Journal of Physics* **46**, pp. 607–612, 1978. Cited on page 202.

167 See e.g. Alan P. Boss, Extrasolar planets, *Physics Today* **49**, pp. 32–38. September 1996. The most recent information can be found at the 'Extrasolar Planet Encyclopaedia' maintained at www.obspm.fr/planets by Jean Schneider at the Observatoire de Paris. Cited on page 205.

168 A good review article is by David W. Hughes, Comets and Asteroids, *Contemporary Physics* **35**, pp. 75–93, 1994. Cited on page 205.

169 G. B. West, J. H. Brown & B. J. Enquist, A general model for the origin of allometric scaling laws in biology, *Science* **276**, pp. 122–126, 4 April 1997, with a comment on page 34 of the same issue. The rules governing branching properties of blood vessels, of lymph systems and of vessel systems in plants are explained. For more about plants, see also the paper G. B. West, J. H. Brown & B. J. Enquist, A general model for the structure and allometry of plant vascular systems, *Nature* **400**, pp. 664–667, 1999. Cited on page 206.

170 J. R. Banavar, A. Martin & A. Rinaldo, Size and form in efficient transportation networks, *Nature* **399**, pp. 130–132, 1999. Cited on page 206.

171 N. Moreira, New striders - new humanoids with efficient gaits change the robotics landscape, *Science News Online* 6th of August, 2005. Cited on page 207.

172 John Mansley Robinson, *An Introduction to Early Greek Philosophy*, Houghton Muffin 1968, chapter 5. Cited on page 209.

173 See e.g. B. Bower, A child's theory of mind, *Science News* **144**, pp. 40–41. Cited on page 211.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

174 The most beautiful book on this topic is the text by Branko Grünbaum & G. C. Shephard, *Tilings and Patterns*, W.H. Freeman and Company, New York, 1987. It has been translated into several languages and republished several times. Cited on page 213.

175 U. Niederer, The maximal kinematical invariance group of the free Schrödinger equation, *Helvetica Physica Acta* **45**, pp. 802–810, 1972. See also the introduction by O. Jahn & V. V. Sreedhar, The maximal invariance group of Newton's equations for a free point particle, arxiv.org/abs/math-ph/0102011. Cited on page 218.

176 The story is told in the interesting biography of Einstein by A. Pais, *'Subtle is the Lord...' – The Science and the Life of Albert Einstein*, Oxford University Press, 1982. Cited on page 219.

177 See the clear presenttion by E. H. Lockwood & R. H. Macmillan, *Geometric Symmetry*, Cambridge University Press, 1978. Cited on page 209.

178 W. Zürn & R. Widmer-Schnidrig, Globale Eigenschwingungen der Erde, *Physik Journal* **1**, pp. 49–55, 2002. Cited on page 227.

179 N. Gauthier, What happens to energy and momentum when two oppositely-moving wave pulses overlap?, *American Journal of Physics* **71**, pp. 787–790, 2003. Cited on page 231.

180 An informative and modern summary of present research about the ear and the details of its function is www.physicsweb.org/article/world/15/5/8. Cited on page 234.

181 S. Adachi, Principles of sound production in wind instruments, *Acoustical Science and Technology* **25**, pp. 400–404, 2004. Cited on page 236.

182 The literature on tones and their effects is vast. For example, people have explored the differences and effects of various intonations in great detail. Several websites, such as bellsouthpwp.net/j/d/jdelaub/jstudio.htm, allow to listen to music played with different intonations. People have even researched wether animals use just or chromatic intonation. (See, for example, K. Leutwyler, Exploring the musical brain, *Scientific American* January 2001.) There are also studies of the effects of low frequencies, of beat notes, and of many other effects on humans. However, many studies mix serious and non-serious arguments. It is easy to get lost in them. Cited on page 238.

183 A. L. Hodgkin & A. F. Huxley, A quantitative description of membrane current and its application to conduction and excitation in nerve, *Journal of Physiology* **117**, pp. 500–544, 1952. This famous paper of theoretical biology earned the authors the Nobel Prize in Medicine in 1963. Cited on page 240.

184 T. Filippov, *The Versatile Soliton*, Springer Verlag, 2000. See also J. S. Russel, Report of the Fourteenth Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Murray, London, 1844, pp. 311–390. Cited on pages 240 and 242.

185 N. J. Zabusky & M. D. Kruskal, Interaction of solitons in a collisionless plasma and the recurrence of initial states, *Physical Review Letters* **15**, pp. 240–243, 1965. Cited on page 242.

186 O. Muskens, De kortste knal ter wereld, *Nederlands tijdschrift voor natuurkunde* pp. 70–73, 2005. Cited on page 242.

187 E. Heller, Freak waves: just bad luck, or avoidable?, *Europhysics News* pp. 159–161, September/October 2005, downloadable at www.europhysicsnews.org. Cited on page 243.

188 For more about the ocean sound channel, see the novel by Tom Clancy, *The Hunt for Red October*. See also the physics script by R. A. Muller, Government secrets of the oceans, atmosphere, and UFOs, web.archive.org/web/*/muller.lbl.gov/teaching/Physics10/chapters/9-SecretsofUFOs.html 2001. Cited on page 245.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

189 B. Wilson, R. S. Batty & L. M. Dill, Pacific and Atlantic herring produce burst pulse sounds, *Biology Letters* **271**, number S3, 7 February 2004. Cited on page 245.

190 See for example the article by G. Fritsch, Infraschall, *Physik in unserer Zeit* **13**, pp. 104–110, 1982. Cited on page 246.

191 Wavelet transformations were developed by the French mathematicians Alex Grossmann, Jean Morlet and Thierry Paul. The basic paper is A. Grossmann, J. Morlet & T. Paul, Integral transforms associated to square integrable representations, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **26**, pp. 2473–2479, 1985. For a modern introduction, see Stéphane Mallat, *A Wavelet Tour of Signal Processing*, Academic Press, 1999. Cited on page 247.

192 Jay Ingram, *The Velocity of Honey*, Viking, 2003. Cited on page 248.

193 M. Boiti, J.-P. Leon, L. Martina & F. Pempinelli, Scattering of localized solitons in the plane, *Physics Letters A* **132**, pp. 432–439, 1988, A. S. Fokas & P. M. Santini, Coherent structures in multidimensions, *Physics Review Letters* **63**, pp. 1329–1333, 1989, J. Hietarinta & R. Hirota, Multidromion solutions to the Davey–Stewartson equation, *Physics Letters A* **145**, pp. 237–244, 1990. Cited on page 248.

194 The sound frequency change with bottle volume is explained on hyperphysics.phy-astr.gsu.edu/Hbase/Waves/cavity.html. Cited on page 248.

195 A passionate introduction is Neville H. Fletcher & Thomas D. Rossing, *The Physics of Musical Instruments*, second edition, Springer 2000. Cited on page 249.

196 M. Ausloos & D. H. Berman, Multivariate Weierstrass–Mandelbrot function, *Proceedings of the Royal Society in London A* **400**, pp. 331–350, 1985. Cited on page 250.

197 Catechism of the Catholic Church, Part Two, Section Two, Chapter One, Article 3, statements 1376, 1377 and 1413, found at www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/__P41.HTM or www.vatican.va/archive/ITA0014/__P40.HTM with their official explanations on www.vatican.va/archive/compendium_ccc/documents/archive_2005_compendium-ccc_en.html and www.vatican.va/archive/compendium_ccc/documents/archive_2005_compendium-ccc_it.html. Cited on page 252.

198 The original text of the 1633 conviction of Galileo can be found on it.wikisource.org/wiki/Sentenza_di_condanna_di_Galileo_Galilei. Cited on page 253.

199 The retraction that Galileo was forced to sign in 1633 can be found on it.wikisource.org/wiki/Abiura_di_Galileo_Galilei. Cited on page 253.

200 M. Artigas/ Un nuovo documento sul caso Galileo: EE 291, *Acta Philosophica* **10**, pp. 199–214, 2001. Cited on page 253.

201 Most of these points are made, directly or indirectly, in the book by Annibale Fantoli, *Galileo: For Copernicanism and for the Church*, Vatican Observatory Publications, second edition, 1996, and by George Coyne, director of the Vatican observatory, in his speeches and publications, for example in G. Coyne, Galileo: for Copernicanism and for the church, *Zwoje* 3/36, 2003, found at www.zwoje-scrolls.com/zwoje36/text05p.htm. Cited on page 253.

202 T. A. McMahob & J. Tyler Bonner, *Form und Leben – Konstruktion vom Reißbrett der Natur*, Spektrum Verlag, 1985. Cited on page 254.

203 G. W. Koch, S. C. Sillett, G. M. Jennings & S. D. Davis, The limits to tree height, *Nature* **428**, pp. 851–854, 2004. Cited on page 254.

204 A simple article explaining the tallness of trees is A. Mineyev, Trees worthy of Paul Bunyan, *Quantum* pp. 4–10, January–February 1994. (Paul Bunyan is a mythical giant lumberjack who is the hero of the early frontier pioneers in the United States.) Note that the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

transport of liquids in trees sets no limits on their height, since water is pumped up along tree stems (except in spring, when it is pumped up from the roots) by evaporation from the leaves. This works almost without limits because water columns, when nucleation is carefully avoided, can be put under tensile stresses of over 100 bar, corresponding to 1000 m. See also P. Nobel, *Plant Physiology*, Academic Press, 2nd Edition, 1999. Cited on page 255.

205 Such information can be taken from the excellent overview article by M. F. Ashby, On the engineering properties of materials, *Acta Metallurgica* **37**, pp. 1273–1293, 1989. The article explains the various general criteria which determine the selection of materials, and gives numerous tables to guide the selection. Cited on page 255.

206 The present record for negative pressure in water was achieved by Q. Zheng, D. J. Durben, G. H. Wolf & C. A. Angell, Liquids at large negative pressures: water at the homogeneous nucleation limit, *Science* **254**, pp. 829–832, 1991. Cited on page 257.

207 H. Maris & S. Balibar, Negative pressures and cavitation in liquid helium, *Physics Today* **53**, pp. 29–34, 2000. Cited on page 257.

208 For a photograph of a single barium *atom* – named Astrid – see Hans Dehmelt, Experiments with an isolated subatomic particle at rest, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **62**, pp. 525–530, 1990. For another photograph of a barium *ion*, see W. Neuhauser, M. Hohenstatt, P. E. Toschek & H. Dehmelt, Localized visible Ba^+ mono-ion oscillator, *Physical Review A* **22**, pp. 1137–1140, 1980. See also the photograph on page 260. Cited on page 259.

209 Holograms of atoms were first produced by Hans-Werner Fink & al., Atomic resolution in lens-less low-energy electron holography, *Physical Review Letters* **67**, pp. 1543–1546, 1991. Cited on page 259.

210 A single–atom laser was built in 1994 by K. An, J. J. Childs, R. R. Dasari & M. S. Feld, Microlaser: a laser with one atom in an optical resonator, *Physical Review Letters* **73**, p. 3375, 1994. Cited on pages 259 and 1198.

211 The photograph on page 259 is the first image that showed subatomic structures (visible as shadows on the atoms). It was published by F. J. Giessibl, S. Hembacher, H. Bielefeldt & J. Mannhart, Subatomic features on the silicon (111)-(7x7) surface observed by atomic force microscopy, *Science* **289**, pp. 422 – 425, 2000. Cited on page 259.

212 See for example C. Schiller, A. A. Koomans, van Rooy, C. Schönenberger & H. B. Elswijk, Decapitation of tungsten field emitter tips during sputter sharpening, *Surface Science Letters* **339**, pp. L925–L930, 1996. Cited on page 259.

213 U. Weierstall & J. C. H. Spence, An STM with time-of-flight analyzer for atomic species identification, MSA 2000, Philadelphia, *Microscopy and Microanalysis* **6**, Supplement 2, p. 718, 2000. Cited on page 259.

214 M. J. Hancock & J. W. M. Bush, Fluid pipes, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **466**, pp. 285–304, 2002. A. E. Hosoi & J. W. M. Bush, Evaporative instabilities in climbing films, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **442**, pp. 217–239, 2001. J. W. M. Bush & A. E. Hasha, On the collision of laminar jets: fluid chains and fishbones, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **511**, pp. 285–310, 2004. Cited on page 260.

215 The present state of our understanding of turbulence is described in ... Cited on page 262.

216 K. Weltner, A comparison of explanations of aerodynamical lifting force, *American Journal of Physics* **55**, pp. 50–54, 1987, K. Weltner, Aerodynamic lifting force, *The Physics*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Teacher **28**, pp. 78–82, 1990. See also the user.uni-frankfurt.de/~weltner/Flight/PHYSIC4.htm and the www.av8n.com/how/htm/airfoils.html websites. Cited on page 263.

217 Lydéric Bocquet, The physics of stone skipping, *American Journal of Physics* **17**, pp. 150–155, 2003. The present recod holder is Kurt Steiner, with 40 skips. See pastoneskipping.com/steiner.htm and www.stoneskipping.com. The site www.yeeha.net/nassa/guin/g2.html is by the a previous world record holder, Jerdome Coleman-McGhee. Cited on page 266.

218 S. F. Kistler & L. E. Scriven, The teapot effect: sheetforming flows with deflection, wetting, and hysteresis, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **263**, pp. 19–62, 1994. Cited on page 268.

219 J. Walker, Boiling and the Leidenfrost effect, a chapter from David Halliday, Robert Resnick & Jearl Walker, *Fundamentals of Physics*, Wiley, 2007. The chapter can also be found on the internet as pdf file. Cited on page 268.

220 E. Hollander, Over trechters en zo ..., *Nederlands tijdschrift voor natuurkunde* **68**, p. 303, 2002. Cited on page 269.

221 S. Dorbolo, H. Caps & N. Vandewalle, Fluid instabilities in the birth and death of antibubbles, *New Journal of Physics* **5**, p. 161, 2003. Cited on page 270.

222 T. T. Lim, A note on the leapfrogging between two coaxial vortex rings at low Reynolds numbers, *Physics of Fluids* **9**, pp. 239–241, 1997. Cited on page 271.

223 P. Krehl, S. Engemann & D. Schwenkel, The puzzle of whip cracking – uncovered by a correlation of whip-tip kinematics with shock wave emission, *Shock Waves* **8**, pp. 1–9, 1998. The authors used high-speed cameras to study the motion of the whip. A new aspect has been added by A. Goriely & T. McMillen, Shape of a cracking whip, *Physical Review Letters* **88**, p. 244301, 2002. This article focuses on the tapered shape of the whip. However, the neglection of the tuft – a piece at the end of the whip which is required to make it crack – in the latter paper shows that there is more to be discovered still. Cited on page 274.

224 Z. Sheng & K. Yamafuji, Realization of a Human Riding a Unicycle by a Robot, *Proceedings of the 1995 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, Vol. 2, pp. 1319 – 1326, 1995. Cited on page 274.

225 On human uncicycling, see Jack Wiley, *The Complete Book of Unicycling*, Lodi, 1984, and Sebastian Hoeher, *Einradfahren und die Physik*, Reinbeck, 1991. Cited on page 274.

226 W. Thomson, Lecture to the Royal Society of Edinburgh, 18 February 1867, *Proceedings of the Royal Society in Edinborough* **6**, p. 94, 1869. Cited on page 274.

227 S. T. Thoroddsen & A. Q. Shen, Granular jets, *Physics of Fluids* **13**, pp. 4–6, 2001, and A. Q. Shen & S. T. Thoroddsen, Granular jetting, *Physics of Fluids* **14**, p. S3, 2002, Cited on page 274.

228 F. Herrmann, Mengenartige Größen im Physikunterricht, *Physikalische Blätter* **54**, pp. 830–832, September 1998. See also his lecture notes on general introductory physics on the website www.physikdidaktik.uni-karlsruhe.de/skripten. Cited on pages 276 and 282.

229 Thermostatics is difficult to learn also because it was not discovered in a systematic way. See C. Truesdell, *The Tragicomical History of Thermodynamics 1822–1854*, Springer Verlag, 1980. An excellent advanced textbook on thermostatics and thermodynamics is Linda Reichl, *A Modern Course in Statistical Physics*, Wiley, 2nd edition, 1998. Cited on page 278.

230 Gas expansion was the main method used for the definition of the official temperature scale. Only in 1990 were other methods introduced officially, such as total radiation thermometry

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

(in the range 140 K to 373 K), noise thermometry (2 K to 4 K and 900 K to 1235 K), acoustical thermometry (around 303 K), magnetic thermometry (0.5 K to 2.6 K) and optical radiation thermometry (above 730 K). Radiation thermometry is still the central method in the range from about 3 K to about 1000 K. This is explained in detail in R. L. Rusby, R. P. Hudson, M. Durieux, J. F. Schooley, P. P. M. Steur & C. A. Swenson, The basis of the ITS-90, *Metrologia* **28**, pp. 9–18, 1991. On the water boiling point see also page 953. Cited on page 278.

231 See for example the captivating text by Gino Segrè, *A Matter of Degrees: What Temperature Reveals About the Past and Future of Our Species, Planet and Universe*, Viking, New York, 2002. Cited on page 279.

232 D. Karstädt, F. Pinno, K.-P. Möllmann & M. Vollmer, Anschauliche Wärmelehre im Unterricht: ein Beitrag zur Visualisierung thermischer Vorgänge, *Praxis der Naturwissenschaften Physik* **5-48**, pp. 24–31, 1999, K.-P. Möllmann & M. Vollmer, Eine etwas andere, physikalische Sehweise - Visualisierung von Energieumwandlungen und Strahlungsphysik für die (Hochschul-)lehre, *Physikalische Bllätter* **56**, pp. 65–69, 2000, D. Karstädt, K.-P. Möllmann, F. Pinno & M. Vollmer, There is more to see than eyes can detect: visualization of energy transfer processes and the laws of radiation for physics education, *The Physics Teacher* **39**, pp. 371–376, 2001, K.-P. Möllmann & M. Vollmer, Infrared thermal imaging as a tool in university physics education, *European Journal of Physics* **28**, pp. S37–S50, 2007. Cited on page 281.

233 B. Polster, What is the best way to lace your shoes?, *Nature* **420**, p. 476, 5 December 2002. Cited on page 283.

234 See for example the article by H. Preston-Thomas, The international temperature scale of 1990 (ITS-90), *Metrologia* **27**, pp. 3–10, 1990, and the errata H. Preston-Thomas, The international temperature scale of 1990 (ITS-90), *Metrologia* **27**, p. 107, 1990, Cited on page 286.

235 For an overview, see Christian Enss & Siegfried Hunklinger, *Low-Temperature Physics*, Springer, 2005. Cited on page 286.

236 The famous paper on Brownian motion which contributed so much to Einstein's fame is A. Einstein, Über die von der molekularkinetischen Theorie der Wärme geforderte Bewegung von in ruhenden Flüssigkeiten suspendierten Teilchen, *Annalen der Physik* **17**, pp. 549–560, 1905. In the following years, Einstein wrote a series of further papers elaborating on this topic. For example, he published his 1905 Ph.D. thesis as A. Einstein, Eine neue Bestimmung der Moleküldimensionen, *Annalen der Physik* **19**, pp. 289–306, 1906, and he corrected a small mistake in A. Einstein, Berichtigung zu meiner Arbeit: 'Eine neue Bestimmung der Moleküldimensionen', *Annalen der Physik* **34**, pp. 591–592, 1911, where, using new data, he found the value $6.6 \cdot 10^{23}$ for Avogadro's number. Cited on page 287.

237 The first tests of the prediction were performed by J. Perrin, *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences* **147**, pp. 475–476, and pp. 530–532, 1908. He masterfully sums up the whole discussion in Jean Perrin, *Les atomes*, Librarie Félix Alcan, Paris, 1913. Cited on page 288.

238 Pierre Gaspard & al., Experimental evidence for microscopic chaos, *Nature* **394**, p. 865, 27 August 1998. Cited on page 288.

239 These points are made clearly and forcibly, as is his style, by van Kampen, Entropie, *Nederlands tijdschrift voor natuurkunde* **62**, pp. 395–396, 3 December 1996. Cited on page 290.

240 This is a disappointing result of all efforts so far, as Grégoire Nicolis always stresses in his university courses. Seth Lloyd has compiled a list of 31 proposed definitions of complexity,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

containing among others, fractal dimension, grammatical complexity, computational complexity, thermodynamic depth. See, for example, a short summary in *Scientific American* p. 77, June 1995. Cited on page 290.

241 Minimal entropy is discussed by L. Szilard, Über die Entropieverminderung in einem thermodynamischen System bei Eingriffen intelligenter Wesen, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **53**, pp. 840–856, 1929. This classic paper can also be found in English translation in his collected works. Cited on page 290.

242 G. Cohen-Tannoudji, *Les constantes universelles*, Pluriel, Hachette, 1998. See also L. Brillouin, *Science and Information Theory*, Academic Press, 1962. Cited on pages 290 and 291.

243 H. W. Zimmermann, Particle entropies and entropy quanta IV: the ideal gas, the second law of thermodynamics, and the P-t uncertainty relation, *Zeitschrift für physikalische Chemie* **217**, pp. 55–78, 2003, and H. W. Zimmermann, Particle entropies and entropy quanta V: the P-t uncertainty relation, *Zeitschrift für physikalische Chemie* **217**, pp. 1097–1108, 2003. Cited on page 291.

244 See for example A. E. Shalyt-Margolin & A. Ya. Tregubovich, Generalized uncertainty relation in thermodynamics, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0307018, or J. Uffink & van Lith-van Dis, Thermodynamic uncertainty relations, *Foundations of Physics* **29**, p. 655, 1999. Cited on page 291.

245 B. Lavenda, *Statistical Physics: A Probabilistic Approach*, Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1991. Cited on page 291.

246 The quote is found in the introduction by George Wald to the text by Lawrence J. Henderson, *The Fitness of the Environment*, Macmillan, New York, 1913, reprinted 1958. Cited on page 292.

247 A fascinating introduction to chemistry is the text by John Emsley, *Molecules at an Exhibition*, Oxford University Press, 1998. Cited on page 293.

248 An excellent introduction into the physics of heat is the book by Linda Reichl, *A Modern Course in Statistical Physics*, Wiley, 2nd edition, 1998. Cited on page 294.

249 Emile Borel, *Introduction géométrique à la physique*, Gauthier-Villars, 1912. Cited on page 295.

250 See V. L. Telegdi, Enrico Fermi in America, *Physics Today* **55**, pp. 38–43, June 2002. Cited on page 295.

251 K. Schmidt-Nielsen, *Desert Animals: Physiological Problems of Heat and Water*, Oxford University Press, 1964. Cited on page 296.

252 Why entropy is created when information is erased, but not when it is acquired, is explained in Charles H. Bennett & Rolf Landauer, Fundamental Limits of Computation, *Scientific American* **253:1**, pp. 48–56, 1985. The conclusion: we should pay to throw the newspaper away, not to buy it. Cited on page 298.

253 See, for example, G. Swift, Thermoacoustic engines and refrigerators, *Physics Today* **48**, pp. 22–28, July 1995. Cited on page 300.

254 Quoted in D. Campbell, J. Crutchfield, J. Farmer & E. Jen, Experimental mathematics: the role of computation in nonlinear science, *Communications of the Association of Computing Machinery* **28**, pp. 374–384, 1985. Cited on page 302.

255 For more about the shapes of snowflakes, see the famous book by W. A. Bentley & W. J. Humphreys, *Snow Crystals*, Dover Publications, New York, 1962. This second printing of the original from 1931 shows a large part of the result of Bentley's lifelong passion, namely several thousand photographs of snowflakes. Cited on page 302.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

256 K. Schwenk, Why snakes have forked tongues, *Science* **263**, pp. 1573–1577, 1994. Cited on page 302.

257 E. Martínez, C. Pérez-Penichet, O. Sotolongo-Costa, O. Ramos, K.J. Måløy, S. Douady, E. Altshuler, Uphill solitary waves in granular flows, *Physical Review* **75**, p. 031303, 2007, and E. Altshuler, O. Ramos, E. Martínez, A.J. Batista-Leyva, A. Rivera & K.E. Bassler, Sandpile formation by revolving rivers, *Physical Review Letters* **91**, p. 014501, 2003. Cited on page 303.

258 P.B. Umbanhowar, F. Melo & H.L. Swinney, Localized excitations in a vertically vibrated granular layer, *Nature* **382**, pp. 793–796, 29 August 1996. Cited on page 304.

259 D.K. Campbell, S. Flach & Y.S. Kivshar, Localizing energy through nonlinearity and discreteness, *Physics Today* **57**, pp. 43–49, January 2004. Cited on page 304.

260 B. Andreotti, The song of dunes as a wave-particle mode locking, *Physical Review Letters* **92**, p. 238001, 2004. Cited on page 305.

261 D.C. Mays & B.A. Faybishenko, Washboards in unpaved highways as a complex dynamic system, *Complexity* **5**, pp. 51–60, 2000. Cited on pages 305 and 395.

262 K. Kötter, E. Goles & M. Markus, Shell structures with 'magic numbers' of spheres in a swirled disk, *Physical Review E* **60**, pp. 7182–7185, 1999. Cited on page 305.

263 A good introduction is the text by Daniel Walgraef, *Spatiotemporal Pattern Formation, With Examples in Physics, Chemistry and Materials Science*, Springer 1996. Cited on page 305.

264 For an overview, see the Ph.D. thesis by Joceline Lega, *Défauts topologiques associés à la brisure de l'invariance de translation dans le temps*, Université de Nice, 1989. Cited on page 307.

265 An idea of the fascinating mechanisms at the basis of the heart beat is given by A. Babloyantz & A. Destexhe, Is the normal heart a periodic oscillator?, *Biological Cybernetics* **58**, pp. 203–211, 1989. Cited on page 308.

266 For a short, modern overview of turbulence, see L.P. Kadanoff, A model of turbulence, *Physics Today* **48**, pp. 11–13, September 1995. Cited on page 309.

267 For a clear introduction, see T. Schmidt & M. Mahrl, A simple mathematical model of a dripping tap, *European Journal of Physics* **18**, pp. 377–383, 1997. Cited on page 309.

268 An overview of science humour can be found in the famous anthology compiled by R.L. Weber, edited by E. Mendoza, *A Random Walk in Science*, Institute of Physics, 1973. It is also available in several expanded translations. Cited on page 309.

269 K. Mertens, V. Putkaradze & P. Vorobieff, Braiding patterns on an inclined plane, *Nature* **430**, p. 165, 2004. Cited on page 311.

270 These beautifully simple experiments were published in G. Müller, Starch columns: analog model for basalt columns, *Journal of Geophysical Research* **103**, pp. 15239–15253, 1998, in G. Müller, Experimental simulation of basalt columns, *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research* **86**, pp. 93–96, 1998, and in G. Müller, Trocknungsrisse in Stärke, *Physikalische Blätter* **55**, pp. 35–37, 1999. Cited on page 311.

271 B. Hof, van Doorne, J. Westerweel, F.T.M. Nieuwstadt, H. Wedin, R. Kerswell, F. Waleffe, H. Faisst & B. Eckhardt, Experimental observation of nonlinear traveling waves in turbulent pipe flow, *Science* **305**, pp. 1594–1598, 2004. Cited on page 312.

272 A fascinating book on the topic is Kenneth Laws & Martha Swope, *Physics and the Art of Dance: Understanding Movement*, Oxford University Press 2002. Cited on page 313.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

273 Josef H. Reichholf, *Eine kurze Naturgeschichte des letzten Jahrtausends*, S. Fischer Verlag, 2007. Cited on page 313.

274 J. J. Lissauer, Chaotic motion in the solar system, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **71**, pp. 835–845, 1999. Cited on page 314.

275 See Jean-Paul Dumont, *Les écoles présocratiques*, Folio Essais, Gallimard, 1991, p. 426. Cited on page 314.

276 For a clear overview of the various sign conventions in general relativity, see the front cover of Charles W. Misner, Kip S. Thorne & John A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, Freeman, 1973. We use the gravitational sign conventions of Hans C. Ohanian & Remo Ruffini, *Gravitazione e spazio-tempo*, Zanichelli, 1997. Cited on page 319.

277 George Birkbeck Norman Hill, *Johnsonian Miscellanies*, Clarendon Press, 1897, in Seward's Biographiana/ Cited on page 319.

278 The first written record of the letter U seems to be Leon Battista Alberti, *Grammatica della lingua toscana*, 1442, the first grammar of a modern (non-latin) language, written by a genius that was intellectual, architect and the father of cryptology. The first written record of the letter J seems to be Antonio de Nebrija, *Gramática castellana*, 1492. Before writing it, Nebrija lived for ten years in Italy, so that it is possible that the I/J distinction is of Italian origin as well. Nebrija was one of the most important Spanish scholars. Cited on page 320.

279 For more information about the letters thorn and eth, have a look at the extensive report to be found on the website www.everytype.com/standards/wynnyogh/thorn.html. Cited on page 320.

280 For a modern history of the English language, see David Crystal, *The Stories of English*, Allen Lane, 2004. Cited on page 320.

281 Hans Jensen, *Die Schrift*, Berlin, 1969, translated into English as *Sign, Symbol and Script: an Account of Man's Efforts to Write*, Putnam's Sons, 1970. Cited on page 321.

282 David R. Lide, editor, *CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics*, 78th edition, CRC Press, 1997. This classic reference work appears in a new edition every year. The full Hebrew alphabet is given on page 2-90. The list of abbreviations of physical quantities for use in formulae approved by ISO, IUPAP and IUPAC can also be found there.

However, the ISO 31 standard, which defines these abbreviations, costs around a thousand euro, is not available on the internet, and therefore can safely be ignored, like any standard that is supposed to be used in teaching but is kept inaccessible to teachers. Cited on pages 323 and 324.

283 See the mighty text by Peter T. Daniels & William Bright, *The World's Writing Systems*, Oxford University Press, 1996. Cited on page 323.

284 See the for example the fascinating book by Steven B. Smith, *The Great Mental Calculators – The Psychology, Methods and Lives of the Calculating Prodigies*, Columbia University Press, 1983. The book also presents the techniques that they use, and that anybody else can use to emulate them. Cited on page 324.

285 See for example the article 'Mathematical notation' in the *Encyclopedia of Mathematics*, 10 volumes, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1988–1993. But first all, have a look at the informative and beautiful members.aol.com/jeff570/mathsym.html website. The main source for all these results is the classic and extensive research by Florian Cajori, *A History of Mathematical Notations*, 2 volumes, The Open Court Publishing Co., 1928–1929. The square root sign is used in Christoff Rudolff, *Die Coss*, Vuolfius Cephaleus Joanni Jung: Argentorati, 1525. (The full title was *Behend vnnd Hubsch Rechnung durch die kunstreichen regeln*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Algebre so gemeinlicklich die Coss genent werden. Darinnen alles so treülich an tag gegeben, das auch allein auss vleissigem lesen on allen mündtlichē vnterricht mag begriffen werden, etc.) Cited on page 324.

286 J. Tschichold, *Formenwamdlungen der et-Zeichen*, Stempel AG, 1953. Cited on page 326.

287 Malcolm B. Parkes, *Pause and Effect: An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West*, University of California Press, 1993. Cited on page 326.

288 This is explained by Berthold Louis Ullman, *Ancient Writing and its Influence*, 1932. Cited on page 326.

289 Paul Lehmann, *Erforschung des Mittelalters – Ausgewählte Abhandlungen und Aufsätze*, Anton Hiersemann, 1961, pp. 4–21. Cited on page 326.

290 Bernard Bischoff, *Paläographie des römischen Altertums und des abendländischen Mittelalters*, Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1979, pp. 215–219. Cited on page 326.

291 Hutton Webster, *Rest Days: A Study in Early Law and Morality*, MacMillan, 1916. The discovery of the unlucky day in Babylonia was made in 1869 by George Smith, who also rediscovered the famous *Epic of Gilgamesh*. Cited on page 326.

292 The connections between Greek roots and many French words – and thus many English ones – can be used to rapidly build up a vocabulary of ancient Greek without much study, as shown by the practical collection by J. Chaineux, *Quelques racines grecques*, Wetteren – De Meester, 1929. See also Donald M. Ayers, *English Words from Latin and Greek Elements*, University of Arizona Press, 1986. Cited on page 328.

293 In order to write well, read William Strunk & E. B. White, *The Elements of Style*, Macmillan, 1935, 1979, or Wolf Schneider, *Deutsch für Kenner – Die neue Stilkunde*, Gruner und Jahr, 1987. Cited on page 329.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

CHALLENGE HINTS AND SOLUTIONS

> Never make a calculation before you know the answer.
>
> John Wheeler's motto

John Wheeler wanted people to estimate, to try and to guess; but not saying the guess out loud. A correct guess reinforces the physics instinct, whereas a wrong one leads to the pleasure of surprise. Guessing is thus an important first step in solving every problem.

Challenge 1, page 12: Do not hesitate to be demanding and strict. The next edition of the text will benefit from it.

Challenge 2, page 13: These topics are all addressed later in the text.

Challenge 3, page 23: There are many ways to distinguish real motion from an illusion of motion: for example, only real motion can be used to set something else into motion. In addition, the motion illusions of the figures show an important failure; nothing moves if the head and the paper remain fixed with respect to each other. In other words, the illusion only *amplifies* existing motion, it does not *create* motion from nothing.

Challenge 4, page 24: Without detailed and precise experiments, both sides can find examples to prove their point. Creation is supported by the appearance of mould or bacteria in a glass of water; creation is also supported by its opposite, namely traceless disappearance, such as the disappearance of motion. However, conservation is supported and creation falsified by all those investigations that explore assumed cases of appearance or disappearance in full detail.

Challenge 6, page 26: Political parties, sects, helping organizations and therapists of all kinds are typical for this behaviour.

Challenge 7, page 30: The issue is not yet completely settled for the motion of empty space, such as in the case of gravitational waves. In any case, empty space is not made of small particles of finite size, as this would contradict the transversality of gravity waves.

Challenge 8, page 32: The circular definition is: objects are defined as what moves with respect to the background, and the background is defined as what stays when objects change. We shall Page 317 return to this important issue several times in our adventure. It will require a certain amount of patience to solve it, though.

Challenge 9, page 34: Holes are not physical systems, because in general they cannot be tracked.

Challenge 10, page 34: See page 1097.

Challenge 11, page 36: Hint: yes, there is such a point.

Challenge 12, page 36: See Figure 208 for an intermediate step. A bubble bursts at a point, and then the rim of the hole increases rapidly, until it disappears on the antipodes. During that process the remaining of the bubble keeps its spherical shape, as shown in the figure. For a film of the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 208 A soap bubble while bursting (© Peter Wienerroither)

process, see www.youtube.com/watch?v=SpcXtmkk26Q. In other words, the final droplets that are ejected stem from the point of the bubble which is opposite to the point of puncture; they are never ejected from the centre of the bubble.

Challenge 13, page 36: A ghost can be a moving image; it cannot be a moving object, as objects cannot interpenetrate. See page 1068.

Challenge 14, page 36: If something could stop moving, motion could disappear into nothing. For a precise proof, one would have to show that no atom moves any more. So far, this has never been observed: motion is conserved. (Nothing in nature can disappear into nothing.)

Challenge 15, page 36: This would indeed mean that space is infinite; however, it is impossible to observe that something moves "for ever": nobody lives that long.

Challenge 16, page 36: How would you measure this?

Challenge 17, page 36: The number of reliable digits of a measurement result is a simple quantification of precision. More details can be found by looking up 'standard deviation' in the index.

Challenge 18, page 36: No; memory is needed for observation and measurements. This is the case for humans and measurement apparatus. Quantum theory will make this particularly clear.

Challenge 19, page 36: Note that you never have observed zero speed. There is always some measurement error which prevents one to say that something is zero. No exceptions!

Challenge 20, page 37: The necessary rope length is nh, where n is the number of wheels/pulleys.

Challenge 21, page 37: $(2^{64} - 1) = 18\,446\,744\,073\,700\,551\,615$ grains of wheat, with a grain weight of 40 mg, are 738 thousand million tons. Given a world harvest in 2006 of 606 million tons, the grains amount to about 1200 years of the world's wheat harvests.

The grain number calculation is simplified by using the formula $1 + m + m^2 + m^3 + ...m^n = (m^{n+1} - 1)/(m - 1)$, that gives the sum of the so-called *geometric sequence*. (The name is historical and is used as a contrast to the *arithmetic sequence* $1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 + ...n = n(n + 1)/2$.) Can you prove the two expressions?

The chess legend is mentioned first by Abu-l 'Abbas Ahmand Ibn Khallikan (1211–1282)Khallikan, Ibn. King Shiram and king Balhait, also mentioned in the legend, are historical figures that lived between the second and fourth century CE. The legend appears to have combined two different stories. Indeed, the calculation of grains appears already in the year 947, in the famous text *Meadows of Gold and Mines of Precious Stones* by Abu ul-Hasan 'Ali ibn Husayn ibn 'Ali ul-Mas'udi.Masudi, Ibn

Challenge 22, page 37: In clean experiments, the flame leans inwards. But such experiments

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

are not easy, and sometimes the flame leans outwards. Just try it. Can you explain both observations?

Challenge 23, page 37: Accelerometers are the simplest motion detectors. They exist in form of piezoelectric devices that produce a signal whenever the box is accelerated and can cost as little as one euro. Another accelerometer that might have a future is an interference accelerometer that makes use of the motion of an interference grating; this device might be integrated in silicon. Other, more precise accelerometers use gyroscopes or laser beams running in circles.

Velocimeters and position detectors can also detect motion; they need a wheel or at least an optical way to look out of the box. Tachographs in cars are examples of velocimeters, computer mice are examples of position detectors.

A cheap enough device would be perfect to measure the speed of skiers or skaters. No such device exists yet.

Challenge 24, page 37: The ball rolls (or slides) towards the centre of the table, as the table centre is somewhat nearer to the centre of the Earth than the border; then the ball shoots over, performing an oscillation around the table centre. The period is 84 min, as shown in challenge 337. (This has never been observed, so far. Why?)

Challenge 25, page 37: Only if the acceleration never vanishes. Accelerations can be felt. Accelerometers are devices that measure accelerations and then deduce the position. They are used in aeroplanes when flying over the atlantic. If the box does not accelerate, it is impossible to say whether it moves or sits still. It is even impossible to say in which direction one moves. (Close your eyes in a train at night to confirm this.)

Challenge 26, page 37: The block moves twice as fast as the cylinders, independently of their radius.

Challenge 27, page 38: This methods is known to work with other fears as well.

Challenge 28, page 38: Three couples require 11 passages. Two couples require 5. For four or more couples there is no solution. What is the solution if there are n couples and $n-1$ places on the boat?

Challenge 29, page 38: Hint: there is an infinite number of such shapes. These curves are called also *Reuleaux curves*. Another hint: The 20 p and 50 p coins in the UK have such shapes. And yes, other shapes than cylinders are also possible: take a twisted square cylinder, for example.

Challenge 30, page 38: Conservation, relativity and minimization are valid generally. In some rare processes in nuclear physics, motion invariance is broke, as is mirror invariance. Continuity is known not to be valid at smallest length and time intervals, but not experiments has yet probed those domains, so that it is still valid in practice.

Challenge 31, page 39: In everyday life, this is correct; what happens when quantum effects are taken into account?

Challenge 32, page 41: Take the average distance change of two neighbouring atoms in a piece of quartz over the last million years. Do you know something still slower?

Challenge 33, page 40: There is only one way: compare the velocity to be measured with the speed of light. In fact, almost all physics textbooks, both for schools and for university, start with the definition of space and time. Otherwise excellent relativity textbooks have difficulties avoiding this habit, even those that introduce the now standard k-calculus (which is in fact the approach mentioned here). Starting with speed is the logically cleanest approach.

Challenge 34, page 42: There is no way to sense one's own motion if one is in vacuum. No way in principle. This result is often called the *principle of relativity*.

Page 132

In fact, there is a way to measure one's motion in space (though not in vacuum): measure your speed with respect to the background radiation. So one has to be careful about what is meant.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 209 Sunbeams in a forest (© Fritz Bieri and Heinz Rieder)

Challenge 35, page 42: The wing load W/A, the ratio between weight W and wing area A, is obviously proportional to the third root of the weight. (Indeed, $W \sim l^3$, $A \sim l^2$, l being the dimension of the flying object.) This relation gives the green trend line.

The wing load W/A, the ratio between weight W and wing area A, is, like all forces in fluids, proportional to the square of the cruise speed v: we have $W/A = v^2 0.38\,\mathrm{kg/m^3}$. The unexplained factor contains the density of air and a general numerical coefficient that is difficult to calculate. This relation connects the upper and lower horizontal scales in the graph.

As a result, the cruise speed scales as the *sixth root* of weight: $v \sim W^{1/6}$. In other words, an Airbus A380 is 750 000 million times heavier than a fruit fly, but only a hundred times as fast.

Challenge 36, page 46: Equivalently: do points in space exist? The final part of our ascent studies this issue in detail; see page 1401.

Challenge 37, page 47: All electricity sources must use the same phase when they feed electric power into the net. Clocks of computers on the internet must be synchronized.

Challenge 38, page 47: Note that the shift increases quadratically with time, not linearly.

Challenge 39, page 47: Natural time is measured with natural motion. Natural motion is the motion of light. Natural time is thus defined with the motion of light.

Challenge 40, page 48: Galileo measured time with a scale (and with other methods). His stopwatch was a water tube that he kept closed with his thumb, pointing into a bucket. To start the stopwatch, he removed his thumb, to stop it, he put it back on. The volume of water in the bucket then gave him a measure of the time interval. This is told in his famous book Galileo Galilei, *Discorsi e dimostrazioni matematiche intorno a due nuove scienze attenenti alla mecanica e i movimenti locali*, usually simply called the 'Discorsi', which he published in 1638 with Louis Elsevier in Leiden, in the Netherlands.

Challenge 41, page 49: There is no way to define a local time at the poles that is consistent with all neighbouring points. (For curious people, check the website www.arctic.noaa.gov/gallery_np.html.)

Challenge 43, page 53: The forest is full of light and thus of light rays: they are straight, as shown by the sunbeams in Figure 209.

Challenge 44, page 53: One pair of muscles moves the lens along the third axis by deforming the eye from prolate to spherical to oblate.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 45, page 53: This you can solve trying to think in four dimensions. Try to imagine how to switch the sequence when two pieces cross. Note: it is usually *not* correct, in this domain, to use time instead of a fourth *spatial* dimension!

Challenge 46, page 55: Measure distances using light.

Challenge 49, page 58: It is easier to work with the unit torus. Take the unit interval $[0,1]$ and equate the end points. Define a set B in which the elements are a given real number b from the interval plus all those numbers who differ from that real by a rational number. The unit circle can be thought as the union of all the sets B. (In fact, every set B is a shifted copy of the rational numbers $\mathbb{Q}$.) Now build a set A by taking one element from each set B. Then build the set family consisting of the set A and its copies A_q shifted by a rational q. The union of all these sets is the unit torus. The set family is countably infinite. Then divide it into *two* countably infinite set families. It is easy to see that each of the two families can be renumbered and its elements shifted in such a way that each of the two families forms a unit torus.

Ref. 40 Mathematicians say that there is no countably infinitely additive measure of $\mathbb{R}^n$ or that sets such as A are non-measurable. As a result of their existence, the 'multiplication' of lengths is possible. Later on we shall explore whether bread or *gold* can be multiplied in this way.

Challenge 50, page 59: Hint: start with triangles.

Challenge 51, page 59: An example is the region between the x-axis and the function which assigns 1 to every transcendental and 0 to every non-transcendental number.

Challenge 52, page 60: We use the definition of the function of the text. The dihedral angle of a regular tetrahedron is an irrational multiple of π, so the tetrahedron has a non-vanishing Dehn invariant. The cube has a dihedral angle of $\pi/2$, so the Dehn invariant of the cube is 0. Therefore, the cube is not equidecomposable with the regular tetrahedron.

Challenge 53, page 60: If you think you can show that empty space is continuous, you are wrong. Check your arguments. If you think you can prove the opposite, you *might* be right – but only if you already know what is explained in the final part of the text. If that is not the case, check your arguments.

Challenge 54, page 61: Obviously, we use light to check that the plumb line is straight, so the two definitions must be the same. This is the case because the field lines of gravity are also possible paths for the motion of light. However, this is not always the case; can you spot the exceptions?

Another way to check straightness is along the surface of calm water.

A third, less precise way, way is to make use of the straightness sensors on the brain. The human brain has a built-in faculty to determine whether an objects seen with the eyes is straight. There are special cells in the brain that fore when this is the case. Any book on vision perception tells more about this topic.

Challenge 55, page 61: The hollow Earth theory is correct if the distance formula is used consistently. In particular, one has to make the assumption that objects get smaller as they approach the centre of the hollow sphere. Good explanations of all events are found on www.geocities.com/inversedearth. Quite some material can be found on the internet, also under the names of celestrocentric system, inner world theory or concave Earth theory. There is no way to prefer one description over the other, except possibly for reasons of simplicity or intellectual laziness.

Challenge 57, page 62: A hint is given in Figure 210. For the measurement of the speed of light with almost the same method, see page 404.

Challenge 58, page 62: A fast motorbike is faster: a driver can catch an arrow, a stunt that was shown on a television show.

Challenge 59, page 62: See Figure 212.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 210 A simple way to measure bullet speeds



FIGURE 211 Leaving a parking space – the outer turning radius



FIGURE 212 How to make a hole in a postcard that allows stepping through it

Challenge 60, page 63: Within 1 per cent, one *fifth* of the height must be empty, and four fifths must be filled; the exact value follows from $\sqrt[3]{2} = 1.25992...$

Challenge 61, page 64: The bear is white, because the obvious spot of the house is at the North pole. But there are infinitely many additional spots (without bears) near the South pole: can you find them?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 62, page 64: We call L the initial length of the rubber band, v the speed of the snail relative to the band and V the speed of the horse relative to the floor. The speed of the snail relative to the floor is given as

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}s}{\mathrm{d}t} = v + V\frac{s}{L+Vt} \,. \tag{106}$$

This is a so-called *differential equation* for the unknown snail position $s(t)$. You can check – by simple insertion – that its solution is given by

$$s(t) = \frac{v}{V}(L+Vt)\ln(1+Vt/L) \,. \tag{107}$$

Therefore, the snail reaches the horse at a time

$$t_{\text{reaching}} = \frac{L}{V}(e^{V/v}-1) \tag{108}$$

which is finite for all values of L, V and v. You can check however, that the time is very large indeed, if realistic speed values are used.

Challenge 63, page 64: Colour is a property that applies only to objects, not to boundaries. The question shows that it is easy to ask questions that make no sense also in physics.

Challenge 64, page 64: You can do this easily yourself. You can even find websites on the topic.

Challenge 66, page 64: Clocks with two hands: 22 times. Clocks with three hands: 2 times.

Challenge 67, page 65: For two hands, the answer is 143 times.

Challenge 68, page 65: The Earth rotates with 15 minutes per minute.

Challenge 69, page 65: You might be astonished, but no reliable data exist on this question. The highest speed of a throw measured so far seems to be a 45 m/s cricket bowl. By the way, much more data are available for speeds achieved with the help of rackets. The *c.* 70 m/s of fast badminton smashes seem to be a good candidate for record racket speed; similar speeds are achieved by golf balls.

Challenge 70, page 65: Yes, it can. In fact, many cats can slip through as well.

Challenge 71, page 65: 1.8 km/h or 0.5 m/s.

Challenge 73, page 65: The different usage reflects the idea that we are able to determine our position by ourselves, but not the time in which we are. The section on determinism will show Page 186 how wrong this distinction is.

Challenge 74, page 65: Yes, there is. However, this is not obvious, as it implies that space and time are not continuous, in contrast to what we learn in primary school. The answer will be found in the final part of this text.

Challenge 75, page 65: For a curve, use, at each point, the curvature radius of the circle approximating the curve in that point; for a surface, define two directions in each point and use two such circles along these directions.

Challenge 76, page 65: It moves about 1 cm in 50 ms.

Challenge 77, page 65: The surface area of the lung is between 100 and 200 m^2, depending on the literature source, and that of the intestines is between 200 and 400 m^2.

Challenge 78, page 66: A limit does not exist in classical physics; however, there is one in nature which appears as soon as quantum effects are taken into account.

Challenge 79, page 66: The final shape is a full cube without any hole.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 213 Solving the car parking puzzle (© Daniel Hawkins)

Challenge 80, page 66: The required gap is

$$= \sqrt{(L-b)^2 - w^2 + 2w\sqrt{R^2 - (L-b)^2}} - L + b \,, \tag{109}$$

as deduced from Figure 211.

Challenge 81, page 66: A smallest gap does not exist: any value will do! Can you show this?

Challenge 82, page 66: The following solution was proposed by Daniel Hawkins.

Assume you are sitting in car A, parked behind car B, as shown in Figure 213. There are two basic methods for exiting a parking space that requires the reverse gear: rotating the car to move the centre of rotation away from (to the right of) car B, and shifting the car downward to move the centre of rotation away from (farther below) car B. The first method requires car A to be partially diagonal, which means that the method will not work for d less than a certain value, essentially

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

the value given above, when no reverse gear is needed. We will concern ourselves with the second method (pictured), which will work for an infinitesimal d.

In the case where the distance d is less than the minimum required distance to turn out of the parking space without using the reverse gear for a given geometry L, w, b, R, an attempt to turn out of the parking space will result in the corner of car A touching car B at a distance T away from the edge of car B, as shown in Figure 213. This distance T is the amount by which car A must be translated downward in order to successfully turn out of the parking space.

The method to leave the parking space, shown in the top left corner of Figure 213, requires two phases to be successful: the initial **turning phase**, and the **straightening phase**. By turning and straightening out, we achieve a vertical shift downward and a horizontal shift left, while preserving the original orientation. That last part is key because if we attempted to turn until the corner of car A touched car B, car A would be rotated, and any attempt to straighten out would just follow the same arc backward to the initial position, while turning the wheel the other direction would rotate the car even more, as in the first method described above.

Our goal is to turn as far as we can and still be able to completely straighten out by time car A touches car B. To analyse just how much this turn should be, we must first look at the properties of a turning car.

Ackermann steering is the principle that in order for a car to turn smoothly, all four wheels must rotate about the same point. This was patented by Rudolph Ackermann in 1817. Some properties of Ackermann steering in relation to this problem are as follows:

- The back wheels stay in alignment, but the front wheels (which we control), must turn different amounts to rotate about the same centre.
- The centres of rotation for left and right turns are on opposite sides of the car
- For equal magnitudes of left and right turns, the centres of rotation are equidistant from the nearest edge of the car. Figure 213 makes this much clearer.
- All possible centres of rotation are on the same line, which also always passes through the back wheels.
- When the back wheels are "straight" (straight will always mean in the same orientation as the initial position), they will be vertically aligned with the centres of rotation.
- When the car is turning about one centre, say the one associated with the maximum left turn, then the potential centre associated with the maximum right turn will rotate along with the car. Similarly, when the cars turns about the right centre, the left centre rotates.

Now that we know the properties of Ackermann steering, we can say that in order to maximize the shift downward while preserving the orientation, we must turn left about the 1st centre such that the 2nd centre rotates a *horizontal* distance d, as shown in Figure 213. When this is achieved, we brake, and turn the steering wheel the complete opposite direction so that we are now turning right about the 2nd centre. Because we shifted leftward d, we will straighten out at the exact moment car A comes in contact with car B. This results in our goal, a downward shift m and leftward shift d while preserving the orientation of car A. A similar process can be performed in reverse to achieve another downward shift m and a *rightward* shift d, effectively moving car A from its initial position (before any movement) downward $2m$ while preserving its orientation. This can be done indefinitely, which is why it is possible to get out of a parking space with an infinitesimal d between car A and car B. To determine how many times this procedure (both sets of turning and straightening) must be performed, we must only divide T (remember T is the amount by which car A must be shifted downward in order to turn out of the parking spot

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

normally) by $2m$, the total downward shift for one iteration of the procedure. Symbolically,

$$n = \frac{T}{2m}$$

In order to get an expression for n in terms of the geometry of the car, we must solve for T and $2m$. To simplify the derivations we define a new length x, also shown in Figure 213.

$$x = \sqrt{R^2 - (L-b)^2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} T + (x - w) &= \sqrt{R^2 - (L-b+d)^2} \\ T &= \sqrt{R^2 - (L-b+d)^2} - x + w \\ &= \sqrt{R^2 - (L-b+d)^2} - \sqrt{R^2 - (L-b)^2} + w \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (x + (x-w)) - m &= \sqrt{(x + (x-w))^2 - d^2} \\ m &= 2x - w - \sqrt{(2x-w)^2 - d^2} \\ &= 2\sqrt{R^2 - (L-b)^2} - w - \sqrt{(2\sqrt{R^2 - (L-b)^2} - w)^2 - d^2} \\ &= 2\sqrt{R^2 - (L-b)^2} - w - \sqrt{4(R^2 - (L-b)^2) - 4w\sqrt{R^2 - (L-b)^2} + w^2 - d^2} \\ &= 2\sqrt{R^2 - (L-b)^2} - w - \sqrt{4R^2 - 4(L-b)^2 - 4w\sqrt{R^2 - (L-b)^2} + w^2 - d^2} \\ 2m &= 4\sqrt{R^2 - (L-b)^2} - 2w - 2\sqrt{4R^2 - 4(L-b)^2 - 4w\sqrt{R^2 - (L-b)^2} + w^2 - d^2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} n &= \frac{T}{2m} \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{R^2 - (L-b+d)^2} - \sqrt{R^2 - (L-b)^2} + w}{4\sqrt{R^2 - (L-b)^2} - 2w - 2\sqrt{4R^2 - 4(L-b)^2 - 4w\sqrt{R^2 - (L-b)^2} + w^2 - d^2}} \end{aligned}$$

The value of n must always be rounded *up* to the next integer to determine how many times one must go backward and forward to leave the parking spot.

Challenge 83, page 67: Nothing, neither a proof nor a disproof.

Challenge 84, page 67: See page 405. On shutters, see also the discussion on page 1492.

Challenge 85, page 67: A hint for the solution is given by Figure 214.

Challenge 86, page 67: Because they are or were liquid.

Challenge 87, page 67: The shape is shown in Figure 215; it has eleven lobes.

Challenge 88, page 68: The cone angle φ, the angle between the cone axis and the cone border (or equivalently, *half* the apex angle of the cone) is related to the solid angle Ω through the relation $\Omega = 2\pi(1 - \cos\varphi)$. Use the surface area of a spherical cap to confirm this result.

Challenge 90, page 68: See Figure 216.

Challenge 93, page 69: Hint: draw all objects involved.

Challenge 94, page 69: The curve is obviously called a *catenary*, from Latin 'catena' for chain. The formula for a catenary is $y = a\cosh(x/a)$. If you approximate the chain by short straight

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 214 A simple drawing – one of the many possible one – proving Pythagoras' theorem



FIGURE 215 The trajectory of the middle point between the two ends of the hands of a clock



FIGURE 216 The angles defined by the hands against the sky, when the arms are extended

segments, you can make wooden blocks that can form an arch without any need for glue. The St. Louis arch is in shape of a catenary. A suspension bridge has the shape of a catenary before it is loaded, i.e., before the track is attached to it. When the bridge is finished, the shape is in between a catenary and a parabola.

Challenge 95, page 70: The inverse radii, or curvatures, obey $a^2 + b^2 + c^2 + d^2 = (1/2)(a + b + c + d)^2$. This formula was discovered by René Descartes. If one continues putting circles in the remaining spaces, one gets so-called circle packings, a pretty domain of recreational mathematics. They have many strange properties, such as intriguing relations between the coordinates of the circle centres and their curvatures.

Challenge 96, page 70: There are two solutions. (Why?) They are the two positive solutions of $l^2 = (b + x)^2 + (b + b^2/x)^2$; the height is then given as $h = b + x$. The two solutions are 4.84 m and 1.26 m. There are closed formulas for the solutions; can you find them?

Challenge 97, page 70: The best way is to calculate first the height B at which the blue ladder

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 217 A high-end slide rule, around 1970 (© Jörn Lütjens)

touches the wall. It is given as a solution of $B^4 - 2hB^3 - (r^2 - b^2)B^2 + 2h(r^2 - b^2)B - h^2(r^2 - b^2) = 0$. Integer-valued solutions are discussed in MARTIN GARDNER, *Mathematical Circus*, Spectrum, 1996.

Challenge 98, page 70: Draw a logarithmic scale, i.e., put every number at a distance corresponding to its natural logarithm. Such a device, called a *slide rule*, is shown in Figure 217. Slide rules were the precursors of electronic calculators; they were used all over the world in prehistoric times, i.e., until around 1970. See also the web page www.oughtred.org.

Challenge 99, page 70: Two more. Build yourself a model of the Sun and the Earth to verify this.

Challenge 100, page 71: One option: use the three-dimensional analogue of Pythagoras's theorem. The answer is 9.

Challenge 101, page 71: The Sun is exactly behind the back of the observer; it is setting, and the rays are coming from behind and reach deep into the sky in the direction opposite to that of the Sun.

Challenge 103, page 71: The volume is given by $V = \int A\,dx = \int_{-1}^{1} 4(1 - x^2)\,dx = 16/3$.

Challenge 104, page 71: Yes. Try it with a paper model.

Challenge 105, page 72: Problems appear when quantum effects are added. A two-dimensional universe would have no matter, since matter is made of spin 1/2 particles. But spin 1/2 particles do not exist in two dimensions. Can you find other reasons?

Challenge 106, page 72: Two dimensions do not allow ordering of events. To say 'before' and 'afterwards' becomes impossible. In everyday life and all domains accessible to measurement, time is surely one-dimensional.

Challenge 108, page 74: From $x = gt^2/2$ you get the following rule: square the number of seconds, multiply by five and you get the depth in metres.

Challenge 109, page 74: Just experiment.

Challenge 110, page 74: The Academicians suspended one cannon ball with a thin wire just in front of the mouth of the cannon. When the shot was released, the second, flying cannon ball flew through the wire, thus ensuring that both balls started at the same time. An observer from far away then tried to determine whether both balls touched the Earth at the same time. The experiment is not easy, as small errors in the angle and air resistance confuse the results.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 111, page 75: A parabola has a so-called focus or focal point. All light emitted from that point and reflected exits in the same direction: all light ray are emitted in parallel. The name 'focus' – Latin for fireplace – expresses that it is the hottest spot when a parabolic mirror is illuminated. Where is the focus of the parabola $y = x^2$? (Ellipses have two foci, with a slightly different definition. Can you find it?)

Challenge 112, page 76: The long jump record could surely be increased by getting rid of the sand stripe and by measuring the true jumping distance with a photographic camera; that would allow jumpers to run more closely to their top speed. The record could also be increased by a small inclined step or by a spring-suspended board at the take-off location, to increase the take-off angle.

Challenge 113, page 76: Walk or run in the rain, measure your own speed v and the angle from the vertical α with which the rain appears to fall. Then the speed of the rain is $v_{\text{rain}} = v/\tan\alpha$.

Challenge 115, page 76: Neglecting air resistance and approximating the angle by 45°, we get $v = \sqrt{dg}$, or about 3.8 m/s. This speed is created by a stead pressure build-up, using blood pressure, which is suddenly released with a mechanical system at the end of the digestive canal. The cited reference tells more about the details.

Challenge 116, page 76: On horizontal ground, for a speed v and an angle from the horizontal α, neglecting air resistance and the height of the thrower, the distance d is $d = v^2 \sin 2\alpha/g$.

Challenge 117, page 76: Check your calculation with the information that the 1998 world record is juggling with 9 balls.

Challenge 118, page 76: It is said so, as rain drops would then be ice spheres and fall with high speed.

Challenge 119, page 77: There are conflicting statements in the literature. But it is a fact that people have gone to hospital because a falling bullet went straight through their head. (See S. Mirsky, It is high, it is far, *Scientific American* p. 86, February 2004.) In addition, the lead in bullets is bad for the environment.

Challenge 120, page 77: This is a true story. The answer can only be given if it is known whether the person had the chance to jump while running or not. In the case described by R. Cross, Forensic physics 101: falls from a height, *American Journal of Physics* **76**, pp. 833–837, 2008, there was no way to run, so that the answer was: murder.

Challenge 121, page 77: For jumps of an animal of mass m the necessary energy E is given as $E = mgh$, and the work available to a muscle is roughly speaking proportional to its mass $W \sim m$. Thus one gets that the height h is independent of the mass of the animal. In other words, the specific mechanical energyof animals is around 1.5 ± 0.7 J/kg.

Challenge 122, page 77: Stones never follow parabolas: when studied in detail, i.e., when the change of g with height is taken into account, their precise path turns out to be an ellipse. This shape appears most clearly for long throws, such as throws around a sizeable part of the Earth, or for orbiting objects. In short, stones follow parabolas only if the Earth is assumed to be flat. If its curvature is taken into account, they follow ellipses.

Challenge 123, page 78: The set of all rotations around a point in a plane is indeed a vector space. What about the set of all rotations around *all* points in a plane? And what about the three-dimensional cases?

Challenge 126, page 78: The scalar product between two vectors $\boldsymbol{a}$ and $\boldsymbol{b}$ is given by

$$\boldsymbol{ab} = ab\cos\sphericalangle(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}) \,. \tag{110}$$

How does this differ form the vector product?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 129, page 81: A candidate for low acceleration of a physical system might be the accelerations measured by gravitational wave detectors. They are below 10^{-13} m/s^2.

Challenge 130, page 81: In free fall (when no air is present) or inside a space station orbiting the Earth, one is accelerated but does not feel anything. In fact, this indistinguishability or equivalence between acceleration and 'feeling nothing' was an essential step for Albert Einstein in his development of general relativity.

Challenge 131, page 81: Professor to student: What is the derivative of velocity? Acceleration! What is the derivative of acceleration? I don't know. *Jerk*! The fourth, fifth and sixth derivatives of position are sometimes called *snap*, *crackle* and *pop*.

Challenge 133, page 83: One can argue that any source of light must have finite size.

Challenge 135, page 84: What the unaided human eye perceives as a tiny black point is usually about 50 µm in diameter.

Challenge 136, page 84: See page 741.

Challenge 137, page 84: One has to check carefully whether the conceptual steps that lead us to extract the concept of point from observations are correct. It will be shown in the final part of the adventure that this is not the case.

Challenge 138, page 85: One can rotate the hand in a way that the arm makes the motion described. See also page 1067.

Challenge 139, page 85: Any number, without limit.

Challenge 140, page 85: The blood and nerve supply is not possible if the wheel has an axle. The method shown to avoid tangling up connections only works when the rotating part has *no* axle: the 'wheel' must float or be kept in place by other means. It thus becomes impossible to make a wheel *axle* using a single piece of skin. And if a wheel without an axle could be built (which might be possible), then the wheel would periodically run over the connection. Could such a axle-free connection realize a propeller?

By the way, it is still thinkable that animals have wheels on axles, if the wheel is a 'dead' object. Even if blood supply technologies like continuous flow reactors were used, animals could not make such a detached wheel grow in a way tuned to the rest of the body and they would have difficulties repairing a damaged wheel. Detached wheels cannot be grown on animals; they must be dead.

Challenge 141, page 86: The brain in the skull, the blood factories inside bones or the growth of the eye are examples.

Challenge 142, page 87: In 2007, the largest big wheels for passengers are around 150 m in diameter. The largest wind turbines are around 125 m in diameter. Cement kilns are the longest wheels: they can be over 300 m along their axis.

Challenge 143, page 87: Air resistance reduces the maximum distance, which is achieved for an angle of about $\pi/4 = 45°$, from around $v^2/g = 91.7$ m down to around 50 m.

Challenge 147, page 89: One can also add the Sun, the sky and the landscape to the list.

Challenge 148, page 90: Ghosts, hallucinations, Elvis sightings, or extraterrestrials must all be one or the other. There is no third option. Even shadows are only special types of images.

Challenge 149, page 90: The issue was hotly discussed in the seventeenth century; even Galileo argued for them being images. However, they are objects, as they can collide with other objects, as the spectacular collision between Jupiter and the comet Shoemaker-Levy 9 in 1994 showed. In the meantime, satellites have been made to collide with comets and even to shoot at them (and hitting).

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 218 The measured (black bars) and calculated behaviour (coloured lines) – more precisely, the dynamical eigenvalues – of a bicycle as a function of its speed (© Arend Schwab)

Challenge 150, page 91: The minimum speed is roughly the one at which it is possible to ride without hands. If you do so, and then *gently* push on the steering wheel, you can make the experience described above. Watch out: too strong a push will make you fall badly.

The *bicycle* is one of the most complex mechanical systems of everyday life, and it is still a subject of research. And obviously, the world experts are Dutch. An overview of the behaviour of a bicycle is given in Figure 218. The main result is that the bicycle is stable in the upright position at a range of medium speeds. Only at low and at large speeds must the rider actively steer to ensure upright position of the bicycle.

For more details, see J. P. Meijaard, J. M. Papadopoulos, A. Ruina & A. L. Schwab, Linearized dynamics equations for the balance and steer of a bicycle: a benchmark and review, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A* **463**, pp. 1955–1982, 2007, and J. D. G. Kooijman, A. L. Schwab & J. P. Meijaard, Experimental validation of a model of an uncontrolled bicycle, *Multibody System Dynamics* **19**, pp. 115–132, 2008. See also the audiophile.tam.cornell.edu/~als93/Bicycle/index.htm website.

Challenge 151, page 93: If the moving ball is not rotating, after the collision the two balls will depart with a *right* angle between them.

Challenge 152, page 94: Part of the energy is converted into heat; the rest is transferred as kinetic energy of the concrete block. As the block is heavy, its speed is small and easily stopped by the human body. This effect works also with anvils, it seems. In another common variation the person does not lie on nails, but on air: he just keeps himself horizontal, with head and shoulders

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

on one chair, and the feet on a second one.

Challenge 153, page 95: Yes, mass works also for magnetism, because the precise condition is not that the interaction be central, but that it realizes a more general condition, which includes accelerations such as those produced by magnetism. Can you deduce the condition from the definition of mass?

Challenge 154, page 95: The weight decreased due to the evaporated water lost by sweating and, to a minor degree, due to the exhaled carbon bound in carbon dioxide.

Challenge 155, page 95: Rather than using the inertial effects of the Earth, it is easier to deduce its mass from its gravitational effects. See challenge 268.

Challenge 159, page 97: At first sight, relativity implies that tachyons have imaginary mass; however, the imaginary factor can be extracted from the mass–energy and mass–momentum relation, so that one can define a real mass value for tachyons; as a result, faster tachyons have smaller energy and smaller momentum. Both momentum and energy can be a negative number of any size.

Challenge 160, page 98: Legs are never perfectly vertical; they would immediately glide away. Once the cat or the person is on the floor, it is almost impossible to stand up again.

Challenge 161, page 98: Momentum (or centre of mass) conservation would imply that the environment would be accelerated into the opposite direction. Energy conservation would imply that a huge amount of energy would be transferred between the two locations, melting everything in between. Teleportation would thus contradict energy and momentum conservation.

Challenge 162, page 99: The part of the tides due to the Sun, the solar wind, and the interactions between both magnetic fields are examples of friction mechanisms between the Earth and the Sun.

Challenge 163, page 100: With the factor 1/2, increase of (physical) kinetic energy is equal to the (physical) work performed on a system: total energy is thus conserved only if the factor 1/2 is added.

Challenge 165, page 101: It is a smart application of momentum conservation.

Challenge 166, page 101: Neither. With brakes on, the damage is higher, but still equal for both cars.

Challenge 167, page 102: Heating systems, transport engines, engines in factories, steel plants, electricity generators covering the losses in the power grid, etc. By the way, the richest countries in the world, such as Sweden or Switzerland, consume only half the energy per inhabitant as the USA. This waste is one of the reasons for the lower average standard of living in the USA.

Challenge 169, page 104: Just throw it into the air and compare the dexterity needed to make it turn around various axes.

Challenge 170, page 105: Use the definition of the moment of inertia and Pythagoras' theorem for every mass element of the body.

Challenge 171, page 105: Hang up the body, attaching the rope in two different points. The crossing point of the prolonged rope lines is the centre of mass.

Challenge 173, page 106: Spheres have an orientation, because we can always add a tiny spot on their surface. This possibility is not given for microscopic objects, and we shall study this situation in the part on quantum theory.

Challenge 172, page 106: See Tables 19 and 20.

Challenge 176, page 107: Self-propelled linear motion contradicts the conservation of momentum; self-propelled change of orientation (as long as the motion stops again) does not contradict

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

any conservation law. But the deep, final reason for the difference will be unveiled in the final part of our adventure.

Challenge 177, page 107: Yes, the ape can reach the banana. The ape just has to turn around its own axis. For every turn, the plate will rotate a bit towards the banana. Of course, other methods, like blowing at a right angle to the axis, peeing, etc., are also possible.

Challenge 179, page 108: The points that move exactly along the radial direction of the wheel form a circle below the axis and above the rim. They are the points that are sharp in Figure 65 of page 107.

Challenge 180, page 108: Use the conservation of angular momentum around the point of contact. If all the wheel's mass is assumed in the rim, the final rotation speed is half the initial one; it is independent of the friction coefficient.

Challenge 182, page 109: Probably the 'rest of the universe' was meant by the writer. Indeed, a moving a part never shifts the centre of gravity of a closed system. But is the universe closed? Or a system? The last part of our adventure covers these issues.

Challenge 183, page 109: Hint: an energy per distance is a force.

Challenge 184, page 110: The conservation of angular momentum saves the glass. Try it.

Challenge 185, page 110: First of all, MacDougall's experimental data is flawed. In the six cases MacDougall examined, he did not know the exact timing of death. His claim of a mass decrease cannot be deduced from his own data. Modern measurements on dying sheep, about the same mass as humans, have shown no mass change, but clear weight pulses of a few dozen grams when the heart stopped. This temporary weight decrease could be due to the expelling of air or moisture, to the relaxing of muscles, or to the halting of blood circulation. The question is not settled.

Challenge 186, page 110: Assuming a square mountain, the height h above the surrounding crust and the depth d below are related by

$$\frac{h}{d} = \frac{\rho_m - \rho_c}{\rho_c} \tag{111}$$

where ρ_c is the density of the crust and ρ_m is the density of the mantle. For the density values given, the ratio is 6.7, leading to an additional depth of 6.7 km below the mountain.

Challenge 188, page 111: The behaviour of the spheres can only be explained by noting that elastic waves propagate through the chain of balls. Only the propagation of these elastic waves, in particular their reflection at the end of the chain, explains that the same number of balls that hit on one side are lifted up on the other. For long times, friction makes all spheres oscillate in phase. Can you confirm this?

Challenge 189, page 112: When the short cylinder hits the long one, two compression waves start to run from the point of contact through the two cylinders. When each compression wave arrives at the end, it is reflected as an expansion wave. If the geometry is well chosen, the expansion wave coming back from the short cylinder can continue into the long one (which is still in his compression phase). For sufficiently long contact times, waves from the short cylinder can thus depose much of their energy into the long cylinder. Momentum is conserved, as is energy; the long cylinder is oscillating in length when it detaches, so that not all its energy is translational energy. This oscillation is then used to drive nails or drills into stone walls. In commercial hammer drills, length ratios of 1:10 are typically used.

Challenge 190, page 112: The momentum transfer to the wall is double when the ball rebounds perfectly.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 191, page 112: If the cork is in its intended position: take the plastic cover off the cork, put the cloth around the bottle (this is for protection reasons only) and repeatedly hit the bottle on the floor or a fall in an inclined way, as shown in Figure 59 on page 98. With each hit, the cork will come out a bit.

If the cork has fallen inside the bottle: put half the cloth inside the bottle; shake until the cork falls unto the cloth. Pull the cloth out: first slowly, until the cloth almost surround the cork, and then strongly.

Challenge 193, page 113: The atomic force microscope.

Challenge 195, page 113: Running man: $E \approx 0.5 \cdot 80\,\mathrm{kg} \cdot (5\,\mathrm{m/s})^2 = 1\,\mathrm{kJ}$; rifle bullet: $E \approx 0.5 \cdot 0.04\,\mathrm{kg} \cdot (500\,\mathrm{m/s})^2 = 5\,\mathrm{kJ}$.

Challenge 196, page 113: It almost doubles in size.

Challenge 197, page 113: At the highest point, the acceleration is $g \sin\alpha$, where α is the angle of the pendulum at the highest point. At the lowest point, the acceleration is v^2/l, where l is the length of the pendulum. Conservation of energy implies that $v^2 = 2gl(1 - \cos\alpha)$. Thus the problem requires that $\sin\alpha = 2(1 - \cos\alpha)$. This results in $\cos\alpha = 3/5$.

Challenge 198, page 113: One needs the mass change equation $\mathrm{d}m/\mathrm{d}t = \pi\rho_{\mathrm{vapour}} r^2 |v|$ due to the vapour and the drop speed evolution $m\,\mathrm{d}v/\mathrm{d}t = mg - v\,\mathrm{d}m/\mathrm{d}t$. These two equations yield

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}v^2}{\mathrm{d}r} = \frac{2g}{C} - 6\frac{v^2}{r} \tag{112}$$

where $C = \rho_{\mathrm{vapour}}/4\rho_{\mathrm{water}}$. The trick is to show that this can be rewritten as

$$r\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\frac{v^2}{r} = \frac{2g}{C} - 7\frac{v^2}{r}\,. \tag{113}$$

For large times, all physically sensible solutions approach $v^2/r = 2g/7C$; this implies that for large times,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}v}{\mathrm{d}t}\frac{v^2}{r} = \frac{g}{7} \quad \text{and} \quad r = \frac{gC}{14}t^2\,. \tag{114}$$

About this famous problem, see for example, B. F. Edwards, J. W. Wilder & E. E. Scime, Dynamics of falling raindrops, *European Journal of Physics* **22**, pp. 113–118, 2001.

Challenge 201, page 114: Weigh the bullet and shoot it against a mass hanging from the ceiling. From the mass and the angle it is deflected to, the momentum of the bullet can be determined.

Challenge 203, page 114: The curve described by the midpoint of a ladder sliding down a wall is a circle.

Challenge 204, page 114: The switched use the power that is received when the switch is pushed and feed it to a small transmitter that acts a high frequency remote control to switch on the light.

Challenge 205, page 114: A clever arrangement of bimetals is used. They move every time the temperature changes from day to night – and vice versa – and wind up a clock spring. The clock itself is a mechanical clock with low energy consumption.

Challenge 207, page 118: The Coriolis effect can be seen as the sum two different effects of equal magnitude. The first effect is the following: on a rotating background, velocity changes time. What an inertial (nonrotating) observer sees as a constant velocity will be seen a velocity changing in time by the rotating observer. The acceleration seen by the rotating observer is negative, and proportional to the angular velocity and to the velocity.

The second effect is change of velocity in space. In a rotating frame of reference, different points have different velocities. The effect is negative, and proportional to the angular velocity and to the velocity.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

In total, the Coriolis acceleration (or Coriolis effect) is thus $\boldsymbol{a}_C = -2\boldsymbol{\omega} \times \boldsymbol{v}$.

Challenge 208, page 119: A *short* pendulum of length L that swings in two dimensions (with amplitude ρ and orientation φ) shows two additional terms in the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$:

$$\mathcal{L} = T - V = \frac{1}{2}m\dot{\rho}^2(1 + \frac{\rho^2}{L^2}) + \frac{l_z^2}{2m\rho^2} - \frac{1}{2}m\omega_0^2\rho^2(1 + \frac{\rho^2}{4\,L^2}) \tag{115}$$

where as usual the basic frequency is $\omega_0^2 = g/L$ and the angular momentum is $l_z = m\rho^2\dot{\varphi}$. The two additional terms disappear when $L \to \infty$; in that case, if the system oscillates in an ellipse with semiaxes a and b, the ellipse is fixed in space, and the frequency is ω_0. For *finite* pendulum length L, the frequency changes to

$$\omega = \omega_0(1 - \frac{a^2 + b^2}{16\,L^2}) \quad ; \tag{116}$$

most of all, the ellipse turns with a frequency

$$\Omega = \omega\frac{3}{8}\frac{ab}{L^2}\,. \tag{117}$$

These formulae can be derived using the least action principle, as shown by C. G. Gray, G. Karl & V. A. Novikov, Progress in classical and quantum variational principles, arxiv.org/abs/physics/0312071. In other words, a short pendulum in elliptical motion shows a precession even *without* the Coriolis effect. Since this precession frequency diminishes with $1/L^2$, the effect is small for long pendulums, where only the Coriolis effect is left over. To see the Coriolis effect in a short pendulum, one thus has to avoid that it starts swinging in an elliptical orbit by adding a suppression method of elliptical motion.

Challenge 209, page 119: The Coriolis acceleration is the reason for the deviation from the straight line. The Coriolis acceleration is due to the change of speed with distance from the rotation axis. Now think about a pendulum, located in Paris, swinging in the North-South direction with amplitude A. At the Southern end of the swing, the pendulum is further from the axis by $A \sin\varphi$, where φ is the latitude. At that end of the swing, the central support point overtakes the pendulum bob with a relative horizontal speed given by $v = 2\pi A \sin\varphi/23\,\mathrm{h}56\,\mathrm{min}$. The period of precession is given by $T_F = v/2\pi A$, where $2\pi A$ is the circumference $2\pi A$ of the envelope of the pendulum's path (relative to the Earth). This yields $T_F = 23\,\mathrm{h}56\,\mathrm{min}/\sin\varphi$. Why is the value that appears in the formula not 24 h, but 23 h56 min?

Challenge 210, page 120: The axis stays fixed with respect to distant stars, not with respect to absolute space (which is an entity that cannot be observed at all).

Challenge 211, page 120: Rotation leads to a small frequency and thus colour changes of the circulating light.

Challenge 212, page 120: The weight changes when going east or when moving west due to the Coriolis acceleration. If the rotation speed is tuned to the oscillation frequency of the balance, the effect is increased by resonance. This trick was also used by Eötvös.

Challenge 213, page 121: The Coriolis acceleration makes the bar turn, as every moving body is deflected to the side, and the two deflections add up in this case. The direction of the deflection depends on whether the experiments is performed on the northern or the southern hemisphere.

Challenge 214, page 121: When rotated by π around an east–west axis, the Coriolis force produces a drift velocity of the liquid around the tube. It has the value

$$v = 2\omega r \sin\theta, \tag{118}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 219 Deducing the expression for the Sagnac effect

as long as friction is negligible. Here ω is the angular velocity of the Earth, θ the latitude and r the (larger) radius of the torus. For a tube with 1 m diameter in continental Europe, this gives a speed of about $6.3 \cdot 10^{-5}$ m/s.

The measurement can be made easier if the tube is restricted in diameter at one spot, so that the velocity is increased there. A restriction by an area factor of 100 increases the speed by the same factor. When the experiment is performed, one has to carefully avoid any other effects that lead to moving water, such as temperature gradients across the system.

Challenge 215, page 121: Imagine a circular light path (for example, inside a circular glass fibre) and two beams moving in opposite directions along it, as shown in Figure 219. If the fibre path rotates with rotation frequency Ω, we can deduce that, after one turn, the difference ΔL in path length is

$$\Delta L = 2R\Omega t = \frac{4\pi R^2 \Omega}{c} \,. \tag{119}$$

The phase difference is thus

$$\Delta\varphi = \frac{8\pi^2 \, R^2}{c\,\lambda}\Omega \tag{120}$$

if the refractive index is 1. This is the required formula for the main case of the Sagnac effect.

Challenge 216, page 122: The metal rod is slightly longer on one side of the axis. When the wire keeping it up is burned with a candle, its moment of inertia decreases by a factor of 10^4; thus it starts to rotate with (ideally) 10^4 times the rotation rate of the Earth, a rate which is easily visible by shining a light beam on the mirror and observing how its reflection moves on the wall.

Challenge 217, page 128: The original result by Bessel was 0.3136″, or 657.7 thousand orbital radii, which he thought to be 10.3 light years or 97.5 Pm.

Challenge 219, page 131: The galaxy forms a stripe in the sky. The galaxy is thus a flattened structure. This is even clearer in the infrared, as shown more clearly in Figure 293 on page 565. From the flattening (and its circular symmetry) we can deduce that the galaxy must be rotating. Thus other matter must exist in the universe.

Challenge 221, page 133: If the Earth changed its rotation speed ever so slightly we would walk inclined, the water of the oceans would flow north, the atmosphere would be filled with storms and earthquakes would appear due to the change in Earth's shape.

Challenge 223, page 134: The scale reacts to your heartbeat. The weight is almost constant over time, except when the heart beats: for a short duration of time, the weight is somewhat lowered at each beat. Apparently it is due to the blood hitting the aortic arch when the heart pumps it upwards. The speed of the blood is about 0.3 m/s at the maximum contraction of the left ventricle. The distance to the aortic arch is a few centimetres. The time between the contraction and the reversal of direction is about 15 ms.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 224, page 134: Use Figure 78 on page 118 for the second half of the trajectory, and think carefully about the first half.

Challenge 225, page 134: Hint: starting rockets at the Equator saves a lot of energy, thus of fuel and of weight.

Challenge 226, page 135: The flame leans towards the inside.

Challenge 227, page 135: The ball leans in the direction it is accelerated to. As a result, one could imagine that the ball in a glass at rest pulls upwards because the floor is accelerated upwards. We will come back to this issue in the section of general relativity.

Challenge 229, page 135: For your exam it is better to say that centrifugal force does not exist. But since in each stationary system there is a force balance, the discussion is somewhat a red herring.

Challenge 231, page 135: Place the tea in cups on a board and attach the board to four long ropes that you keep in your hand.

Challenge 232, page 135: The friction if the tides on Earth are the main cause.

Challenge 233, page 136: An earthquake with Richter magnitude of 12 is 1000 times the energy of the 1960 Chile quake with magnitude 10; the latter was due to a crack throughout the full 40 km of the Earth's crust along a length of 1000 km in which both sides slipped by 10 m with respect to each other. Only the impact of a meteorite could lead to larger values than 12.

Challenge 234, page 136: This is not easy; a combination of friction and torques play a role. See for example the article J. Sauer, E. Schörner & C. Lennerz, Real-time rigid body simulation of some classical mechanical toys, 10th European Simulation and Symposium and Exhibition (ESS '98) 1998, pp. 93–98, or http//www.lennerz.de/paper_ess98.pdf.

Challenge 236, page 136: If a wedding ring rotates on an axis that is not a principal one, angular momentum and velocity are not parallel.

Challenge 237, page 136: Yes; it happens twice a year. To minimize the damage, dishes should be dark in colour.

Challenge 238, page 137: A rocket fired from the back would be a perfect defence against planes attacking from behind. However, when released, the rocket is effectively flying backwards with respect to the air, thus turns around and then becomes a danger to the plane that launched it. Engineers who did not think about this effect almost killed a pilot during the first such tests.

Challenge 239, page 137: Whatever the ape does, whether it climbs up or down or even lets himself fall, it remains at the same height as the mass. Now, what happens if there is friction at the wheel?

Challenge 240, page 137: Yes, if he moves at a large enough angle to the direction of the boat's motion.

Challenge 242, page 137: The moment of inertia is $\Theta = \frac{2}{5}mr^2$.

Challenge 243, page 137: The moments of inertia are equal also for the cube, but the values are $\Theta = \frac{1}{6}ml^2$. The efforts required to put a sphere and a cube into rotation are thus different.

Challenge 244, page 137: See the article by C. Ucke & H.-J. Schlichting, Faszinierendes Dynabee, *Physik in unserer Zeit* **33**, pp. 230–231, 2002.

Challenge 245, page 138: See the article by C. Ucke & H.-J. Schlichting, Die kreisende Büroklammer, *Physik in unserer Zeit* **36**, pp. 33–35, 2005.

Challenge 246, page 138: Yes. Can you imagine what happens for an observer on the Equator?

Challenge 247, page 138: A straight line at the zenith, and circles getting smaller at both sides. See an example on the website antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/ap021115.html.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 249, page 139: The plane is described in the websites cited; for a standing human the plane is the vertical plane containing the two eyes.

Challenge 250, page 139: As said before, legs are simpler than wheels to grow, to maintain and to repair; in addition, legs do not require flat surfaces (so-called 'streets') to work.

Challenge 251, page 141: The staircase formula is an empirical result found by experiment, used by engineers world-wide. Its origin and explanation seems to be lost in history.

Challenge 252, page 141: Classical or everyday nature is right-left symmetric and thus requires an even number of legs. Walking on two-dimensional surfaces naturally leads to a minimum of four legs.

Challenge 254, page 142: The length of the day changes with latitude. So does the length of a shadow or the elevation of stars at night, facts that are easily checked by telephoning a friend. Ships appear at the horizon first be showing only their masts. These arguments, together with the round shadow of the earth during a lunar eclipse and the observation that everything falls downwards everywhere, were all given already by Aristotle, in his text *On the Heavens*. It is now known that everybody in the last 2500 years knew that the Earth is s sphere. The myth that many people used to believe in a flat Earth was put into the world – as rhetorical polemic – by Copernicus. The story then continued to be exaggerated more and more during the following centuries, because a new device for spreading lies had just been invented: book printing. Fact is that since 2500 years the vast majority of people knew that the Earth is a sphere.

Page 848

Challenge 255, page 142: Robert Peary had forgotten that on the date he claimed to be at the North Pole, 6th of April 1909, the Sun is very low on the horizon, casting very long shadows, about ten times the height of objects. But on his photograph the shadows are much shorter. (In fact, the picture is taken in such a way to hide all shadows as carefully as possible.) Interestingly, he had even convinced the US congress to officially declare him the first man on the North Pole in 1911. (A rival crook had claimed to have reached it before Peary, but his photograph has the same mistake.) Peary also cheated on the travelled distances of the last few days; he also failed to mention that the last days he was pulled by his partner, Matthew Henson, because he was not able to walk any more. In fact Matthew Henson deserves more credit for that adventure than Peary. Henson, however, did not know that Peary cheated on the position they had reached.

Challenge 256, page 142: Yes, the effect has been measured for skyscrapers. Can you estimate the values?

Challenge 257, page 144: The tip of the velocity arrow, when drawn over time, produces a circle around the centre of motion.

Challenge 258, page 144: Draw a figure of the situation.

Challenge 259, page 144: Again, draw a figure of the situation.

Challenge 260, page 144: The value of the product GM for the Earth is $4.0 \cdot 10^{14}\,\mathrm{m^3/s^2}$.

Challenge 261, page 145: All points can be reached for general inclinations; but when shooting horizontally in one given direction, only points on the first half of the circumference can be reached.

Challenge 263, page 146: On the moon, the gravitational acceleration is $1.6\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$, about one sixth of the value on Earth. The surface values for the gravitational acceleration for the planets can be found on many internet sites.

Challenge 264, page 146: The Atwood machine is the answer: two almost equal masses m_1 and m_2 connected by a string hanging from a well-oiled wheel of negligible mass. The heavier one falls very slowly. Can show that the acceleration a of this 'unfree' fall is given by $a = g(m_1 - m_2)/(m_1 + m_2)$? In other words, the smaller the mass difference is, the slower the fall is.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 265, page 146: You should absolutely try to understand the origin of this expression. It allows to understand many essential concepts of mechanics. The idea is that for small amplitudes, the acceleration of a pendulum of length l is due to gravity. Drawing a force diagram for a pendulum at a general angle α shows that

$$\begin{aligned} ma &= -mg\sin\alpha \\ ml\frac{\mathrm{d}^2\alpha}{\mathrm{d}t^2} &= -mg\sin\alpha \\ l\frac{\mathrm{d}^2\alpha}{\mathrm{d}t^2} &= -g\sin\alpha\ . \end{aligned} \tag{121}$$

For the mentioned small amplitudes (below 15°) we can approximate this to

$$l\frac{\mathrm{d}^2\alpha}{\mathrm{d}t^2} = -g\alpha\ . \tag{122}$$

This is the equation for a harmonic oscillation (i.e., a sinusoidal oscillation). The resulting motion is:

$$\alpha(t) = A\sin(\omega t + \varphi)\ . \tag{123}$$

The amplitude A and the phase φ depend on the initial conditions; however, the oscillation frequency is given by the length of the pendulum and the acceleration of gravity (check it!):

$$\omega = \sqrt{\frac{l}{g}}\ . \tag{124}$$

(For arbitrary amplitudes, the formula is much more complex; see the internet or special mechanics books for more details.)

Challenge 266, page 146: Walking speed is proportional to l/T, which makes it proportional to $l^{1/2}$. The relation is also true for animals in general. Indeed, measurements show that the maximum walking speed (thus not the running speed) across all animals is given by

$$v_{\mathrm{maxwalking}} = (2.2 \pm 0.2)\,\mathrm{m}^{1/2}/\mathrm{s}\,\sqrt{l}\ . \tag{125}$$

Challenge 268, page 148: Cavendish suspended a horizontal handle with a long metal wire. He then approached a large mass to the handle, avoiding any air currents, and measured how much the handle rotated.

Challenge 269, page 148: The acceleration due to gravity is $a = Gm/r^2 \approx 5\,\mathrm{nm/s^2}$ for a mass of 75 kg. For a fly with mass $m_{\mathrm{fly}} = 0.1\,\mathrm{g}$ landing on a person with a speed of $v_{\mathrm{fly}} = 1\,\mathrm{cm/s}$ and deforming the skin (without energy loss) by $d = 0.3\,\mathrm{mm}$, a person would be accelerated by $a = (v^2/d)(m_{\mathrm{fly}}/m) = 0.4\,\mu\mathrm{m/s^2}$. The energy loss of the inelastic collision reduces this value at least by a factor of ten.

Challenge 271, page 149: The easiest way to see this is to picture gravity as a flux emanating form a sphere. This gives a $1/r^{d-1}$ dependence for the force and thus a $1/r^{d-2}$ dependence of the potential.

Challenge 273, page 151: Since the paths of free fall are ellipses, which are curves lying in a plane, this is obvious.

Challenge 274, page 152: See page 155.

Challenge 275, page 153: The low gravitational acceleration of the Moon, $1.6\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$, implies that gas molecules at usual temperatures can escape its attraction.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 220 The famous 'vomit comet', a KC-135, performing a parabolic flight (NASA)

Challenge 277, page 154: A flash of light is sent to the Moon, where several Cat's-eyes have been deposited by the Lunokhod and Apollo missions. The measurement precision of the time a flash take to go and come back is sufficient to measure the Moon's distance change. For more details, see challenge 618.

Challenge 282, page 157: The Lagrangian points L4 and L5 are on the orbit, 60° before and behind the orbiting body. They are stable if the mass ratio of the central and the orbiting body is sufficiently large (above 24.9)

Challenge 283, page 157: The Lagrangian point L3 is located on the orbit, but precisely on the other side of the central body. The Lagrangian point L1 is located on the line connecting the planet with the central body, whereas L2 lies outside the orbit, on the same line. If R is the radius of the orbit, the distance between the orbiting body and the L1 and L2 point is $\sqrt[3]{m/3M}\,R$, giving around 4 times the distance of the Moon for the Sun-Earth system. L1, L2 and L3 are saddle points, but effectively stable orbits exist around them. Many satellites make use of these properties, including the famous WMAP satellite that measured the ripples of the big bang, which is located at L2.

Challenge 284, page 159: This is a resonance effect, in the same way that a small vibration of a string can lead to large oscillation of the air and sound box in a guitar.

Challenge 286, page 160: The expression for the strength of tides, namely $2GM/d^3$, can be rewritten as $(8/3)\pi G\rho(R/d)^3$. Now, R/d is roughly the same for Sun and Moon, as every eclipse shows. So the density ρ must be much larger for the Moon. In fcat, the ratio of the strengths (height) of the tides of Moon and Sun is roughly 7 : 3. This is also the ratio between the mass densities of the two bodies.

Challenge 287, page 160: The total angular momentum of the Earth and the Moon must remain constant.

Challenge 292, page 164: Either they fell on inclined snowy mountain sides, or they fell into high trees, or other soft structures. The record was over 7 km of survived free fall. A recent case made the news in 2007 and is told in www.bbc.co.uk/jersey/content/articles/2006/12/20/michael_holmes_fall_feature.shtml.

Challenge 294, page 165: For a few thousand Euros, you can experience zero-gravity in a parabolic flight, such as the one shown in Figure 220. (Many 'photographs' of parabolic flights found on the internet are in fact computer graphics. What about this one?)

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 295, page 165: The centre of mass of a broom falls with the usual acceleration; the end thus falls faster.

Challenge 296, page 165: Just use energy conservation for the two masses of the jumper and the string. For more details, including the comparison of experimental measurements and theory, see N. Dubelaar & R. Brantjes, De valversnelling bij bungee-jumping, *Nederlands tijdschrift voor natuurkunde* **69**, pp. 316–318, October 2003.

Challenge 297, page 165: About 1 ton.

Challenge 298, page 165: About 5 g.

Challenge 299, page 166: Your weight is roughly constant; thus the Earth must be round. On a flat Earth, the weight would change from place to place, depending on your distance from the border.

Challenge 300, page 166: Nobody ever claimed that the centre of mass is the same as the centre of gravity! The attraction of the Moon is negligible on the surface of the Earth.

Challenge 302, page 167: That is the mass of the Earth. Just turn the table on its head.

Challenge 304, page 167: The Moon will be about 1.25 times as far as it is now. The Sun then will slow down the Earth–Moon system rotation, this time due to the much smaller tidal friction from the Sun's deformation. As a result, the Moon will return to smaller and smaller distances to Earth. However, the Sun will have become a red giant by then, after having swallowed both the Earth and the Moon.

Challenge 306, page 167: As Galileo determined, for a swing (half a period) the ratio is $\sqrt{2}/\pi$. (See challenge 265). But not more than two, maybe three decimals of π can be determined in this way.

Challenge 307, page 168: Momentum conservation is not a hindrance, as any tennis racket has the same effect on the tennis ball.

Challenge 308, page 168: In fact, in velocity space, elliptic, parabolic and hyperbolic motions are all described by circles. In all cases, the hodograph is a circle.
Ref. 131

Challenge 309, page 168: This question is old (it was already asked in Newton's times) and deep. One reason is that stars are kept apart by rotation around the galaxy. The other is that galaxies are kept apart by the momentum they got in the big bang. Without the big bang, all stars would have collapsed together. In this sense, the big bang can be deduced from the attraction of gravitation and the immobile sky at night. We shall find out later that the darkness of the night sky gives a second argument for the big bang.

Challenge 310, page 168: Due to the plateau, the effective mass of the Earth is larger.

Challenge 311, page 168: The choice is clear once you notice that there is no section of the orbit which is concave towards the Sun. Can you show this?

Challenge 312, page 169: It would be a black hole; no light could escape. Black holes are discussed in detail in the chapter on general relativity.
Page 604

Challenge 313, page 169: A handle of two bodies.

Challenge 316, page 169: Using a maximal jumping height of h =0.5 m on Earth and an estimated asteroid density of ρ =3 Mg/m^3, we get a maximum radius of $R^2 = 3gh/4\pi G\rho \approx 703$ m.

Challenge 317, page 170: The shape of an analemma at local noon is shown in Figure 221. The vertical extension of the analemma is due to the obliquity, i.e., the tilt of the Earth's axis (it is twice 23.45°). The horizontal extension is due to the combination of the obliquity and of the ellipticity of the orbit around the Sun. Both effects change the speed of the Earth along its orbit, leading to changes of the position of the Sun at local noon during the course of the year. The asymmetrical

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 221 The analemma photographed, at local noon, from January to December 2002, at the Parthenon on Athen's Acropolis, and a precision sundial (© Anthony Ayiomamitis, Stefan Pietrzik)

position of the central crossing point The shape of the analemma is also built into the shadow pole of precision sundials.

Challenge 318, page 171: Capture of a fluid body if possible if it is split by tidal forces.

Challenge 319, page 171: The tunnel would be an elongated ellipse in the plane of the Equator, reaching from one point of the Equator to the point at the antipodes. The time of revolution would not change, compared to a non-rotating Earth. See A. J. Simonson, Falling down a hole through the Earth, *Mathematics Magazine* 77, pp. 171–188, June 2004.

Challenge 321, page 171: The centre of mass of the solar system can be as far as twice the radius from the centre of the Sun; it thus can be outside the Sun.

Challenge 322, page 172: First, during northern summer time the Earth moves faster around the Sun than during northern winter time. Second, shallow Sun's orbits on the sky give longer days because of light from when the Sun is below the horizon.

Challenge 323, page 172: Apart from the visibility of the Moon, no effect on humans has ever been detected. Gravitational effects – including tidal effects – electrical effects, magnetic effects and changes in cosmic rays are all swamped by other effects. Indeed the gravity of passing trucks, factory electromagnetic fields, the weather and solar activity changes have larger influences on humans than th Moon. The locking of the menstrual cycle to the moon phase is a visual effect.

Challenge 324, page 172: Distances were difficult to measure. It is easy to observe a planet that is before the Sun, but it is hard to check whether a planet is behind the Sun.

Challenge 325, page 172: See the mentioned reference.

Challenge 326, page 172: True.

Challenge 327, page 173: For each pair of opposite shell elements (drawn in yellow), the two attractions compensate.

Challenge 328, page 173: There is no practical way; if the masses on the shell could move, along the surface (in the same way that charges can move in a metal) this might be possible, provided that enough mass is available.

Challenge 331, page 173: Yes, one could, and this has been thought of many times, including by Jules Verne. The necessary speed depends on the direction of the shot with respect of the rotation of the Earth.

Challenge 332, page 173: Never. The Moon points always towards the Earth. The Earth changes position a bit, due to the ellipticity of the Moon's orbit. Obviously, the Earth shows phases.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 334, page 174: What counts is *local* verticality; with respect to it, the river always flows downhill.

Challenge 335, page 174: There are no such bodies, as the chapter of general relativity will show.

Challenge 337, page 176: The oscillation is a purely sinusoidal, or harmonic oscillation, as the restoring force increases linearly with distance from the centre of the Earth. The period T for a homogeneous Earth is $T = 2\pi\sqrt{R^3/GM} = 84\,\text{min}$.

Challenge 338, page 176: The period is the same for all such tunnels and thus in particular it is the same as the 84 min valid also for the pole to pole tunnel. See for example, R. H. Romer, The answer is forty-two – many mechanics problems, only one answer, *Physics Teacher* **41**, pp. 286–290, May 2003.

Challenge 339, page 176: There is no simple answer: the speed depends on the latitude and on other parameters.

Challenge 340, page 176: The centrifugal force must be equal to the gravitational force. Call the constant linear mass density d and the unknown length l. Then we have $GMd\int_R^{R+l} \mathrm{d}r/r^2 = \omega^2 d\int_R^{R+l} r\,\mathrm{d}r$. This gives $GMdl/(R^2 + Rl) = (2Rl + l^2)\omega^2 d/2$, yielding $l = 0.14\,\text{Gm}$.

Challenge 342, page 176: The inner rings must rotate faster than the outer rings. If the rings were solid, they would be torn apart. But this reasoning is true only if the rings are inside a certain limit, the so-called *Roche limit*. The Roche limit is that radius at which gravitational force F_g and tidal force F_t cancel on the surface of the satellite. For a satellite with mass m and radius r, orbiting a central mass M at distance d, we look at the forces on a small mass μ on its surface. We get the condition $Gm\mu/r^2 = 2GM\mu r/d^3$. With a bit of algebra, one gets the Roche limit

$$d_\text{Roche} = R(2\frac{\rho_M}{\rho_m})^{1/3} \,. \tag{126}$$

Below that distance from a central mass M, fluid satellites cannot exist. The calculation shown here is only an approximation; the actual Roche limit is about two times that value.

Challenge 347, page 180: In reality muscles keep an object above ground by continuously lifting and dropping it; that requires energy and work.

Challenge 348, page 180: The electricity consumption of a rising escalator indeed increases when the person on it walks upwards. By how much?

Challenge 349, page 180: Knowledge is power. Time is money. Now, power is defined as work per time. Inserting the previous equations and transforming them yields

$$\text{money} = \frac{\text{work}}{\text{knowledge}} \,, \tag{127}$$

which shows that the less you know, the more money you make. That is why scientists have low salaries.

Challenge 351, page 181: The lack of static friction would avoid that the fluid stays attached to the body; the so-called boundary layer would not exist. One then would have to wing effect.

Challenge 353, page 183: True?

Challenge 355, page 184: From $\mathrm{d}v/\mathrm{d}t = g - v^2(1/2c_w A\rho/m)$ and using the abbreviation $c = 1/2c_w A\rho$, we can solve for $v(t)$ by putting all terms containing the variable v on one side, all terms with t on the other, and integrating on both sides. We get $v(t) = \sqrt{gm/c}\tanh\sqrt{cg/m}\,t$.

Challenge 357, page 186: The phase space has $3N$ position coordinates and $3N$ momentum coordinates.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 222 The mechanism inside the south-pointing carriage

Page 745 **Challenge 358**, page 186: The light mill is an example.

Challenge 359, page 186: Electric charge.

Challenge 360, page 186: If you have found reasons to answer yes, you overlooked something. Just go into more details and check whether the concepts you used apply to the universe. Also define carefully what you mean by 'universe'.

Challenge 362, page 187: A system showing energy or matter motion faster than light would imply that for such systems there are observers for which the order between cause and effect are reversed. A space-time diagram (and a bit of exercise from the section on special relativity) shows this.

Challenge 363, page 188: If reproducibility would not exist, we would have difficulties in checking observations; also reading the clock is an observation. The connection between reproducibility and time shall become important in the final part of our adventure.

Challenge 364, page 189: Even if surprises were only rare, each surprise would make it impossible to define time just before and just after it.

Challenge 367, page 189: Of course; moral laws are summaries of what others think or will do about personal actions.

Challenge 368, page 190: The fastest glide path between two points, the *brachistochrone*, turns out to be the *cycloid*, the curve generated by a point on a wheel that is rolling along a horizontal plane.

The proof can be found in many ways. The simplest is...

Challenge 371, page 191: Figure 222 shows the most credible reconstruction of a south-pointing carriage.

Challenge 372, page 192: The water is drawn up along the sides of the spinning egg. The fastest way to empty a bottle of water is to spin the water while emptying it.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 373, page 192: The right way is the one where the chimney falls like a V, not like an inverted V. See challenge 295 on falling brooms for inspiration on how to deduce the answer. It turns out that the chimney breaks (if it is not fastened to the base) at a height between half or two thirds of the total, depending at the angle at which this happens. For a complete solution of the problem, see the excellent paper G. VARESCHI & K. KAMIYA, Toy models for the falling chimney, *AMerican Journal of Physics* 71, pp. 1025–1031, 2003.

Challenge 381, page 200: In one dimension, the expression $F = ma$ can be written as $-\mathrm{d}V/\mathrm{d}x = m\mathrm{d}^2x/\mathrm{d}t^2$. This can be rewritten as $\mathrm{d}(-V)/\mathrm{d}x - \mathrm{d}/\mathrm{d}t[\mathrm{d}/\mathrm{d}\dot{x}(\frac{1}{2}m\dot{x}^2)] = 0$. This can be expanded to $\partial/\partial x(\frac{1}{2}m\dot{x}^2 - V(x)) - \mathrm{d}/[\partial/\partial\dot{x}(\frac{1}{2}m\dot{x}^2 - V(x))] = 0$, which is Lagrange's equation for this case.

Challenge 383, page 200: Do not despair. Up to now, nobody has been able to imagine a universe (that is not necessarily the same as a 'world') different from the one we know. So far, such attempts have always led to logical inconsistencies.

Challenge 385, page 202: The two are equivalent since the equations of motion follow from the principle of minimum action and at the same time the principle of minimum action follows from the equations of motion.

Challenge 387, page 203: For gravity, all three systems exist: rotation in galaxies, pressure in planets and the Pauli pressure in stars. Against the strong interaction, the Pauli principle acts in nuclei and neutron stars; in neutron stars maybe also rotation and pressure complement the Pauli pressure. But for the electromagnetic interaction there are no composites other than our everyday matter, which is organized by the Pauli principle alone.

Challenge 389, page 206: Angular momentum is the change with respect to angle, whereas rotational energy is again the change with respect to time, as all energy is.

Challenge 390, page 206: Not in this way. A small change can have a large effect, as every switch shows. But a small change in the brain must be communicated outside, and that will happen roughly with a $1/r^2$ dependence. That makes the effects so small, that even with the most sensitive switches – which for thoughts do not exist anyway – no effects can be realized.

Challenge 393, page 207: The relation is

$$\frac{c_1}{c_2} = \frac{\sin\alpha_1}{\alpha_2} \,. \tag{128}$$

The particular speed ratio between air (or vacuum, which is almost the same) and a material gives the *index of refraction n*:

$$n = \frac{c_1}{c_0} = \frac{\sin\alpha_1}{\alpha_0} \tag{129}$$

Challenge 394, page 207: Gases are mainly made of vacuum. Their index of refraction is near to one.

Challenge 395, page 207: Diamonds also sparkle because they work as prisms; different colours have different indices of refraction. Thus their sparkle is also due to their dispersion; therefore it is a mix of all colours of the rainbow.

Challenge 396, page 207: The principle for the growth of trees is simply the minimum of potential energy, since the kinetic energy is negligible. The growth of vessels inside animal bodies is minimized for transport energy; that is again a minimum principle. The refraction of light is the path of shortest time; thus it minimizes change as well, if we imagine light as moving entities moving without any potential energy involved.

Challenge 397, page 207: Special relativity requires that an invariant measure of the action exist. It is presented later in the walk.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 398, page 207: The universe is not a physical system. This issue will be discussed in detail later on.

Page 1440

Challenge 399, page 208: Use either the substitution $u = \tan t/2$ or use the historical trick

$$\sec\varphi = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\cos\varphi}{1+\sin\varphi} + \frac{\cos\varphi}{1+\sin\varphi}\right) . \tag{130}$$

Challenge 400, page 209: We talk to a person because we know that somebody understands us. Thus we assume that she somehow sees the same things we do. That means that observation is partly viewpoint-independent. Thus nature is symmetric.

Challenge 401, page 211: Memory works because we recognize situations. This is possible because situations over time are similar. Memory would not have evolved without this reproducibility.

Challenge 402, page 212: Taste differences are not fundamental, but due to different viewpoints and – mainly – to different experiences of the observers. The same holds for feelings and judgements, as every psychologist will confirm.

Challenge 403, page 213: The integers under addition form a group. Does a painter's set of oil colours with the operation of mixing form a group?

Challenge 404, page 213: There is only one symmetry operation: a rotation about π around the central point. That is the reason that later on the group D_4 is only called approximate symmetry group.

Challenge 410, page 217: Scalar is the magnitude of any vector; thus the speed, defined as $v = |\boldsymbol{v}|$, is a scalar, whereas the velocity $\boldsymbol{v}$ is not. Thus the length of any vector (or pseudovector), such as force, acceleration, magnetic field, or electric field, is a scalar, whereas the vector itself is not a scalar.

Challenge 413, page 218: The charge distribution of an extended body can be seen as a sum of a charge, a charge dipole, a charge quadrupole, a charge octupole, etc. The quadrupole is described by a tensor.

Compare: The inertia against motion of an extended body can be seen as sum of a mass, a mass dipole, a mass quadrupole, a mass octupole, etc. The mass quadrupole is described by the moment of inertia.

Challenge 417, page 220: The conserved charge for rotation invariance is angular momentum.

Challenge 420, page 223: An oscillation has a period in time, i.e., a discrete time translation symmetry. A wave has both discrete time and discrete space translation symmetry.

Challenge 421, page 223: Motion reversal is a symmetry for any closed system; despite the observations of daily life, the statements of thermodynamics and the opinion of several famous physicists (who form a minority though) all ideally closed systems are reversible.

Challenge 432, page 231: The potential energy is due to the 'bending' of the medium; a simple displacement produces no bending and thus contains no energy. Only the gradient captures the bending idea.

Challenge 434, page 232: The phase changes by π.

Challenge 436, page 233: Waves can be damped to extremely low intensities. If this is not possible, the observation is not a wave.

Challenge 437, page 234: The way to observe diffraction and interference with your naked fingers is told on page 726.

Challenge 444, page 243: If the distances to the loudspeaker is a few metres, and the distance to the orchestra is 20 m, as for people with enough money, the listener at home hears it first.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 446, page 243: An ellipse (as for planets around the Sun) with the fixed point as centre (in contrast to planets, where the Sun is in a focus of the ellipse).

Challenge 449, page 244: The sound of thunder or of car traffic gets lower and lower in frequency with increasing distance.

Challenge 451, page 244: Neither; both possibilities are against the properties of water: in surface waves, the water molecules move in circles.

Challenge 452, page 244: Swimmers are able to cover 100 m in 48 s, or slightly better than 2 m/s. With a body length of about 1.9 m, the critical speed is 1.7 m/s. That is why short distance swimming depends on training; for longer distances the technique plays a larger role, as the critical speed has not been attained yet. The formula also predicts that on the 1500 m distance, a 2 m tall swimmer has a potential advantage of over 45 s on one with body height of 1.8 m. In addition, longer swimmers have an additional advantage: they swim shorter distances (why?). It is thus predicted that successful long-distance swimmers will get taller and taller over time. This is a pity for a sport that so far could claim to have had champions of all sizes and body shapes, in contrast to many other sports.

Challenge 454, page 246: To reduce noise reflection and thus hall effects. They effectively diffuse the arriving wave fronts.

Challenge 456, page 246: Waves in a river are never elliptical; they remain circular.

Challenge 457, page 246: The lens is a cushion of material that is 'transparent' to sound. The speed of sound is faster in the cushion than in the air, in contrast to a glass lens, where the speed of light is slower in the glass. The shape is thus different: the cushion must look like a biconcave lens.

Challenge 459, page 246: The Sun is always at a different position than the one we observe it to be. What is the difference, measured in angular diameters of the Sun?

Challenge 460, page 246: The $3 \times 3 \times 3$ cube has a rigid system of three perpendicular axes, on which a square can rotate at each of the 6 ends. The other squares are attaches to pieces moving around theses axes. The $4 \times 4 \times 4$ cube is different though; just find out. The limit on the segment number seems to be 6, so far. A $7 \times 7 \times 7$ cube requires varying shapes for the segments. But more than $5 \times 5 \times 5$ is not found in shops. However, the website www.oinkleburger.com/Cube/applet allows to play with virtual cubes up to $100 \times 100 \times 100$ and more.

Challenge 462, page 247: An overview of systems being tested at present can be found in K.-U. Graw, Energiereservoir Ozean, *Physik in unserer Zeit* **33**, pp. 82–88, Februar 2002. See also Oceans of electricity – new technologies convert the motion of waves into watts, *Science News* **159**, pp. 234–236, April 2001.

Challenge 463, page 247: In everyday life, the assumption is usually justified, since each spot can be approximately represented by an atom, and atoms can be followed. The assumption is questionable in situations such as turbulence, where not all spots can be assigned to atoms, and most of all, in the case of motion of the vacuum itself. In other words, for gravity waves, and in particular for the quantum theory of gravity waves, the assumption is not justified.

Challenge 466, page 250: There are many. One would be that the transmission and thus reflection coefficient for waves would almost be independent of wavelength.

Challenge 467, page 251: A drop with a diameter of 3 mm would cover a surface of 7.1 m^2 with a 2 nm film.

Challenge 469, page 255: The critical height for a column of material is given by $h_{\text{crit}}^4 = \frac{\beta}{4\pi g} m \frac{E}{\rho^2}$, where $\beta \approx 1.9$ is the constant determined by the calculation when a column buckles under its own weight.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 472, page 258: One possibility is to describe see particles as extended objects, such as clouds; another is given in the last part of the text.

Challenge 474, page 262: The constant k follows from the conservation of energy and that of mass: $k = \sqrt{2/(\rho(A_1^2/A_2^2 - 1))}$. The cross sections are denoted by A and the subscript 1 refers to any point far from the constriction, and the subscript 2 to the constriction.

Challenge 475, page 264: Some people notice that in some cases friction is too high, and start sucking at one end of the tube to get the flow started; while doing so, they can inhale or swallow gasoline, which is poisonous.

Challenge 481, page 265: The blood pressure in the feet of a standing human is about 27 kPa, double the pressure at the heart.

Challenge 482, page 265: Calculation gives $N = J/j = 0.0001\,\mathrm{m^3/s}/(7\,\mu\mathrm{m}^2 0.0005\,\mathrm{m/s})$, or about $6 \cdot 10^9$; in reality, the number is much larger, as most capillaries are closed at a given instant. The reddening of the face shows what happens when all small blood vessels are opened at the same time.

Challenge 483, page 265: Throwing the stone makes the level fall, throwing the water or the piece of wood leaves it unchanged.

Challenge 484, page 265: The ship rises higher into the sky. (Why?)

Challenge 488, page 265: The pumps worked in suction; but air pressure only allows 10 m of height difference for such systems.

Challenge 489, page 266: This argument is comprehensible only when one remembers that 'twice the amount' means 'twice as many molecules'.

Challenge 490, page 266: The alcohol is frozen and the chocolate is put around it.

Challenge 491, page 266: The author suggested in an old edition that a machine should be based on the same machines that throw the clay pigeons used in the sports of trap shooting and skeet. In the meantime, Lydéric Bocquet and Christophe Clanet have built such a machine, but using a different design; a picture can be found on the website lpmcn.univ-lyon1.fr/%7Elbocquet.

Challenge 492, page 266: The third component of *air* is the noble gas argon, making up about 1 %. The rest is made up by carbon dioxide, water vapour and other gases. Are these percentages volume or weight percentages?

Challenge 493, page 266: The pleural cavity between the lungs and the thorax is permanently below atmospheric pressure. A hole in it, formed for example by a bullet, a sword or an accident, leads to the collapse of the lung – the so-called *pneumothorax* – and often to death. Open chest operations on people have became possible only after the surgeon Ferdinand Sauerbruch learned in 1904 how to cope with the problem. Nowadays, surgeons keep the lung under higher than atmospheric pressure until everything is sealed again.

Challenge 494, page 266: It uses the air pressure created by the water flowing downwards.

Challenge 495, page 266: Yes. The bulb will not resist two such cars though.

Challenge 496, page 266: Radon is about 8 times as heavy as air; it is he densest gas known. In comparison, $Ni(CO)$ is 6 times, $SiCl_4$ 4 times heavier than air. Mercury vapour (obviously also a gas) is 7 times heavier than air. In comparison, bromine vapour is 5.5 times heavier than air.

Challenge 498, page 267: None.

Challenge 500, page 267: He brought the ropes into the cabin by passing them through liquid mercury.

Challenge 501, page 268: The pressure destroys the lung.

Challenge 503, page 268: There are no official solutions for these questions; just check your assumptions and calculations carefully. The internet is full of such calculations.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 504, page 268: The soap flows down the bulb, making it thicker at the bottom and thinner at the top, until it bursts.

Challenge 506, page 268: For this to happen, friction would have to exist on the microscopic scale and energy would have to disappear.

Challenge 507, page 268: The longer funnel is empty before the short one. (If you do not believe it, try it out.) In the case that the amount of water in the funnel outlet can be neglected, one can use energy conservation for the fluid motion. This yields the famous Bernoulli equation $p/\rho + gh + v^2/2 = \text{const}$, where p is pressure, ρ the density of water, and g is $9.81\,\text{m/s}^2$. Therefore, the speed v is higher for greater lengths h of the thin, straight part of the funnel: the longer funnel empties first.

But this is strange: the formula gives a simple free fall relation, as the *air* pressure is the same above and below and disappears from the calculation. The expression for the speed is thus independent of whether a tube is present or not. The real reason for the faster emptying of the tube is thus that a tube forces more water to flow out than the lack of a tube. Without tube, the diameter of the water flow *diminishes* during fall. With tube, it stays *constant*. This difference leads to the faster emptying for longer tubes.

Alternatively, you can look at the *water* pressure value *inside* the funnel. You will discover that the water pressure is lowest at the start of the exit tube. This internal water pressure is lower for longer tubes and sucks out the water faster in those cases.

Challenge 508, page 269: The eyes of fish are positioned in such a way that the pressure reduction by the flow is compensated by the pressure increase of the stall. By the way, their heart is positioned in such a way that it is helped by the underpressure.

Challenge 510, page 269: This feat has been achieved for lower mountains, such as the Monte Bianco in the Alps. At present however, there is no way to safely hover at the high altitudes of the Himalayas.

Challenge 512, page 269: Press the handkerchief in the glass, and lower the glass into the water with the opening first, while keeping the opening horizontal. This method is also used to lower people below the sea. The paper ball in the bottle will fly towards you. Blowing into a funnel will keep the ping-pong ball tightly into place, and the more so the stronger you blow. Blowing through a funnel towards a candle will make it lean towards you.

Challenge 517, page 271: Glass shatters, glass is elastic, glass shows transverse sound waves, glass does not flow (in contrast to what many books state), not even on scale of centuries, glass molecules are fixed in space, glass is crystalline at small distances, a glass pane supported at the ends does not hang through.

Challenge 518, page 271: No metal wire allows to build such a long wire. Only the idea of carbon nanotubes has raised the hope again; some dream of wire material based on them, stronger than any material known so far. However, no such material is known yet. The system faces many dangers, such as fabrication defects, lightning, storms, meteorites and space debris. All would lead to the breaking of the wires – if such wires will ever exist. But the biggest of all dangers is the lack of cash to build it.

Challenge 520, page 272: A medium-large earthquake would be generated.

Challenge 521, page 272: A stalactite contains a thin channel along its axis through which the water flows, whereas a stalagmite is massive throughout.

Challenge 522, page 272: About 1 part in a thousand.

Challenge 523, page 272: Even though the iron core of the Earth formed by collecting the iron from colliding asteroids which then sunk into the centre of the Earth, the scheme will not work today: in its youth, the Earth was much more liquid than today. The iron will most probably not

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

sink. In addition, there is no known way to build a measurement probe that can send strong enough sound waves for this scheme. The temperature resistance is also an issue, but this may be solvable.

Challenge 525, page 274: Atoms are not infinitely hard, as quantum theory shows. Atoms are more similar to deformable clouds.

Page 1022

Challenge 527, page 281: In 5000 million years, the present method will stop, and the Sun will become a red giant. But it will burn for many more years after that.

Challenge 531, page 285: We will find out later that the universe is not a physical system; thus the concept of entropy does not apply to it. Thus the universe is neither isolated nor closed.

Page 1440

Challenge 534, page 286: The answer depends on the size of the balloons, as the pressure is not a monotonous function of the size. If the smaller balloon is not too small, the smaller balloon wins.

Challenge 536, page 286: Measure the area of contact between tires and street (all four) and then multiply by 200 kPa, the usual tire pressure. You get the weight of the car.

Challenge 541, page 288: If the average square displacement is proportional to time, the matter is made of smallest particles. This was confirmed by the experiments of Jean Perrin. The next step is to deduce the number of these particles form the proportionality constant. This constant, defined by $\langle d^2 \rangle = 4Dt$, is called the diffusion constant (the factor 4 is valid for random motion in two dimensions). The diffusion constant can be determined by watching the motion of a particle under the microscope.

We study a Brownian particle of radius a. In two dimensions, its square displacement is given by

$$\langle d^2 \rangle \frac{4kT}{\mu} t \,, \tag{131}$$

where k is the Boltzmann constant and T the temperature. The relation is deduced by studying the motion of a particle with drag force $-\mu v$ that is subject to random hits. The linear drag coefficient μ of a sphere of radius a is given by

$$\mu = 6\pi\eta a \,. \tag{132}$$

In other words, one has

$$k = \frac{6\pi\eta a}{4T} \frac{\langle d^2 \rangle}{t} \,. \tag{133}$$

All quantities on the right can be measured, thus allowing to determine the Boltzmann constant k. Since the ideal gas relation shows that the ideal gas constant R is related to the Boltzmann constant by $R = N_A k$, the Avogadro constant N_A that gives the number of molecules in a mole is also found in this way.

Challenge 549, page 295: Yes, the effect is easily noticeable.

Challenge 551, page 295: Hot air is less dense and thus wants to rise.

Challenge 552, page 295: Keep the paper wet.

Challenge 554, page 296: The air had to be dry.

Challenge 555, page 296: In general, it is impossible to draw a line through three points. Since absolute zero and the triple point of water are fixed in magnitude, it was practically a sure bet that the boiling point would not be at precisely 100 °C.

Challenge 556, page 296: No, as a water molecule is heavier than that. However, if the water is allowed to be dirty, it is possible. What happens if the quantum of action is taken into account?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 223 A candle on Earth and in microgravity (NASA)

Challenge 557, page 296: The danger is not due to the amount of energy, but due to the time in which it is available.

Challenge 558, page 297: The internet is full of solutions.

Challenge 560, page 297: Only if it is a closed system. Is the universe closed? Is it a system? This is discussed in the final part of the mountain ascent.

Challenge 563, page 298: For such small animals the body temperature would fall too low. They could not eat fast enough to get the energy needed to keep themselves warm.

Challenge 572, page 299: It is about 10^{-9} that of the Earth.

Challenge 574, page 299: The thickness of the folds in the brain, the bubbles in the lung, the density of blood vessels and the size of biological cells.

Challenge 575, page 299: The mercury vapour above the liquid gets saturated.

Challenge 576, page 299: A dedicated NASA project studied this question. Figure 223 gives an example comparison. You can find more details on their website.

Challenge 577, page 299: The risks due to storms and the financial risks are too large.

Challenge 578, page 300: The vortex inside the tube is cold near its axis and hot in the regions away from the axis. Through the membrane in the middle of the tube (shown in Figure 194 on page 300) the air from the axis region is sent to one end and the air from the outside region to the other end. The heating of the outside region is due to the work that the air rotating inside has to do on the air outside to get a rotation that consumes angular momentum. For a detailed explanation, see the beautiful text by MARK P. SILVERMAN, *And Yet it Moves: Strange Systems and Subtle Questions in Physics*, Cambridge University Press, 1993, p. 221.

Challenge 579, page 300: Egg white hardens at 70°C, egg yolk at 65 to 68°C. Cook an egg at the latter temperature, and the feat is possible.

Challenge 583, page 300: In the case of water, a few turns mixes the ink, and turning backwards increases the mixing. In the case of glycerine, a few turns *seems* to mix the ink, and turning backwards undoes the mixing.

Challenge 585, page 301: Negative temperatures are a conceptual crutch definable only for systems with a few discrete states; they are not real temperatures, because they do not describe equilibrium states, and indeed never apply to systems with a continuum of states.

Challenge 586, page 302: This is also true for the shape human bodies, the brain control of human motion, the growth of flowers, the waves of the sea, the formation of clouds, the processes leading to volcano eruptions, etc.

Challenge 591, page 308: First, there are many more butterflies than tornadoes. Second, tornadoes do not rely on small initial disturbances for their appearance. Third, the belief in the butter-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

fly 'effect' completely neglects an aspect of nature that is essential for self-organization: friction and dissipation. The butterfly 'effect', assumed that it existed, would require that dissipation in the air should have completely unrealistic properties. This is not the case in the atmosphere. But most important of all, there is no experimental basis for the 'effect': it has never been observed. Thus it does not exist.

Challenge 602, page 315: All three statements are hogwash. A drag coefficient implies that the cross area of the car is known to the same precision. This is actually extremely difficult to measure and to keep constant. In fact, the value 0.375 for the Ford Escort was a cheat, as many other measurements showed. The fuel consumption is even more ridiculous, as it implies that fuel volumes and distances can be measured to that same precision. Opinion polls are taken by phoning at most 2000 people; due to the difficulties in selecting the right representative sample, that gives a precision of at most 3 %.

Challenge 603, page 316: No. Nature does not allow more than about 20 digits of precision, as we will discover later in our walk. That is not sufficient for a standard book. The question whether such a number can be part of its own book thus disappears.

Challenge 605, page 317: Space-time is defined using matter; matter is defined using space-time.

Challenge 606, page 317: Fact is that physics has been based on a circular definition for hundreds of years. Thus it is possible to build even an exact science on sand. Nevertheless, the elimination of the circularity is an important aim.

Challenge 607, page 317: Every measurement is a comparison with a standard; every comparison requires light or some other electromagnetic field. This is also the case for time measurements.

Challenge 608, page 317: Every mass measurement is a comparison with a standard; every comparison requires light or some other electromagnetic field.

Challenge 609, page 317: Angle measurements have the same properties as length or time measurements.

Challenge 611, page 333: For example, speed inside materials is slowed, but between atoms, light still travels with vacuum speed.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



CREDITS

Acknowledgements

Many people who have kept their gift of curiosity alive have helped to make this project come true. Most of all, Saverio Pascazio has been – present or not – a constant reference for this project. Fernand Mayné, Anna Koolen, Ata Masafumi, Roberto Crespi, Serge Pahaut, Luca Bombelli, Herman Elswijk, Marcel Krijn, Marc de Jong, Martin van der Mark, Kim Jalink, my parents Peter and Isabella Schiller, Mike van Wijk, Renate Georgi, Paul Tegelaar, Barbara and Edgar Augel, M. Jamil, Ron Murdock, Carol Pritchard, Richard Hoffman, Stephan Schiller and, most of all, my wife Britta have all provided valuable advice and encouragement.

Many people have helped with the project and the collection of material. Most useful was the help of Mikael Johansson, Bruno Barberi Gnecco, Lothar Beyer, the numerous improvements by Bert Sierra, the detailed suggestions by Claudio Farinati, the many improvements by Eric Sheldon, the detailed suggestions by Andrew Young, the continuous help and advice of Jonatan Kelu, the corrections of Elmar Bartel, and in particular the extensive, passionate and conscientious help of Adrian Kubala.

Important material was provided by Bert Peeters, Anna Wierzbicka, William Beaty, Jim Carr, John Merrit, John Baez, Frank DiFilippo, Jonathan Scott, Jon Thaler, Luca Bombelli, Douglas Singleton, George McQuarry, Tilman Hausherr, Brian Oberquell, Peer Zalm, Martin van der Mark, Vladimir Surdin, Julia Simon, Antonio Fermani, Don Page, Stephen Haley, Peter Mayr, Allan Hayes, Norbert Dragon, Igor Ivanov, Doug Renselle, Wim de Muynck, Steve Carlip, Tom Bruce, Ryan Budney, Gary Ruben, Chris Hillman, Olivier Glassey, Jochen Greiner, squark, Martin Hardcastle, Mark Biggar, Pavel Kuzin, Douglas Brebner, Luciano Lombardi, Franco Bagnoli, Lukas Fabian Moser, Dejan Corovic, Steve Carlip, Corrado Massa, Tom Helmond, Gary Gibbons, Heinrich Neumaier, Peter Brown, Paul Vannoni, John Haber, Saverio Pascazio, Klaus Finkenzeller, Leo Volin, Jeff Aronson, Roggie Boone, Lawrence Tuppen, Quentin David Jones, Arnaldo Uguzzoni, Frans van Nieuwpoort, Alan Mahoney, Britta Schiller, Petr Danecek, Ingo Thies, Vitaliy Solomatin, Carl Offner, Nuno Proença, Elena Colazingari, Paula Henderson, Daniel Darre, Wolfgang Rankl, John Heumann, Joseph Kiss, Martha Weiss, Antonio González, Antonio Martos, André Slabber, Ferdinand Bautista, Zoltán Gácsi, Pat Furrie, Michael Reppisch, Enrico Pasi, Thomas Köppe, Martin Rivas, Herman Beeksma, Tom Helmond, John Brandes, Vlad Tarko, Nadia Murillo, Ciprian Dobra, Romano Perini, Harald van Lintel, Andrea Conti, François Belfort, Dirk Van de Moortel, Heinrich Neumaier, Jarosław Królikowski, John Dahlman, Fathi Namouni, Paul Townsend, Sergei Emelin, Freeman Dyson, S.R. Madhu Rao, David Parks, Jürgen Janek, Daniel Huber, Alfons Buchmann, William Purves, Pietro Redondi, Sergei Kopeikin, plus a number of people who wanted to remain unnamed.

The software tools were refined with extensive help on fonts and typesetting by Michael Zedler and Achim Blumensath and with the repeated and valuable support of Donald Arseneau; help came also from Ulrike Fischer, Piet van Oostrum, Gerben Wierda, Klaus Böhncke, Craig Upright, Herbert Voss, Andrew Trevorrow, Danie Els, Heiko Oberdiek, Sebastian Rahtz, Don Story, Vin-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

cent Darley, Johan Linde, Joseph Hertzlinger, Rick Zaccone, John Warkentin, Ulrich Diez, Uwe Siart, Will Robertson, Joseph Wright Enrico Gregorio, Rolf Niepraschk and Alexander Grahn.

All illustrations and animations in the text were made available by the copyright holders. A warm thank you to all of them. They are mentioned in the image and film credit sections. In particular, Luca Gastaldi, Antonio Martos and Ulrich Kolberg produced images specifically for this text; Lucas Barbosa and José Antonio Díaz Navas produced special animations. The typesetting and book design is due to the professional consulting of Ulrich Dirr. The design of the book and its website owe also much to the suggestions and support of my wife Britta.

Since May 2007, the production and distribution of this text is generously supported by the Klaus Tschira Foundation.

Film credits

The clear animation of a suspended spinning top, shown on page 125, was made for this text by Lucas V. Barbosa. The beautiful animation of the lunation on page 153 was calculated from actual astronomical data and is copyright and courtesy by Martin Elsässer. It can be found on his website www.mondatlas.de/lunation.html. The film of an oscillating quartz on page 228 is copyright and courtesy of Micro Crystal, part of the Swatch Group, found at www.microcrystal.com. The films of solitons on page 242 and of dromions on page 249 are copyright and courtesy by Jarmo Hietarinta. They can be found on his website users.utu.fi/hietarin. The film of leapfrogging vortex rings on page 271 is copyright and courtesy by Lim Tee Tai. It can be found via his fluid dynamics website serve.me.nus.edu.sg. The film of the growing snowflake on page 306 is copyright and courtesy by Kenneth Libbrecht. It can be found on his website www.its.caltech.edu/~atomic/snowcrystals.

Image credits

The mountain photograph on the cover is courtesy and copyright by Dave Thompson (www.daveontrek.co.uk). The lightning photograph on page 19 is courtesy and copyright by Harald Edens and found on the www.lightningsafety.noaa.gov/photos.htm and www.weather-photography.com websites. The motion illusion on page 25 is courtesy and copyright by Michael Bach and found on his website www.michaelbach.de/ot/mot_rotsnake/index.html. It is a variation of the illusion by Kitaoka Akiyoshi found on www.ritsumei.ac.jp/~akitaoka and used here with his permission. The figures on pages 27, 59 and 164 were made especially for this text and are copyright by Luca Gastaldi. The high speed photograph of a bouncing tennis ball on page 26 is courtesy and copyright by the International Tennis Federation, and were provided by Janet Page. The figure of Etna on pages 28 and 510 is copyright and courtesy of Marco Fulle and taken from the wonderful website www.stromboli.net. The famous photograph of the Les Poulains and its lighthouse by Philip Plisson on page 29 is courtesy and copyright by Pechêurs d'Images; see the websites www.plisson.com and www.pecheurs-d-images.com. It is also found in Plisson's magnus opus *La Mer*, a stunning book of photographs of the sea. The picture on page 30 of Alexander Tsukanov jumping from one ultimate wheel to another is copyright and courtesy of the Moscow State Circus. The photograph of a deer on page 32 is copyright and courtesy of Tony Rodgers and taken from his website www.flickr.com/photos/moonm. The graph on page 43 is redrawn and translated from the wonderful book by Henk Tennekes, *De wetten van de vliegkunst - Over stijgen, dalen, vliegen en zweven*, Aramith Uitgevers, 1993. The photographs of the ping-pong ball on page 45 and of the dripping water tap on page 261 are copyright and courtesy of Andrew Davidhazy and found on his website www.rit.edu/~andpph. The photograph of the bouncing water droplet on page 45 are copyright and courtesy of Max

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Groenendijk and found on the website www.lightmotif.nl. The photograph of the precision sundial on page 49 is copyright and courtesy of Stefan Pietrzik and found at commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Image:Präzissions-Sonnenuhr_mit_Sommerwalze.jpg The graph on the scaling of biological rhythms on page 51 is courtesy and copyright of Enrique Morgado. The illustrations of the vernier caliper and the micrometer screw on page 56 and 66 are copyright of Medien Werkstatt, courtesy of Stephan Bogusch, and taken from their instruction course found on their website www.medien-werkstatt.de. The photo of the tiger on page 56 is copyright of Naples zoo (in Florida, not in Italy), and courtesy of Tim Tetzlaff; see their website at www.napleszoo.com. The other length measurement devices on page 56 are courtesy and copyright of Keyence and Leica Geosystems, found at www.leica-geosystems.com. The curvimeter photograph on page 58 is copyright and courtesy of Frank Müller and found on the www.wikimedia.org website. The crystal photograph on the left of page 61 is copyright and courtesy of Stephan Wolfsried and found on the www.mindat.org website. The crystal photograph on the right of page 61 is courtesy of Tullio Bernabei, copyright of Arch. Speleoresearch & Films/La Venta and and found on the www.laventa.it and www.naica.com.mx websites. The hollow Earth figure on pages 63 and 624 is courtesy of Helmut Diel and was drawn by Isolde Diel. The wonderful photographs on page 69, page 129, page 143, page 156, page 170 and page 380 are courtesy and copyright by Anthony Ayiomamitis; the story of the photographs is told on his beautiful website at www.perseus.gr. The anticrepuscular photograph on page 71 is courtesy and copyright by Peggy Peterson. The firing caterpillar figure of page 76 is courtesy and copyright of Stanley Caveney. The photograph of an airbag sensor on page 82 is courtesy and copyright of Bosch; the accelerometer picture is is courtesy and copyright of Rieker Electronics; the three drawings of the human ear are copyright of Northwestern University and courtesy of Tim Hain and found on his website www.dizziness-and-balance.com/disorders/bppv/otoliths.html. The photograph of Orion on page 84 is courtesy and copyright by Matthew Spinelli. The photograph of N. decemspinosa on page 86 is courtesy and copyright of Robert Full, and found on his website rjf9.biol.berkeley.edu/twiki/bin/view/PolyPEDAL/LabPhotographs. The photograph of P. ruralis on page 86 is courtesy and copyright of John Brackenbury, and part of his wonderful collection on the website www.sciencephoto.co.uk. The millipede photograph on page 86 is courtesy and copyright of David Parks, and found on his website www.mobot.org/mobot/madagascar/image.asp?relation=A71. The photograph of the Gekko climbing the bus window on page 86 is courtesy and copyright of Marcel Berendsen, and found on his website www.flickr.com/photos/berendm. The photograph of comet McNaught on page 87 is courtesy and copyright by its discoveror, Robert McNaught; it is taken from his website at www.mso.anu.edu.au/~rmn and is found also on antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/ap070122.html. The photograph of the standard kilogram on page 91 is courtesy and copyright by the Bureau International des Poids et Mesures (BIPM). The photograph of Mendeleyev's balance on page 97 is copyright of Thinktank Trust and courtesy of Jack Kirby; it can be found on the www.birminghamstories.co.uk website. The photograph of the laboratory scale on page 97 is copyright and courtesy of Mettler-Toledo. The measured graph of the walking human on page 108 is courtesy and copyright of Ray McCoy. The photograph of Foucault's gyroscope on page 120 is courtesy and copyright of the museum of the CNAM, the Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers in Paris, whose website is at www.arts-et-metiers.net. The photograph of the laser gyroscope on page 120 is courtesy and copyright of JAXA, the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency, and found on their website at jda.jaxa.jp. The drawing of the precision laser gyroscope on page 122 is courtesy and copyright of the Bundesamt für Kartographie und Geodäsie. The photograph of the instrument is courtesy and copyright of Carl Zeiss. The machine is located at the Fundamentalstation Wettzell, and its website is found at www.wettzell.ifag.de. The graph of the temperature record on page 130 is copyright and courtesy Jean Jouzel and Science/AAAS. The sonoluminsecence picture on page 134 is courtesy and copyright of Detlev

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Lohse. Figure 98 on page 138 is courtesy and copyright of the international Gemini project (Gemini Observatory/Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy) at www.ausgo.unsw.edu.au and www.gemini.edu. The photograph of the clock that needs no winding up is copyright Jaeger-LeCoultre and courtesy of Ralph Stieber. Its history and working are described in detail in a brochure available from the company. The company's website is www.Jaeger-LeCoultre.com. The basilisk running over water, page 140 and on the back cover, is courtesy and copyright by the Belgian group TERRA vzw and found on their website www.terra.vzw.org. The water strider photograph on page 140 is courtesy and copyright by Charles Lewallen. The photograph of the water robot on page 140 is courtesy and copyright by the American Institute of Physics. The photograph of the precision pendulum clock on page 145 is copyright of Erwin Sattler OHG,Sattler OHG, Erwin and courtesy of Ms. Stephanie Sattler-Rick; it can be found at the www.erwinsattler.de website. The figure on the triangulation of the meridian of Paris on page 147 is copyright and courtesy of Ken Alder and found on his website www.kenalder.com. The geoid of page 150 is courtesy and copyright by the GFZ Potsdam, found at www.gfz-potsdam.de. The photograph of the Galilean satellites on page 151 is courtesy and copyright by Robin Scagell and taken from his website www.galaxypix.com. The moon maps on page 153 are courtesy of the USGS Astrogeology Research Program, astrogeology.usgs.gov, in particular Mark Rosek and Trent Hare. The photograph of the tides on page 158 is copyright and courtesy of Gilles Régnier and found on his website www.gillesregnier.com; it also shows an animation of that tide over the whole day. The pictures fast descents on snow on page 166 are copyright and courtesy of Simone Origone, www.simoneorigone.it, and of Éric Barone, www.ericbarone.com. The pictures of solar eclipses on page 176 are courtesy and copyright by the Centre National d'Etudes Spatiales, at www.cnes.fr, and of Laurent Laveder, from his beautiful site at www.PixHeaven.net. The pictures of daisies on page 193 are copyright and courtesy of Giorgio Di Iorio, found on his website www.flickr.com/photos/gioischia, and of Thomas Lüthi, found on his website www.tiptom.ch/album/blumen/. The photograph of fireworks in Chantilly on page 195 is courtesy and copyright of Christophe Blanc and taken from his beautiful website at christopheblanc.free.fr. The figure of myosotis on page 210 is courtesy and copyright by Markku Savela. The interference figures on page 233 are copyright and courtesy of Rüdiger Paschotta and found on his free laser encyclopedia at www.rp-photonics.com. The figure of the soliton in the water canal on page 241 is copyright and courtesy of Dugald Duncan and taken from his website on www.ma.hw.ac.uk/solitons/soliton1.html. The fractal mountain on page 251 is courtesy and copyright by Paul Martz, who explains on his website www.gameprogrammer.com/fractal.html how to program such images. The photographs of silicon carbide on page 256 are copyright and courtesy of Dietmar Siche. The photograph of an AFM on page 258 is copyright of Nanosurf (see www.nanosurf.ch) and used with kind permission of Robert Sum. The AFM image of silicon on page 259 is copyright of the Universität Augsburg and is used by kind permission of German Hammerl. The figure of helium atoms on metal on page 259 is copyright and courtesy of IBM. The photograph of a single barium ion on page 260 is copyright and courtesy of Werner Neuhauser at the Universität Hamburg. The photographs of fluid motion on page 261 are copyright and courtesy of John Bush, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and taken from his web site www-math.mit.edu/~bush. The photograph of the smoke ring at Etna on page 270 is courtesy and copyright by Daniela Szczepanski and found at her extensive websites www.vulkanarchiv.de and www.vulkane.net. The photograph of the Atomium on page 274 is courtesy and copyright by the Asbl Atomium Vzw and used with their permission, in cooperation with SABAM in Belgium. Both the picture and the Atomium itself are under copyright. The photographs of the granular jet on page 275 in sand are copyright and courtesy of Amy Shen, who discovered the phenomenon together with Sigurdur Thoroddsen. The photograph of the bucket-wheel excavator on page 277 is copyright and courtesy of RWE and can be found on their website www.rwe.com. The thermographic im-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

ages of a braking bicycle on page 279 are copyright Klaus-Peter Möllmann and Michael Vollmer, Fachhochschule Brandenburg/Germany, and courtesy of Michael Vollmer and Frank Pinno. The balloon photograph on page 285 is copyright Johan de Jong and courtesy of the Dutch Balloon Register found at www.dutchballoonregister.nl.ballonregister, nederlands The scanning tunnelling microscope picture of gold on page 293 is courtesy of Sylvie Rousset and copyright by CNRS in France. The photographs and figure on page 303 are copyright and courtesy of Ernesto Altshuler, Claro Noda and coworkers, and found on their website www.complexperiments.net. The road corrugation photo is courtesy of David Mays and taken from his paper Ref. 261. The oscillon picture on page 305 is courtesy and copyright by Paul Umbanhowar. The drawing of swirled spheres on page 305 is courtesy and copyright by Karsten Kötter. The pendulum fractal on page 308 is courtesy and copyright by Paul Nylander and found on his website bugman123.com.

The fluid flowing over an inclined plate on page 310 is courtesy and copyright by Vakhtang Putkaradze. The photograph of the Belousov-Zhabotinski reaction on page 311 is courtesy and copyright of Yamaguchi University and found on their picture gallery at www.sci.yamaguchi-u.ac.jp/sw/sw2006/. The photographs of starch columns on page 312 are copyright of Gerhard Müller (1940–2002), and are courtesy of Ingrid Hörnchen. The other photographs on the same page are courtesy and copyright of Raphael Kessler, from his websitewww.raphaelk.co.uk, of Bob Pohlad, from his websitewww.ferrum.edu/bpohlad, and of Cédric Hüsler. The photograph of sunbeams on page 358 is copyright and courtesy by Fritz Bieri and Heinz Rieder and found on their website www.beatenbergbilder.ch. The drawing on page 362 is courtesy and copyright of Daniel Hawkins. The photograph of a slide rule on page 366 is courtesy and copyright of Jörn Lütjens, and found on his website www.joernluetjens.de. The photograph of the bursting soap bubble on page 356 is copyright and courtesy by Peter Wienerroither and found on his website homepage.univie.ac.at/Peter.Wienerroither. The historical portraits of physicists in the text do not have copyright, except where mentioned. All drawings not explicitly mentioned are copyright © 1997 – 2009 by Christoph Schiller. If you suspect that a copyright is not correctly given or obtained, this has not done on purpose, and you are kindly asked to contact the author.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Second Part



Relativity

In our quest to learn how things move,
the experience of hiking and other motion
leads us to discover that there is a maximum speed in nature,
and that two events that happen at the same time for one observer
may not for another.
We discover that empty space can bend, wobble and move,
we find that there is a maximum force in nature,
and we understand why we can see the stars.

Contents

401 15 Maximum speed, observers at rest, and motion of light

Can one play tennis using a laser pulse as the ball and mirrors as rackets? 406 • Albert Einstein 407 • The speed of light as an invariant limit speed 408 • Special relativity with a few lines 410 • Acceleration of light and the Doppler effect 412 • The difference between light and sound 414 • Can one shoot faster than one's shadow? 415 • The composition of velocities 417 • Observers and the principle of special relativity 418 • What is space-time? 422 • Can we travel to the past? – Time and causality 423

425 **Curiosities about special relativity**

Faster than light: how far can we travel? 425 • Synchronization and time travel – can a mother stay younger than her own daughter? 425 • Length contraction 428 • Relativistic films – aberration and Doppler effect 431 • Which is the best seat in a bus? 431 • How fast can one walk? 434 • Is the speed of shadow greater than the speed of light? 435 • Parallel to parallel is not parallel – Thomas rotation 437 • A never-ending story – temperature and relativity 438

438 **Relativistic mechanics**

Mass in relativity 439 • Why relativistic snooker is more difficult 440 • Mass is concentrated energy 441 • Collisions, virtual objects and tachyons 444 • Systems of particles – no centre of mass 446 • Why is most motion so slow? 447 • The history of the mass–energy equivalence formula of De Pretto and Einstein 447 • 4-vectors 448 • 4-momentum 451 • 4-force 452 • Rotation in relativity 453 • Wave motion 454 • The action of a free particle – how do things move? 455 • Conformal transformations – why is the speed of light constant? 456

458 **Accelerating observers**

Acceleration for inertial observers 459 • Accelerating frames of reference 460 • Event horizons 464 • Acceleration changes colours 465 • Can light move faster than *c*? 466 • What is the speed of light? 467 • Limits on the length of solid bodies 468

469 **Special relativity in four sentences**

Could the speed of light vary? 469 • What happens near the speed of light? 470

471 16 General relativity: gravitation, maximum speed and maximum force

Maximum force – general relativity in one statement 472 • The force and power limits 473 • The experimental evidence 475 • Deducing general relativity 476 • Space-time is curved 481 • Conditions of validity of the force and power limits 482 • Gedanken experiments and paradoxes about the force limit 483 • Gedanken experiments with the power limit and the mass flow limit 488 • Hide and seek 491 • An intuitive understanding of general relativity 491 • An intuitive understanding of cosmology 494 • Experimental challenges for the third millennium 495 • A summary of general relativity 496 • Acknowledgement 497

498 17 The new ideas on space, time and gravity

Rest and free fall 498 • What is gravity? – A second answer 499 • What tides tell us about gravity 502 • Bent space and mattresses 504 • Curved space-time 506 • The speed of light and the gravitational constant 508 • Why does a stone thrown into the air fall back to Earth? – Geodesics 509 • Can light fall? 512 • Curiosities and fun challenges about gravitation 513 • What is weight? 518 • Why do apples fall? 518

520 18 Motion in general relativity – bent light and wobbling vacuum

520 **Weak fields**

The Thirring effects 520 • Gravitomagnetism 522 • Gravitational waves 525 • Bending of light and radio waves 533 • Time delay 535 • Effects on orbits 535 • The geodesic effect 538 • Curiosities and fun challenges about weak fields 540

540 **How is curvature measured?**

Curvature and space-time 544 • Curvature and motion in general relativity 545 • Universal gravity 546 • The Schwarzschild metric 547 • Curiosities and fun challenges about curvature 547

548 **All observers – heavier mathematics**

The curvature of space-time 548 • The description of momentum, mass and energy 549 • Hilbert's action – how things fall? 551 • The symmetries of general relativity 552 • Einstein's field equations 552 • More on the force limit 555 • Deducing universal gravity 556 • Deducing linearized general relativity 556 • How to calculate the shape of geodesics 557 • Mass in general relativity 558 • Is gravity an interaction? 559 • The essence of general relativity 560 • Riemann gymnastics 561 • Curiosities and fun challenges about general relativity 563

564 19 Why can we see the stars? – Motion in the universe

Which stars do we see? 564 • What do we see at night? 566 • What is the universe? 571 • The colour and the motion of the stars 572 • Do stars shine every night? 575 • A short history of the universe 577 • The history of space-time 580 • Why is the sky dark at night? 585 • Is the universe open, closed or marginal? 587 • Why is the universe transparent? 588 • The big bang and its consequences 589 • Was the big bang a big bang? 590 • Was the big bang an event? 590 • Was the big bang a beginning? 590 • Does the big bang imply creation? 591 • Why can we see the Sun? 592 • Why are the colours of the stars different? 593 • Are there dark stars? 594 • Are all stars different? – Gravitational lenses 594 • What is the shape of the universe? 596 • What is behind the horizon? 597 • Why are there stars all over the place? – Inflation 598 • Why are there so few stars? – The energy and entropy content of the universe 598 • Why is matter lumped? 600 • Why are stars so small compared with the universe? 600 • Are stars and galaxies moving apart or is the universe expanding? 600 • Is there more than one universe? 600 • Why are the stars fixed? – Arms, stars and Mach's principle 601 • At rest in the universe 602 • Does light attract light? 602 • Does light decay? 603

604 20 Black holes – falling forever

Why study black holes? 604 • Horizons 604 • Orbits 607 • Hair and entropy 609 • Black holes as energy sources 611 • Curiosities and fun challenges about black holes 613 • Formation of and search for black holes 616 • Singularities 617 • A quiz – is the universe a black hole? 618

619 21 Does space differ from time?

Can space and time be measured? 620 • Are space and time necessary? 621 • Do closed timelike curves exist? 622 • Is general relativity local? – The hole argument 622 • Is the Earth hollow? 623 • Are space, time and mass independent? 624

626 22 General relativity in ten points – a summary for the layman

The accuracy of the description 627 • Research in general relativity and cosmology 628 • Could general relativity be different? 630 • The limits of general relativity 631

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

632 Bibliography

655 Challenge hints and solutions

663 Credits

Image credits 663

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 15

MAXIMUM SPEED, OBSERVERS AT REST, AND MOTION OF LIGHT

> Fama nihil est celerius.*
>
> Antiquity

Light is indispensable for a precise description of motion. To check whether a line or a path of motion is straight, we must look along it. In other words, we use light to define straightness. How do we decide whether a plane is flat? We look across it,** again using light. How do we measure length to high precision? With light. How do we measure time to high precision? With light: once it was light from the Sun that was used; nowadays it is light from caesium atoms.

Page 909

Light is important because it is the standard for *undisturbed motion*. Physics would have evolved much more rapidly if, at some earlier time, light propagation had been recognized as the ideal example of motion.

But is light really a phenomenon of motion? Yes. This was already known in ancient Greece, from a simple daily phenomenon, the *shadow*. Shadows prove that light is a moving entity, emanating from the light source, and moving in straight lines.*** The Greek thinker Empedocles (*c.* 490 to *c.* 430 BCE) drew the logical conclusion that light takes a certain amount of time to travel from the source to the surface showing the shadow.

Ref. 294

Empedocles stated that the speed of light is finite. We can confirm this result with a different, equally simple, but subtle argument. Speed can be measured. And measurement is comparison with a standard. Therefore the *perfect* speed, which is used as the implicit measurement standard, must have a finite value. An infinite velocity standard would not allow measurements at all. In nature, the lightest entities move with the highest speed.

Challenge 613 s

* 'Nothing is faster than rumour.' This common sentence is a simplified version of Virgil's phrase: *fama, malum qua non aliud velocius ullum.* 'Rumour, the evil faster than all.' From the *Aeneid*, book IV, verses 173 and 174.

** Note that looking along the plane from all sides is not sufficient for this check: a surface that a light beam touches right along its length in *all* directions does not need to be flat. Can you give an example? One needs other methods to check flatness with light. Can you specify one?

Challenge 612 s

*** Whenever a source produces shadows, the emitted entities are called *rays* or *radiation*. Apart from light, other examples of radiation discovered through shadows were *infrared rays* and *ultraviolet rays*, which emanate from most light sources together with visible light, and *cathode rays*, which were found to be to the motion of a new particle, the *electron*. Shadows also led to the discovery of *X-rays*, which again turned out to be a version of light, with high frequency. *Channel rays* were also discovered via their shadows; they turn out to be travelling ionized atoms. The three types of radioactivity, namely *α-rays* (helium nuclei), *β-rays* (again electrons), and *γ-rays* (high-energy X-rays) also produce shadows. All these discoveries were made between 1890 and 1910: those were the 'ray days' of physics.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 224 Rømer's method of measuring the speed of light



FIGURE 225 The rainwalker's or windsurfer's method of measuring the speed of light

Light, which is indeed extremely light, is an obvious candidate for motion with perfect but finite speed. We will confirm this in a minute.

A finite speed of light means that whatever we see is a message from the *past*. When we see the stars,* the Sun or a person we love, we always see an image of the past. In a sense, nature prevents us from enjoying the present – we must therefore learn to enjoy the past.

The speed of light is high; therefore it was not measured until the years 1668 to 1676, even though many, including Galileo, had tried to do so earlier. The first measurement

* The photograph of the night sky and the milky way, on page 397 is copyright Anthony Ayiomamitis and is found on his splendid website www.perseus.gr.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Ref. 295 Page 168 method was worked out and published by the Danish astronomer Ole Rømer* when he was studying the orbits of Io and the other Galilean satellites of Jupiter. He did not obtain any specific value for the speed of light because he had no reliable value for the satellite's distance from Earth and because his timing measurements were unprecise. The Ref. 296 lack of a numerical result was quickly corrected by his peers, mainly Christiaan Huygens Challenge 614 s and Edmund Halley. (You might try to deduce Rømer's method from Figure 224.) Since Rømer's time it has been known that light takes a bit more than 8 minutes to travel from the Sun to the Earth. This result was confirmed in a beautiful way fifty years later, in 1726, Page 128 by the astronomer James Bradley. Being English, Bradley thought of the 'rain method' to Ref. 297 measure the speed of light.

How can we measure the speed of falling rain? We walk rapidly with an umbrella, measure the angle α at which the rain appears to fall, and then measure our own velocity v. (We can clearly see the angle while walking if we look at the rain to our left or right, if possible against a dark background.) As shown in Figure 225, the speed c of the rain is then given by

$$c = v/\tan\alpha \ . \tag{134}$$

In the same way we can measure the speed of wind when on a surfboard or on a ship. The same measurement can be made for light; we just need to measure the angle at which the light from a star above Earth's orbit arrives at the Earth. Because the Earth is moving relative to the Sun and thus to the star, the angle is not 90°. This deviation is called the *aberration* of light; the angle is determined most easily by comparing measurements made six months apart. The value of the aberration angle is 20.5″. (Nowadays it can be measured with a precision of five decimal digits.) Given that the speed of the Earth around the Sun is $v = 2\pi R/T = 29.7\,\mathrm{km/s}$, the speed of light must therefore be $c = 0.300\,\mathrm{Gm/s}$.** This is

* Ole (Olaf) Rømer (1644 Aarhus – 1710 Copenhagen), Danish astronomer. He was the teacher of the Dauphin in Paris, at the time of Louis XIV. The idea of measuring the speed of light in this way was due to the Italian astronomer Giovanni Cassini, whose assistant Rømer had been. Rømer continued his measurements until 1681, when Rømer had to leave France, like all protestants (such as Christiaan Huygens), so that his work was interrupted. Back in Denmark, a fire destroyed all his measurement notes. As a result, he was not able to continue improving the precision of his method. Later he became an important administrator and reformer of the Danish state.

** Umbrellas were not common in Britain in 1726; they became fashionable later, after being introduced from China. The umbrella part of the story is made up. In reality, Bradley had his idea while sailing on the Thames, when he noted that on a moving ship the apparent wind has a different direction from that on land. He had observed 50 stars for many years, notably Gamma Draconis, and during that time he had been puzzled by the *sign* of the aberration, which was *opposite* to the effect he was looking for, namely the star parallax. Both the parallax and the aberration for a star above the ecliptic make them describe a small Challenge 615 s ellipse in the course of an Earth year, though with different rotation senses. Can you see why?

By the way, it follows from special relativity that the formula (134) is wrong, and that the correct formula Challenge 616 s is $c = v/\sin\alpha$; can you see why?

To determine the speed of the Earth, we first have to determine its distance from the Sun. The simplest method is the one by the Greek thinker Aristarchos of Samos (*c.* 310 to *c.* 230 BCE). We measure the angle between the Moon and the Sun at the moment when the Moon is precisely half full. The cosine of that angle gives the ratio between the distance to the Moon (determined, for example, by the methods of page 144) Challenge 617 s and the distance to the Sun. The explanation is left as a puzzle for the reader.

The angle in question is almost a right angle (which would yield an infinite distance), and good instru- Ref. 298 ments are needed to measure it with precision, as Hipparchos noted in an extensive discussion of the prob-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 226 Fizeau's set-up to measure the speed of light (photo © AG Didaktik und Geschichte der Physik, Universität Oldenburg)

an astonishing value, especially when compared with the highest speed ever achieved by a man-made object, namely the Voyager satellites, which travel at 52 Mm/h = 14 km/s, with the growth of children, about 3 nm/s, or with the growth of stalagmites in caves, about 0.3 pm/s. We begin to realize why measurement of the speed of light is a science in its own right.

The first *precise* measurement of the speed of light was made in 1849 by the French physicist Hippolyte Fizeau (1819–1896). His value was only 5 % greater than the modern one. He sent a beam of light towards a distant mirror and measured the time the light took to come back. How did Fizeau measure the time without any electric device? In fact, he used the same ideas that are used to measure bullet speeds; part of the answer is given in Figure 226. (How far away does the mirror have to be?) A modern reconstruction of his experiment by Jan Frercks has achieved a precision of 2 %. Today, the experiment is much simpler; in the chapter on electrodynamics we will discover how to measure the speed of light using two standard UNIX or Linux computers connected by a cable.

Page 62
Challenge 619 s
Ref. 300
Page 682

The speed of light is so high that it is even difficult to prove that it is *finite*. Perhaps the most beautiful way to prove this is to photograph a light pulse flying across one's field of view, in the same way as one can photograph a car driving by or a bullet flying through the air. Figure 227 shows the first such photograph, produced in 1971 with a

Ref. 301

lem around 130 BCE. Precise measurement of the angle became possible only in the late seventeenth century, when it was found to be 89.86°, giving a distance ratio of about 400. Today, thanks to radar measurements of planets, the distance to the Sun is known with the incredible precision of 30 metres. Moon distance variations can even be measured to the nearest centimetre; can you guess how this is achieved?

Page 923
Challenge 618 s
Ref. 299

Aristarchos also determined the radius of the Sun and of the Moon as multiples of those of the Earth. Aristarchos was a remarkable thinker: he was the first to propose the heliocentric system, and perhaps the first to propose that stars were other, faraway suns. For these ideas, several of his contemporaries proposed that he should be condemned to death for impiety. When the Polish monk and astronomer Nicolaus Copernicus (1473–1543) again proposed the heliocentric system two thousand years later, he did not mention Aristarchos, even though he got the idea from him.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 227 A photograph of a light pulse moving from right to left through a bottle with milky water, marked in millimetres (photograph © Tom Mattick)



FIGURE 228 A consequence of the finiteness of the speed of light (watch out for the tricky details – light *does* travel straight from the source, it does *not* move along the drawn curved line)

standard off-the-shelf reflex camera, a very fast shutter invented by the photographers, and, most noteworthy, not a single piece of electronic equipment. (How fast does such a shutter have to be? How would you build such a shutter? And how would you make sure it opened at the right instant?) Challenge 620 s

A finite speed of light also implies that a rapidly rotating light beam behaves as shown as in Figure 228. In everyday life, the high speed of light and the slow rotation of lighthouses make the effect barely noticeable.

In short, light moves extremely rapidly. It is much faster than lightning, as you might like to check yourself. A century of increasingly precise measurements of the speed have culminated in the modern value Challenge 621 s

$$c = 299\,792\,458\,\mathrm{m/s}. \tag{135}$$

In fact, this value has now been fixed *exactly*, by definition, and the metre has been defined in terms of c. Table 49 gives a summary of what is known today about the motion of light. Two of the most surprising properties were discovered in the late nineteenth century. They form the basis of special relativity. Ref. 302

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 49 Properties of the motion of light

OBSERVATIONS ABOUT LIGHT
Light can move through vacuum.
Light transports energy.
Light has momentum: it can hit bodies.
Light has angular momentum: it can rotate bodies.
Light moves across other light undisturbed.
Light in vacuum always moves faster than any material body does.
The speed of light, its true signal speed, is the forerunner speed. Page 754
In vacuum, the speed of light is 299 792 458 m/s.
The proper speed of light is infinite. Page 425
Shadows can move without any speed limit.
Light moves in a straight line when far from matter.
High-intensity light is a wave.
Light beams are approximations when the wavelength is neglected.
In matter, both the forerunner speed and the energy speed of light are lower than in vacuum.
In matter, the group velocity of light pulses can be zero, positive, negative or infinite.

CAN ONE PLAY TENNIS USING A LASER PULSE AS THE BALL AND MIRRORS AS RACKETS?

> Et nihil est celerius annis.*
>
> Ovid, *Metamorphoses*.

We all know that in order to throw a stone as far as possible, we run as we throw it; we know instinctively that in that case the stone's speed with respect to the ground is higher than if we do not run. However, to the initial astonishment of everybody, experiments show that light emitted from a moving lamp has the same speed as light emitted from a resting one. Light (in vacuum) is never faster than light; all light beams have the same speed. Many specially designed experiments have confirmed this result to high precision. The speed of light can be measured with a precision of better than 1 m/s; but even for lamp speeds of more than 290 000 000 m/s no differences have been found. (Can you guess what lamps were used?)

Ref. 303

Challenge 622 s

In everyday life, we also know that a stone arrives more rapidly if we run towards it than in the case that we stand still or even run away from it. But astonishingly again, for light no such effect exists! All experiments clearly show that if we run towards a lamp, we measure the same speed of light as in the case that we stand still or even run away from it. Also these experiments have been performed to the highest precision possible.

Ref. 317

All experiments thus show that the velocity of light has the *same value* for all observers, even if they are moving with respect to each other or with respect to the light source. The speed of light is indeed the ideal, perfect measurement standard.**

* 'Nothing is faster than the years.' Book X, verse 520.

** An equivalent alternative term for the speed of light is 'radar speed' or 'radio speed'; we will see below

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 229 Albert Einstein (1879–1955)

Ref. 306 There is also a second set of experimental evidence for the constancy, or better, the invariance of the speed of light. Every electromagnetic device, such as an electric toothbrush, shows that the speed of light is constant. We will discover that magnetic fields would not result from electric currents, as they do every day in every motor and in every loudspeaker, if the speed of light were not constant. This was actually how the invariance was first deduced, by several researchers. Only after understanding this, did the German–Swiss physicist Albert Einstein show that the invariance of the speed of light is also in agreement with the observed motion of bodies. We will check this agreement in this chapter. The connection between electric toothbrushes and relativity will be explored in the chapters on electrodynamics. (For information about direct influences of relativity on machine design, see the interesting textbook by Van Bladel.)

Page 692

Page 692

Ref. 308

The main connection between light and motion of bodies can be stated in a few words. If the speed of light were not invariant, observers would be able to move at the speed of light. Since light is a wave, such observers would see a wave standing still. However, electromagnetism forbids such a phenomenon. Therefore, observers cannot reach the speed of light. The speed of light is an invariant limit speed. In other words, tennis with light is not fun: the speed of light is always the same.

Albert Einstein

Albert Einstein (b. 1879 Ulm, d. 1955 Princeton) was one of the greatest physicists and of the greatest thinkers ever. In 1905, he published three important papers: one about Brownian motion, one about special relativity, and one about the idea of light quanta. The first paper showed definitely that matter is made of atoms; the second showed the invariance of the speed of light; and the third paper was one of the starting points of quantum theory. Each paper was worth a Nobel Prize, but he was awarded the prize only

---

Page 732 why this is the case.

The speed of light is also not far from the speed of neutrinos. This was shown most spectacularly by the observation of a supernova in 1987, when the flash and the neutrino pulse arrived a 12 seconds apart. (It is not known whether the difference is due to speed differences or to a different starting point of the two flashes.) What is the first digit for which the two speed values could differ, knowing that the supernova was $1.7 \cdot 10^5$ light years away?

Challenge 623 s

Experiments also show that the speed of light is the same in all directions of space, to at least 21 digits of precision. Other data, taken from gamma ray bursts, show that the speed of light is independent of frequency, to at least 20 digits of precision.

Ref. 304

Ref. 305

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 50 How to convince yourself and others that there is a maximum speed c in nature

Issue	Method
Local energy speed values $> c$ are not observed	check all observations
Observed speed values $> c$ are either non-local or not due to energy transport	check all observations
Local energy speed values $> c$ cannot be produced	check all attempts
Local energy speed values $> c$ cannot be imagined	solve all paradoxes
A maximum local energy speed value c is consistent	1 – check that all consequences, however weird, are confirmed by observation 2 – deduce the theory of special relativity from it and check it

for the last one. Also in 1905, he proved the famous formula $E_0 = mc^2$ (published in early 1906), possibly triggered by an idea of Olinto De Pretto. Although Einstein was one of the founders of quantum theory, he later turned against it. His famous discussions with his friend Niels Bohr nevertheless helped to clarify the field in its most counter-intuitive aspects. He explained the Einstein–de Haas effect which proves that magnetism is due to motion inside materials. In 1915 and 1916, he published his highest achievement: the general theory of relativity, one of the most beautiful and remarkable works of science.

Page 447

Page 498

Being Jewish and famous, Einstein was a favourite target of attacks and discrimination by the National Socialist movement; in 1933 he emigrated to the USA. He was not only a great physicist, but also a great thinker; his collection of thoughts about topics outside physics are well worth reading.

Ref. 307

Anyone interested in emulating Einstein should know that he published many papers, and that many of them were wrong; he would then correct the results in subsequent papers, and then do so again. This happened so frequently that he made fun of himself about it. Einstein realized the famous definition of a genius as a person who makes the largest possible number of mistakes in the shortest possible time.

The speed of light as an invariant limit speed

Observers cannot reach the speed of light. Equivalently, no object can reach the speed of light. In other words, not only is light the standard of speed; it is also the maximal speed in nature. In short, the velocity v of any physical system in nature (i.e., any localized mass or energy) is bound by

$$v \leqslant c \,. \tag{136}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

This relation is the basis of special relativity; in fact, the full theory of special relativity is contained in it. The maximum speed implies many fascinating results: it leads to observer-varying time and length intervals, to an intimate relation between mass and energy, and to the existence of event horizons, as we will see.

Already in 1895, the discussion of viewpoint invariance had been called the *theory of relativity* by Henri Poincaré.* Einstein often regretted that the theory was called 'Relativitätstheorie' or 'theory of relativity'. The expression was already in vogue and had been proposed years before by Henri Poincaré; Einstein would have preferred the name 'Invarianztheorie' or 'theory of invariance', but was not able to change the name any more. Thus Einstein called the description of motion *without* gravity the theory of *special* relativity, and the description of motion *with* gravity the theory of *general* relativity. Both fields are full of fascinating and counter-intuitive results.

Ref. 309
Ref. 306

Can an invariant limit speed exist in nature? Table 50 shows that we need to explore three points to accept the idea. We need to show that no higher speed is *observed*, that no higher energy speed *can* ever be observed, and show that *all* consequences of invariance, however weird they may be, apply to nature. In fact, this is the theory of special relativity and thus is all we do in the remaining of this chapter.

The invariance of the speed of light is in complete contrast with Galilean mechanics, which describes the behaviour of stones, and proves that Galilean mechanics is *wrong* at high velocities. At low velocities the description remains good, because the error is small. But if we want a description valid at *all* velocities, we have to discard Galilean mechanics. For example, when we play tennis we use the fact that by hitting the ball in the right way, we can increase or decrease its speed. But with light this is impossible. Even if we take an aeroplane and fly after a light beam, it still moves away with the same speed. And astonishingly, all experiments confirms this weird behaviour.

If we accelerate a bus we are driving, the cars on the other side of the road pass by with higher and higher speeds. For light, experiment shows that this is *not* so: light always passes by with the *same* speed.** Light does not behave like cars or any other matter object. Again, all experiments confirm this weird behaviour.

Why exactly is the invariance of the speed of light almost unbelievable, even though the measurements show it unambiguously? Take two observers O and Ω (pronounced 'omega') moving with relative velocity v, such as two cars on opposite sides of the street. Imagine that at the moment they pass each other, a light flash is emitted by a lamp in O. The light flash moves through positions $x(t)$ for O and through positions $\xi(\tau)$ (pronounced 'xi of tau') for Ω. Since the speed of light is the same for both, we have

$$\frac{x}{t} = c = \frac{\xi}{\tau} \,. \tag{137}$$

* Henri Poincaré (1854–1912), important French mathematician and physicist. Poincaré was one of the most productive men of his time, advancing relativity, quantum theory, and many parts of mathematics.

The most beautiful and simple introduction to relativity is still that given by Albert Einstein himself, for example in *Über die spezielle und allgemeine Relativitätstheorie*, Vieweg, 1917 and 1997, or in *The Meaning of Relativity*, Methuen, 1951. It has taken a century for books almost as beautiful to appear, such as the text by Taylor and Wheeler.

Ref. 311, Ref. 312

** Indeed, even with the current measurement precision of $2 \cdot 10^{-13}$, we cannot discern any changes of the speed of light with the speed of the observer.

Ref. 304

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 230 A drawing containing most of special relativity, including the expressions for time dilation and for the Lorentz transformation

However, in the situation described, we obviously have $x \neq \xi$. In other words, the constancy of the speed of light implies that $t \neq \tau$, i.e., that *time is different for observers moving relative to each other*. Time is thus not unique. This surprising result, which has been confirmed by many experiments, was first stated clearly in 1905 by Albert Einstein. Though many others knew about the invariance of c, only the young Einstein had the courage to say that time is observer-dependent, and to face the consequences. Let us do so as well.

Challenge 624 e

Ref. 310

One remark is in order. The speed of light is a limit speed. What is meant with this statement is that the speed of light *in vacuum* is a limit speed. For example, particles can indeed move faster than the speed of light *in matter*, as long as they move slower than the speed of light *in vacuum*. This is regularly observed. If the particle is charged, this situation gives rise to the so-called *Vavilov–Čerenkov radiation*. It corresponds to the V-shaped wave created by a motor boat on the sea or the cone-shaped shock wave around an aeroplane moving faster than the speed of sound. Vavilov–Čerenkov radiation is regularly observed; for example it is the cause of the blue glow of the water in nuclear reactors. Incidentally, the speed of light in matter can be quite low: in the centre of the Sun, the speed of light is estimated to be only around 10 km/year = 0.3 mm/s, and even in the laboratory, for some materials, it has been found to be as low as 0.3 m/s. In the following chapters, when we use the term 'speed of light', we mean the speed of light in vacuum. In fact, the speed of light in air is smaller than that in vacuum only by a fraction of one per cent, so that in most cases, the difference between air and vacuum can be neglected.

Ref. 313, Ref. 314

Special relativity with a few lines

The speed of light is invariant and constant for all observers. We can thus deduce all relations between what two different observers measure with the help of Figure 230. It shows two observers moving with constant speed against each other in space-time, with the first sending a light flash to the second, from where it is reflected back to the first.

Ref. 315

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 231 Moving clocks go slow: moving clocks mark time more slowly that do stationary clocks

Since light speed is constant, light is the only way to compare time and space coordinates for two distant observers. Two distant clocks (like two distant metre bars) can only be compared, or synchronized, using light or radio flashes. Since light speed is constant, all light paths in the same direction are parallel in such diagrams.

A constant relative speed between two observers implies that a constant factor k re-
Challenge 625 s lates the time coordinates of events. (Why is the relation linear?) If a flash starts at a time T as measured for the first observer, it arrives at the second at time kT, and then back
Challenge 626 s again at the first at time k^2T. The drawing shows that

$$k = \sqrt{\frac{c+v}{c-v}} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{v}{c} = \frac{k^2-1}{k^2+1} \,. \tag{138}$$

Page 412 This factor will appear again in the Doppler effect.*

The figure also shows that the time coordinate t_1 assigned by the first observer to the moment in which the light is reflected is different from the coordinate t_2 assigned by the second observer. Time is indeed different for two observers in relative motion. Figure 231 illustrates the result.

The *time dilation factor* between the two time coordinates is found from Figure 230 by comparing the values t_1 and t_2; it is given by

$$\frac{t_1}{t_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\frac{v^2}{c^2}}} = \gamma(v) \,. \tag{139}$$

Time intervals for a moving observer are *shorter* by this factor γ; the time dilation factor is always larger than 1. In other words, *moving clocks go slower*. For everyday speeds the
Challenge 627 e effect is tiny. That is why we do not detect time differences in everyday life. Nevertheless, Galilean physics is not correct for speeds near that of light. The same factor γ also appears in the formula $E = \gamma mc^2$, which we will deduce below. Expression (138) or (139) is the only piece of mathematics needed in special relativity: all other results derive from it.

If a light flash is sent forward starting from the second observer and reflected back, he will make the same statement: for him, the first clock is moving, and also for him, the moving clock marks time more slowly. *Each of the observers observes that the other clock marks time more slowly.* The situation is similar to that of two men comparing the number

* The explanation of relativity using the factor k is often called *k-calculus*.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

of steps between two identical ladders that are not parallel. A man on either ladder will always observe that the steps of the *other* ladder are shorter. For another analogy, take two people moving away from each other: each of them notes that the other gets smaller as their distance increases.

Naturally, many people have tried to find arguments to avoid the strange conclusion that time differs from observer to observer. But none have succeeded, and experimental results confirm this conclusion. Let us have a look at some of them.

Acceleration of light and the Doppler effect

Light *can* be accelerated. Every mirror does this! We will see in the chapter on electromagnetism that matter also has the power to *bend* light, and thus to accelerate it. However, it will turn out that all these methods only change the *direction* of propagation; none has the power to change the *speed* of light in a vacuum. In short, light is an example of a motion that cannot be stopped. There are only a few other such examples. Can you name one?

Page 737

Challenge 628 s

What would happen if we could accelerate light to higher speeds? For this to be possible, light would have to be made of *massive* particles. If light had mass, it would be necessary to distinguish the 'massless energy speed' c from the speed of light c_L, which would be lower and would depend on the kinetic energy of those massive particles. The speed of light would not be constant, but the massless energy speed would still be so. Massive light particles could be captured, stopped and stored in a box. Such boxes would make electric illumination unnecessary; it would be sufficient to store some daylight in them and release the light, slowly, during the following night, maybe after giving it a push to speed it up.*

Physicists have tested the possibility of massive light in quite some detail. Observations now put any possible mass of light (particles) at less than $1.3 \cdot 10^{-52}$ kg from terrestrial experiments, and at less than $4 \cdot 10^{-62}$ kg from astrophysical arguments (which are slightly less compelling). In other words, light is not heavy, light is light.

Ref. 316, Ref. 317

But what happens when light hits a *moving* mirror? If the speed of light does not change, something else must. The situation is akin to that of a light source moving with respect to the receiver: the receiver will observe a *different colour* from that observed by the sender. This is called the *Doppler effect*. Christian Doppler** was the first to study the frequency shift in the case of sound waves – the well-known change in whistle tone between approaching and departing trains – and to extend the concept to the case of light waves. As we will see later on, light is (also) a wave, and its colour is determined by its frequency, or equivalently, by its wavelength λ. Like the tone change for moving trains, Doppler realized that a moving light source produces a colour at the receiver that is different from the colour at the source. Simple geometry, and the conservation of the number of maxima and minima, leads to the result

Challenge 629 e

* Incidentally, massive light would also have *longitudinal* polarization modes. This is in contrast to observations, which show that light is polarized exclusively *transversally* to the propagation direction.

** Christian Andreas Doppler (b. 1803 Salzburg, d. 1853 Venezia), Austrian physicist. Doppler studied the effect named after him for sound and light. Already in 1842 he predicted (correctly) that one day we would be able to use the effect to measure the motion of distant stars by looking at their colours.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 232 The set-up for the observation of the Doppler effect in one and three dimensions: waves emitted by an approaching source arrive with higher frequency and shorter wavelength, in contrast to waves emitted by a departing source

$$\frac{\lambda_r}{\lambda_s} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-v^2/c^2}}\left(1-\frac{v}{c}\cos\theta_r\right) = \gamma\left(1-\frac{v}{c}\cos\theta_r\right) . \qquad (140)$$

The variables v and θ_r in this expression are defined in Figure 232. Light from an approaching source is thus blue-shifted, whereas light from a departing source is red-shifted. The first observation of the Doppler effect for light was made by Johannes Stark* in 1905, who studied the light emitted by moving atoms. All subsequent experiments

* Johannes Stark (1874–1957), discovered in 1905 the optical Doppler effect in channel rays, and in 1913 the splitting of spectral lines in electrical fields, nowadays called the Stark effect. For these two discoveries he received the 1919 Nobel Prize for physics. He left his professorship in 1922 and later turned into a full-blown National Socialist. A member of the NSDAP from 1930 onwards, he became known for aggressively criticizing other people's statements about nature purely for ideological reasons; he became rightly despised by the academic community all over the world.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

confirmed the calculated colour shift within measurement errors; the latest checks have found agreement to within two parts per million. Ref. 318

In contrast to sound waves, a colour change is also found when the motion is *transverse* to the light signal. Thus, a yellow rod in rapid motion across the field of view will have a blue leading edge and a red trailing edge prior to the closest approach to the observer. The colours result from a combination of the longitudinal (first-order) Doppler shift and the transverse (second-order) Doppler shift. At a particular angle $\theta_{\text{unshifted}}$ the colours will be the same. (How does the wavelength change in the purely transverse case? What is the expression for $\theta_{\text{unshifted}}$ in terms of v?) Challenge 630 s

The colour shift is used in many applications. Almost all solid bodies are mirrors for radio waves. Many buildings have doors that open automatically when one approaches. A little sensor above the door detects the approaching person. It usually does this by measuring the Doppler effect of radio waves emitted by the sensor and reflected by the approaching person. (We will see later that radio waves and light are manifestations of the same phenomenon.) So the doors open whenever something moves towards them. Police radar also uses the Doppler effect, this time to measure the speed of cars.* Page 732

The Doppler effect also makes it possible to measure the velocity of light sources. Indeed, it is commonly used to measure the speed of distant stars. In these cases, the Doppler shift is often characterized by the *red-shift number* z, defined with the help of wavelength λ or frequency f by

$$z = \frac{\Delta\lambda}{\lambda} = \frac{f_S}{f_R} - 1 = \sqrt{\frac{c+v}{c-v}} - 1 \,. \tag{141}$$

Can you imagine how the number z is determined? Typical values for z for light sources in the sky range from −0.1 to 3.5, but higher values, up to more than 10, have also been found. Can you determine the corresponding speeds? How can they be so high? Challenge 632 s Challenge 633 s

In summary, whenever one tries to change the *speed* of light, one only manages to change its *colour*. That is the Doppler effect. In short, acceleration of light leads to colour change. This connection leads to a puzzle: we know from classical physics that when light passes a large mass, such as a star, it is deflected. Does this deflection lead to a Doppler shift? Page 161 Challenge 634 s

The difference between light and sound

The Doppler effect for light is much more fundamental than the Doppler effect for sound. Even if the speed of light were not yet known to be constant, this effect alone would *prove* that time is different for observers moving relative to each other. Why? Time is what we read from our watch. In order to determine whether another watch is synchronized with our own one, we look at both watches. In short, we need to use light signals to synchronize clocks. Now, any change in the colour of light moving from one observer to another necessarily implies that their watches run differently, and thus that time is *different* for the two of them. One way to see this is to note that also a light source is a clock – 'ticking' very rapidly. So if two observers see different colours from the same Ref. 319

Challenge 631 s * At what speed does a red traffic light appear green?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 233 Lucky Luke

source, they measure different numbers of oscillations for the same clock. In other words, time is different for observers moving against each other. Indeed, equation (138) implies that the whole of relativity follows from the full Doppler effect for light. (Can you confirm that the connection between observer-dependent frequencies and observer-dependent time breaks down in the case of the Doppler effect for *sound*?)

Challenge 635 s

Why does the behaviour of light imply special relativity, while that of sound in air does not? The answer is that light is a limit for the motion of energy. Experience shows that there are supersonic aeroplanes, but there are no superluminal rockets. In other words, the limit $v \leqslant c$ is valid only if c is the speed of light, not if c is the speed of sound in air.

However, there is at least one system in nature where the speed of sound is indeed a limit speed for energy: the speed of sound is the limit speed for the motion of *dislocations* in crystalline solids. (We discuss this in detail later on.) As a result, the theory of special relativity is also valid for such dislocations, provided that the speed of light is replaced everywhere by the speed of sound! Dislocations obey the Lorentz transformations, show length contraction, and obey the famous energy formula $E = \gamma mc^2$. In all these effects the speed of sound c plays the same role for dislocations as the speed of light plays for general physical systems.

Page 1320

Ref. 320

Given special relativity is based on the statement that nothing can move faster than light, this statement needs to be carefully checked.

Can one shoot faster than one's shadow?

> Quid celerius umbra?*

For Lucky Luke to achieve the feat shown in Figure 233, his bullet has to move faster than the speed of light. (What about his hand?) In order to emulate Lucky Luke, we could take the largest practical amount of energy available, taking it directly from an electrical power station, and accelerate the lightest 'bullets' that can be handled, namely electrons. This experiment is carried out daily in particle accelerators such as the Large Electron Positron ring, the LEP, of 27 km circumference, located partly in France and partly in

Challenge 636 e

* 'What is faster than the shadow?' A motto often found on sundials.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 234 Experimental values (black dots) for the electron velocity v as function of their kinetic energy T, compared with the prediction of Galilean physics (blue) and that of special relativity (red)

Switzerland, near Geneva. There, 40 MW of electrical power (the same amount used by a small city) used to accelerate electrons and positrons to energies of over 16 nJ (104.5 GeV) each, and their speed was measured. The result is shown in Figure 234: even with these impressive means it is impossible to make electrons move more rapidly than light. (Can you imagine a way to measure energy and speed separately?) The speed–energy relation of Figure 234 is a consequence of the maximum speed, and is deduced below. These and many similar observations thus show that there is a *limit* to the velocity of objects. Bodies (and radiation) cannot move at velocities higher than the speed of light.* The accuracy of Galilean mechanics was taken for granted for more than three centuries, so that nobody ever thought of checking it; but when this was finally done, as in Figure 234, it was found to be wrong.

Ref. 321 Challenge 637 e Page 441

The people most unhappy with this limit are computer engineers: if the speed limit were higher, it would be possible to make faster microprocessors and thus faster computers; this would allow, for example, more rapid progress towards the construction of computers that understand and use language.

The existence of a limit speed runs counter to Galilean mechanics. In fact, it means that for velocities near that of light, say about 15 000 km/s or more, the expression $mv^2/2$ is *not* equal to the kinetic energy T of the particle. In fact, such high speeds are rather common: many families have an example in their home. Just calculate the speed of electrons inside a television, given that the transformer inside produces 30 kV.

Challenge 638 s

The observation of speed of light as a *limit* speed for objects is easily seen to be a consequence of its *constancy*. Bodies that can be at rest in one frame of reference obviously move more slowly than the maximum velocity (light) in that frame. Now, if something moves more slowly than something else for *one* observer, it does so for all other observers as well. (Trying to imagine a world in which this would not be so is interesting: funny things would happen, such as things interpenetrating each other.) Since the speed of light is the same for all observers, no object can move faster than light, for every observer.

Challenge 639 d

We conclude that the maximum speed is the speed of *massless* entities. Electromagnetic waves, including light, are the only known entities that can travel at the maximum

* There are still people who refuse to accept these results, as well as the ensuing theory of relativity. Every physicist should enjoy the experience, at least once in his life, of conversing with one of these men. (Strangely, no woman has yet been reported as belonging to this group of people.) This can be done, for example, via the internet, in the sci.physics.relativity newsgroup. See also the www.crank.net website. Crackpots are a fascinating lot, especially since they teach the importance of *precision* in language and in reasoning, which they all, without exception, neglect. Encounters with several of them provided the inspiration for this chapter.

Ref. 322

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 235 How to deduce the composition of velocities

speed. Gravitational waves are also predicted to achieve maximum speed. Though the speed of neutrinos cannot be distinguished experimentally from the maximum speed, recent experiments suggest that they do have a tiny mass. Ref. 323

Conversely, if a phenomenon exists whose speed is the limit speed for one observer, then this limit speed must necessarily be the same for all observers. Is the connection between limit property and observer invariance generally valid in nature? Challenge 640 e Challenge 641 r

The composition of velocities

If the speed of light is a limit, no attempt to exceed it can succeed. This implies that when velocities are composed, as when one throws a stone while running, the values cannot simply be added. If a train is travelling at velocity v_{te} relative to the Earth, and somebody throws a stone inside it with velocity v_{st} relative to the train in the same direction, it is usually assumed as evident that the velocity of the stone relative to the Earth is given by $v_{se} = v_{st} + v_{te}$. In fact, both reasoning and measurement show a different result.

The existence of a maximum speed, together with Figure 235, implies that the k-factors must satisfy $k_{se} = k_{st}k_{te}$.* Then we only have to insert the relation (138) between each k-factor and the respective speed to get Page 408 Challenge 642 e

$$v_{se} = \frac{v_{st} + v_{te}}{1 + v_{st}v_{te}/c^2} \,. \tag{142}$$

This is called the *velocity composition formula*. The result is never larger than c and is always smaller than the naive sum of the velocities.** Expression (142) has been confirmed by all of the millions of cases for which it has been checked. You may check that it simplifies to the naive sum for everyday life values. Challenge 643 e Page 441, page 692 Ref. 317

* By taking the (natural) logarithm of this equation, one can define a quantity, the *rapidity*, that measures

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Observers and the principle of special relativity

Special relativity is built on a simple principle:

▷ *The maximum speed of energy transport is the same for all observers.*

Ref. 325 Or, as Hendrik Lorentz* liked to say, the equivalent:

▷ *The speed v of a physical system is bound by*

$$v \leqslant c \tag{143}$$

for all observers, where c is the speed of light.

This independence of the speed of light from the observer was checked with high precision by Michelson and Morley** in the years from 1887 onwards. It has been confirmed in all subsequent experiments; the most precise to date, by Stephan Schiller and his team, achieved a precision of 10^{-14} and is shown in Figure 236.

Ref. 326 Ref. 327

In fact, special relativity is also confirmed by all the precision experiments that were performed *before* it was formulated. You can even confirm it yourself at home. The way to do this is shown in the section on electrodynamics.

Page 692

The existence of a limit speed has several interesting consequences. To explore them, let us keep the rest of Galilean physics intact.*** The limit speed is the speed of light. It is constant for all observers. This constancy implies:

— In a closed free-floating room, there is no way to tell the speed of the room.
— There is no notion of absolute rest (or space): rest (like space) is an observer-dependent concept.****

---

the speed and is additive.

Ref. 324 ** One can also deduce the Lorentz transformation directly from this expression.

* Hendrik Antoon Lorentz (b. 1853 Arnhem, d. 1928 Haarlem) was, together with Boltzmann and Kelvin, one of the most important physicists of his time. He deduced the so-called Lorentz transformation and the Lorentz contraction from Maxwell's equation for the electrodynamic field. He was the first to understand, long before quantum theory confirmed the idea, that Maxwell's equations for the vacuum also describe matter and all its properties, as long as moving charged point particles – the electrons – are included. He showed this in particular for the dispersion of light, for the Zeeman effect, for the Hall effect and for the Faraday effect. He gave the correct description of the Lorentz force. In 1902, he received the physics Nobel Prize, together with Pieter Zeeman. Outside physics, he was active in the internationalization of scientific collaborations. He was also instrumental in the creation of the largest human-made structures on Earth: the polders of the Zuyder Zee.

** Albert Abraham Michelson (b. 1852 Strelno, d. 1931 Pasadena), Prussian–Polish–US-American physicist, awarded the Nobel Prize in Physics in 1907. Michelson called the set-up he devised an *interferometer*, a term still in use today. Edward William Morley (1838–1923), US-American chemist, was Michelson's friend and long-time collaborator.

Page 132 *** This point is essential. For example, Galilean physics states that only *relative* motion is physical. Galilean physics also excludes various mathematically possible ways to realize a constant light speed that would contradict everyday life.

Einstein's original 1905 paper starts from two principles: the constancy of the speed of light and the equivalence of all inertial observers. The latter principle had already been stated in 1632 by Galileo; only the constancy of the speed of light was new. Despite this fact, the new theory was named – by Poincaré – after the old principle, instead of calling it 'invariance theory', as Einstein would have preferred.

Ref. 309

Challenge 644 s **** Can you give the argument leading to this deduction?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 236 The result, the schematics and the cryostat set-up for the most precise Michelson–Morley experiment performed to date (© Stephan Schiller)

— Time depends on the observer; time is not absolute.

More interesting and specific conclusions can be drawn when two additional conditions are assumed. First, we study situations where gravitation can be neglected. (If this not the case, we need *general* relativity to describe the system.) Secondly, we also assume that the data about the bodies under study – their speed, their position, etc. – can be gathered without disturbing them. (If this not the case, we need *quantum theory* to describe the system.)

To deduce the *precise* way in which the different time intervals and lengths measured by two observers are related to each other, we take an additional simplifying step. We start with a situation where no interaction plays a role. In other words, we start with *relativistic kinematics* of bodies moving without disturbance.

If an undisturbed body is observed to travel along a straight line with a constant velocity (or to stay at rest), one calls the observer *inertial*, and the coordinates used by the observer an *inertial frame of reference*. Every inertial observer is itself in undisturbed motion. Examples of inertial observers (or frames) thus include – in *two* dimensions – those moving on a frictionless ice surface or on the floor inside a smoothly running train or ship; for a full example – in all *three* spatial dimensions – we can take a cosmonaut travelling in a space-ship as long as the engine is switched off. Inertial observers in

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 237 Two inertial observers and a beam of light



FIGURE 238 Space-time diagrams for light seen from two different observers using coordinates (t, x) and (τ, ξ)

three dimensions might also be called *free-floating* observers. They are thus not so common. Non-inertial observers are much more common. Can you confirm this? Inertial observers are the most simple ones, and they form a special set:

Challenge 645 e

— Any two inertial observers move with constant velocity relative to each other (as longs as gravity plays no role, as assumed above).
— All inertial observers are equivalent: they describe the world with the same equations. Because it implies the lack of absolute space and time, this statement was called the *principle of relativity* by Henri Poincaré. However, the *essence* of relativity is the existence of a limit speed.

To see how measured length and space intervals change from one observer to the other, we assume two inertial observers, a Roman one using coordinates x, y, z and t, and a Greek one using coordinates ξ, υ, ζ and τ,* that move with velocity $\boldsymbol{v}$ relative to each other. The axes are chosen in such a way that the velocity points in the x-direction. The constancy of the speed of light in any direction for any two observers means that for the motion of light the coordinate differentials are related by

$$0 = (c\mathrm{d}t)^2 - (\mathrm{d}x)^2 - (\mathrm{d}y)^2 - (\mathrm{d}z)^2 = (c\mathrm{d}\tau)^2 - (\mathrm{d}\xi)^2 - (\mathrm{d}\upsilon)^2 - (\mathrm{d}\zeta)^2 \,. \qquad (144)$$

Assume also that a flash lamp at rest for the Greek observer, thus with $\mathrm{d}\xi = 0$, produces two flashes separated by a time interval $\mathrm{d}\tau$. For the Roman observer, the flash lamp moves with speed v, so that $\mathrm{d}x = v\mathrm{d}t$. Inserting this into the previous expression, and assuming linearity and speed direction independence for the general case, we find that intervals are related by

Challenge 646 e

* They are read as 'xi', 'upsilon', 'zeta' and 'tau'. The names, correspondences and pronunciations of all Greek letters are explained in Appendix A.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}t &= \gamma(\mathrm{d}\tau + v\mathrm{d}\xi/c^2) = \frac{\mathrm{d}\tau + v\mathrm{d}\xi/c^2}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}} \quad \text{with} \quad v = \mathrm{d}x/\mathrm{d}t \\ \mathrm{d}x &= \gamma(\mathrm{d}\xi + v\mathrm{d}\tau) = \frac{\mathrm{d}\xi + v\mathrm{d}\tau}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}} \\ \mathrm{d}y &= \mathrm{d}v \\ \mathrm{d}z &= \mathrm{d}\zeta \ . \end{aligned} \tag{145}$$

These expressions describe how length and time intervals measured by different observers are related. At relative speeds v that are small compared to the velocity of light, such as occur in everyday life, the time intervals are essentially equal; the *stretch factor* or *relativistic correction* or *relativistic contraction* γ is then equal to 1 for all practical purposes. However, for velocities *near* that of light the measurements of the two observers give different values. In these cases, space and time *mix*, as shown in Figure 238.

The expressions (145) are also strange in another respect. When two observers look at each other, each of them claims to measure shorter intervals than the other. In other words, special relativity shows that the grass on the other side of the fence is always *shorter* – if one rides along beside the fence on a bicycle and if the grass is inclined. We explore this bizarre result in more detail shortly.

Challenge 647 s

The stretch factor γ is equal to 1 for most practical purposes in everyday life. The largest value humans have ever achieved is about $2 \cdot 10^5$; the largest observed value in nature is about 10^{12}. Can you imagine where they occur?

Challenge 648 s

Once we know how space and time *intervals* change, we can easily deduce how *coordinates* change. Figures 237 and 238 show that the x coordinate of an event L is the sum of two intervals: the ξ coordinate and the length of the distance between the two origins. In other words, we have

$$\xi = \gamma(x - vt) \quad \text{and} \quad v = \frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t} \ . \tag{146}$$

Using the invariance of the space-time interval, we get

$$\tau = \gamma(t - xv/c^2) \ . \tag{147}$$

Henri Poincaré called these two relations the *Lorentz transformations of space and time* after their discoverer, the Dutch physicist Hendrik Antoon Lorentz.* In one of the most beautiful discoveries of physics, in 1892 and 1904, Lorentz deduced these relations from the equations of electrodynamics, where they had been lying, waiting to be discovered, since 1865.** In that year James Clerk Maxwell had published the equations that describe everything electric and magnetic. However, it was only Einstein who first understood that t and τ, as well as x and ξ, are equally important and thus equally valid descriptions of space and time.

Ref. 328

Page 706

* For information about Hendrik Antoon Lorentz, see page 418.

** The same discovery had been published first in 1887 by the German physicist Woldemar Voigt (1850–1919); Voigt – pronounced 'Fohgt' – was also the discoverer of the Voigt effect and the Voigt tensor. Independently, in 1889, the Irishman George F. Fitzgerald also found the result.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The Lorentz transformation describes the change of viewpoint from one inertial frame to a second, moving one. This change of viewpoint is called a (Lorentz) *boost*. The formulae (146) and (147) for the boost are central to the theories of relativity, both special and general. In fact, the mathematics of special relativity will not get more difficult than that: if you know what a square root is, you can study special relativity in all its beauty.

Many alternative formulae for boosts have been explored, such as expressions in which the relative acceleration of the two observers is included, as well as the relative
Ref. 329 velocity. However, they had all to be discarded after comparing their predictions with experimental results. Before we have a look at such experiments, we continue with a few logical deductions from the boost relations.

What is space-time?

> Von Stund' an sollen Raum für sich und Zeit für sich völlig zu Schatten herabsinken und nur noch eine Art Union der beiden soll Selbstständigkeit bewaren.*
>
> Hermann Minkowski.

The Lorentz transformations tell us something important: that space and time are two aspects of the same basic entity. They 'mix' in different ways for different observers. This fact is commonly expressed by stating that time is the *fourth dimension*. This makes sense because the common basic entity – called *space-time* – can be defined as the set of all events, events being described by four coordinates in time and space, and because the
Challenge 649 s set of all events has the properties of a manifold.** (Can you confirm this?)

In other words, the existence of a maximum speed in nature forces us to introduce a space-time manifold for the description of nature. In the theory of special relativity, the space-time manifold is characterized by a simple property: the *space-time interval* $\mathrm{d}i$
Ref. 330 between two nearby events, defined as

$$\mathrm{d}i^2 = c^2\mathrm{d}t^2 - \mathrm{d}x^2 - \mathrm{d}y^2 - \mathrm{d}z^2 = c^2\mathrm{d}t^2\left(1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}\right) , \tag{148}$$

is independent of the (inertial) observer. Such a space-time is also called Minkowski space-time, after Hermann Minkowski,*** the teacher of Albert Einstein; he was the first, in 1904, to define the concept of space-time and to understand its usefulness and importance.

The space-time interval $\mathrm{d}i$ of equation (148) has a simple interpretation. It is the time measured by an observer moving from event (t, x) to event $(t+\mathrm{d}t, x+\mathrm{d}x)$, the so-called *proper time*, multiplied by c. If we neglect the factor c, we could simply call it wristwatch time.

---

* 'Henceforth space by itself and time by itself shall completely fade into shadows and only a kind of union of the two shall preserve autonomy.' This famous statement was the starting sentence of Minkowski's 1908 talk at the meeting of the Gesellschaft für Naturforscher und Ärzte.

Page 897 ** The term 'manifold' is defined in Appendix B.

*** Hermann Minkowski (1864–1909), German mathematician. He had developed similar ideas to Einstein, but the latter was faster. Minkowski then developed the concept of space-time. Minkowski died suddenly at the age of 44.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 239 A space-time diagram for a moving object T seen from an inertial observer O in the case of one and two spatial dimensions; the slope of the curve at a point gives the speed that that point, and is thus never steeper than that of light

We *live* in a Minkowski space-time, so to speak. Minkowski space-time exists independently of things. And even though coordinate systems can be different from observer to observer, the underlying entity, space-time, is still *unique*, even though space and time by themselves are not.

How does Minkowski space-time differ from Galilean space-time, the combination of everyday space and time? Both space-times are manifolds, i.e., continuum sets of points, both have one temporal and three spatial dimensions, and both manifolds have the topology of the punctured sphere. (Can you confirm this?) Both manifolds are flat, i.e., free of curvature. In both cases, space is what is measured with a metre rule or with a light ray, and time is what is read from a clock. In both cases, space-time is fundamental; it is and remains the *background* and the *container* of things and events.

Challenge 650 s

The central difference, in fact the only one, is that Minkowski space-time, in contrast to the Galilean case, *mixes* space and time, and in particular, does so differently for observers with different speeds, as shown in Figure 238. That is why time is an observer-dependent concept.

The maximum speed in nature thus forces us to describe motion with space-time. That is interesting, because in space-time, speaking in simple terms, *motion does not exist*. Motion exists only in space. In space-time, nothing moves. For each point particle, space-time contains a world-line. In other words, instead of asking why motion exists, we can equivalently ask why space-time is criss-crossed by world-lines. At this point, we are still far from answering either question. What we can do is to explore *how* motion takes place.

Can we travel to the past? – Time and causality

We know that time is different for different observers. Does time nevertheless order events in sequences? The answer given by relativity is a clear 'yes and no'. Certain sets of events are not naturally ordered by time; others sets are. This is best seen in a space-time diagram.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Clearly, two events can be placed in sequence only if one event is the *cause* of the other. But this connection can only apply if the events exchange energy (e.g. through a signal). In other words, a relation of cause and effect between two events implies that energy or signals can travel from one event to the other; therefore, the speed connecting the two events must not be larger than the speed of light. Figure 239 shows that event E at the origin of the coordinate system can only be influenced by events in quadrant IV (the *past light cone*, when all space dimensions are included), and can itself influence only events in quadrant II (the *future light cone*). Events in quadrants I and III neither influence nor are influenced by event E: signal speed above that of light would be necessary to achieve that. The light cone defines the boundary between events that *can* be ordered with respect to their origin – namely those inside the cone – and those that *cannot* – those outside the cones, happening elsewhere for all observers. (Some people call all the events happening elsewhere the *present*.) So, time orders events only *partially*. For example, for two events that are not causally connected, their temporal order (or their simultaneity) depends on the observer!

In particular, the past light cone gives the complete set of events that can influence what happens at the origin. One says that the origin is *causally connected* only to the past light cone. This statement reflects the fact that any influence involves transport of energy, and thus cannot travel faster than the speed of light. Note that causal connection is an invariant concept: all observers agree on whether or not it applies to two given events.

Challenge 651 s Can you confirm this?

A vector inside the light cone is called *timelike*; one on the light cone is called *light-like* or *null*; and one outside the cone is called *spacelike*. For example, the *world-line* of an observer, i.e., the set of all events that make up its past and future history, consists of timelike events only. Time is the fourth dimension; it expands space to space-time and thus 'completes' space-time. This is the relevance of the fourth dimension to special relativity, no more and no less.

Special relativity thus teaches us that causality and time can be defined *only* because light cones exist. If transport of energy at speeds faster than that of light did exist, time could not be defined. Causality, i.e., the possibility of (partially) ordering events for all observers, is due to the existence of a maximal speed.

If the speed of light could be surpassed in some way, the future could influence the

Challenge 652 s past. Can you confirm this? In such situations, one would observe *acausal* effects. However, there is an everyday phenomenon which tells that the speed of light is indeed maximal: our memory. If the future could influence the past, we would also be able to *remember* the future. To put it in another way, if the future could influence the past, the second principle of thermodynamics would not be valid and our memory would not work.* No other data from everyday life or from experiments provide any evidence that the future can influence the past. In other words, *time travel to the past is impossible*. How the situation changes in quantum theory will be revealed later on. Interestingly, time travel to the future *is* possible, as we will see shortly.

* Another related result is slowly becoming common knowledge. Even if space-time had a nontrivial shape, such as a cylindrical topology with closed time-like curves, one still would not be able to travel into the

Ref. 331 past, in contrast to what many science fiction novels suggest. This is made clear by Stephen Blau in a recent pedagogical paper.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

CURIOSITIES ABOUT SPECIAL RELATIVITY

Let us start with a puzzle that helps to sharpen the concepts. Seen by an observer on an island, two lightning strokes hit simultaneously: one hits the island, and another, many miles away, the open sea. A second observer is a pilot in a relativistic aeroplane and happens to be just above the island. Which lightning hits first for the pilot?

For the pilot, the distant lightning, hitting the sea, hits first. But this is a trick question: despite being the one that hits first, the distant lightning is observed by the pilot to hit *after* the one on the island, because light from the distant hit needs time to reach him. However, the pilot can compensate for the propagation time and then deduces that the distant lightning hit first.

Challenge 653 e

Let us explore a few additional consequences of special relativity.

Faster than light: how far can we travel?

How far away from Earth can we travel, given that the trip should not last more than a lifetime, say 80 years, and given that we are allowed to use a rocket whose speed can approach the speed of light as closely as desired? Given the time t we are prepared to spend in a rocket, given the speed v of the rocket and assuming optimistically that it can accelerate and decelerate in a negligible amount of time, the distance d we can move away is given by

Challenge 654 e

$$d = \frac{vt}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}} \,. \tag{149}$$

The distance d is larger than ct already for $v > 0.71c$, and, if v is chosen large enough, it increases beyond all bounds! In other words, relativity does *not* limit the distance we can travel in a lifetime, and not even the distance we can travel in a single second. We could, in principle, roam the entire universe in less than a second. In situations such as these it makes sense to introduce the concept of *proper velocity* w, defined as

$$w = \frac{d}{t} = \frac{v}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}} = \gamma\, v \,. \tag{150}$$

As we have just seen, proper velocity is *not* limited by the speed of light; in fact the proper velocity of light itself is infinite.*

Synchronization and time travel – can a mother stay younger than her own daughter?

A maximum speed implies that time is different for different observers moving relative to each other. So we have to be careful about how we synchronize clocks that are far

* Using proper velocity, the relation given in equation (142) for the superposition of two velocities $\mathbf{w}_a = \gamma_a \mathbf{v}_a$ and $\mathbf{w}_b = \gamma_b \mathbf{v}_b$ simplifies to

Challenge 655 e

$$w_{s\parallel} = \gamma_a \gamma_b (v_a + v_{b\parallel}) \quad \text{and} \quad w_{s\perp} = w_{b\perp} \,, \tag{151}$$

where the signs $\parallel$ and $\perp$ designate the component in the direction of and the component perpendicular to $\mathbf{v}_a$, respectively. One can in fact express all of special relativity in terms of 'proper' quantities.

Ref. 332

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 240 The twin paradox

apart, even if they are at rest with respect to each other in an inertial reference frame. For example, if we have two similar watches showing the same time, and if we carry one of them for a walk and back, they will show different times afterwards. This experiment has actually been performed several times and has fully confirmed the prediction of special relativity. The time difference for a person or a watch in an aeroplane travelling around the Earth once, at about 900 km/h, is of the order of 100 ns – not very noticeable in everyday life. In fact, the delay is easily calculated from the expression

Ref. 333, Ref. 334

$$\frac{t}{t'} = \gamma \,. \tag{152}$$

Human bodies are clocks; they show the elapsed time, usually called *age*, by various changes in their shape, weight, hair colour, etc. If a person goes on a long and fast trip, on her return she will have aged *less* than a second person who stayed at her (inertial) home.

The most famous illustration of this is the famous *twin paradox* (or *clock paradox*). An adventurous twin jumps on a relativistic rocket that leaves Earth and travels for many years. Far from Earth, he jumps on another relativistic rocket going the other way and returns to Earth. The trip is illustrated in Figure 240. At his arrival, he notes that his twin brother on Earth is much older than himself. Can you explain this result, especially the asymmetry between the two brothers? This result has also been confirmed in many experiments.

Ref. 335

Special relativity thus confirms, in a surprising fashion, the well-known observation that those who travel a lot remain younger. The price of the retained youth is, however, that everything around one changes very much more quickly than if one is at rest with the environment.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 241 More muons than expected arrive at the ground because fast travel keeps them young

The twin paradox can also be seen as a confirmation of the possibility of time travel to the future. With the help of a fast rocket that comes back to its starting point, we can arrive at local times that we would never have reached within our lifetime by staying home. Alas, we can *never* return to the past.*

One of the simplest experiments confirming the prolonged youth of fast travellers involves the counting of muons. Muons are particles that are continuously formed in the upper atmosphere by cosmic radiation. Muons *at rest* (with respect to the measuring clock) have a finite half-life of 2.2 µs (or, at the speed of light, 660 m). After this amount of time, half of the muons have decayed. This half-life can be measured using simple muon counters. In addition, there exist special counters that only count muons travelling within a certain speed range, say from $0.9950c$ to $0.9954c$. One can put one of these special counters on top of a mountain and put another in the valley below, as shown in Figure 241. The first time this experiment was performed, the height difference was 1.9 km. Flying 1.9 km through the atmosphere at the mentioned speed takes about 6.4 µs. With the half-life just given, a naive calculation finds that only about 13% of the muons observed at the top should arrive at the lower site. However, it is observed that about 82% of the muons arrive below. The reason for this result is the relativistic time dilation. Indeed, at the mentioned speed, muons experience a time difference of only 0.62 µs during the travel from the mountain top to the valley. This shorter time yields a much lower number of lost muons than would be the case without time dilation; moreover, the measured percentage confirms the value of the predicted time dilation factor γ within experimental errors, as you may want to check. A similar effect is seen when relativistic muons are produced in accelerators.

Page 1222
Ref. 337
Challenge 656 s
Challenge 657 s

Half-life dilation has also been found for many other decaying systems, such as pions, hydrogen atoms, neon atoms and various nuclei, always confirming the predictions of

Ref. 336
* There are even special books on time travel, such as the well researched text by Nahin. Note that the concept of time travel has to be clearly defined; otherwise one has no answer to the clerk who calls his office chair a time machine, as sitting on it allows him to get to the future.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

special relativity. Since all bodies in nature are made of particles, the 'youth effect' of high speeds (usually called 'time dilation') applies to bodies of all sizes; indeed, it has not only been observed for particles, but also for lasers, radio transmitters and clocks. Ref. 317

If motion leads to time dilation, a clock on the Equator, constantly running around the Earth, should go slower than one at the poles. However, this prediction, which was made by Einstein himself, is incorrect. Ref. 338 The centrifugal acceleration leads to a reduction in gravitational acceleration that exactly cancels the increase due to the velocity. This story serves as a reminder to be careful when applying special relativity in situations involving gravity. Special relativity is only applicable when space-time is flat, not when gravity is present.

In short, a mother *can* stay younger than her daughter. We can also conclude that we cannot synchronize clocks at rest with respect to each other simply by walking, clock in hand, from one place to another. The correct way to do so is to exchange light signals. Challenge 658 s Can you describe how?

A precise definition of synchronization allows us to call two distant events simultaneous. In addition, special relativity shows that simultaneity depends on the observer. This is confirmed by all experiments performed so far.

However, the mother's wish is not easy to fulfil. Let us imagine that a mother is accelerated in a spaceship away from Earth at $10\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$ for ten years, then decelerates at $10\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$ for another ten years, then accelerates for ten additional years towards the Earth, and finally decelerates for ten final years in order to land safely back on our planet. The mother has taken 40 years for the trip. She got as far as 22 000 light years from Earth. At her return on Earth, 44 000 years have passed. All this seems fine, until we realize that the necessary amount of fuel, even for the most efficient engine imaginable, is so large that the mass returning from the trip is only one part in $2 \cdot 10^{19}$. Challenge 659 e The necessary amount of fuel does not exist on Earth.

Length contraction

The length of an object measured by an observer attached to the object is called its proper length. According to special relativity, the length measured by an inertial observer passing by is always smaller than the proper length. This result follows directly from the Lorentz transformations. Challenge 660 e

For a Ferrari driving at 300 km/h or 83 m/s, the length is contracted by 0.15 pm: less than the diameter of a proton. Seen from the Sun, the Earth moves at 30 km/s; this gives a length contraction of 6 cm. Neither of these effects has ever been measured. But larger effects could be. Let us explore some examples.

Imagine a pilot flying through a barn with two doors, one at each end. The plane is slightly longer than the barn, but moves so rapidly that its relativistically contracted length is shorter than the length of the barn. Can the farmer close the barn (at least for a short time) with the plane completely inside? The answer is positive. But why can the pilot not say the following: relative to him, the barn is contracted; therefore the plane does not fit inside the barn? The answer is shown in Figure 242. For the farmer, the doors close (and reopen) at the same time. For the pilot, they do not. For the farmer, the pilot is in the dark for a short time; for the pilot, the barn is never dark. (That is not completely true: Challenge 661 s can you work out the details?)

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 242 The observations of the pilot and the barn owner



FIGURE 243 The observations of the trap digger and of the snowboarder, as (misleadingly) published in the literature

We now explore some variations of the general case. Can a rapid snowboarder fall into a hole that is a bit shorter than his board? Imagine him boarding so fast that the length contraction factor $\gamma = d/d'$ is 4.* For an observer on the ground, the snowboard is four times shorter, and when it passes over the hole, it will fall into it. However, for the boarder, it is the hole which is four times shorter; it seems that the snowboard cannot fall into it.

Ref. 339 More careful analysis shows that, in contrast to the observation of the hole digger, the snowboarder does not experience the board's shape as fixed: while passing over the hole, the boarder observes that the board takes on a parabolic shape and falls into the hole, Challenge 663 e as shown in Figure 243. Can you confirm this? In other words, shape is not an observer-invariant concept. (However, rigidity *is* observer-invariant, if defined properly; can you Challenge 664 s confirm this?)

Ref. 340 This explanation, though published, is not correct, as Harald van Lintel and Christian Gruber have pointed out. One should not forget to estimate the size of the effect. At relativistic speeds the time required for the hole to affect the full thickness of the board cannot be neglected. The snowboarder only sees his board take on a parabolic shape if it is extremely thin and flexible. For usual boards moving at relativistic speeds, the

Challenge 662 s * Even the Earth contracts in its direction of motion around the Sun. Is the value measurable?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 244 Does the conducting glider keep the lamp lit at large speeds?



FIGURE 245 What happens to the rope?

Challenge 665 e snowboarder has no time to fall any appreciable height h or to bend into the hole before passing it. Figure 243 is so exaggerated that it is incorrect. The snowboarder would simply speed over the hole.

The paradoxes around length contraction become even more interesting in the case Ref. 341 of a conductive glider that makes electrical contact between two rails, as shown in Figure 244. The two rails are parallel, but one rail has a gap that is longer than the glider. Can you work out whether a lamp connected in series stays lit when the glider moves Challenge 666 s along the rails with relativistic speed? (Make the simplifying and not fully realistic assumption that electrical current flows as long and as soon as the glider touches the rails.) Do you get the same result for all observers? And what happens when the glider is longer than the detour? Or when it approaches the lamp from the other side of the detour? (Warning: this problem gives rise to *heated* debates!) What is unrealistic in this experiment?

Ref. 342 Another example of length contraction appears when two objects, say two cars, are connected over a distance d by a straight rope, as shown in Figure 245. Imagine that both are at rest at time $t = 0$ and are accelerated together in exactly the same way. The observer at rest will maintain that the two cars remain the same distance apart. On the other hand, the rope needs to span a distance $d' = d/\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$, and thus has to expand when the two cars are accelerating. In other words, the rope will break. Is this prediction Challenge 667 s confirmed by observers on each of the two cars?

A funny – but quite unrealistic – example of length contraction is that of a submarine Ref. 343 moving horizontally. Imagine that the resting submarine has tuned its weight to float in water without any tendency to sink or to rise. Now the submarine moves (possibly with relativistic speed). The captain observes the water outside to be Lorentz contracted; thus the water is denser and he concludes that the submarine will rise. A nearby fish sees the submarine to be contracted, thus denser than water, and concludes that the submarine Challenge 668 s will sink. Who is wrong, and what is the buoyancy force? Alternatively, answer the fol- Challenge 669 s lowing question: why is it impossible for a submarine to move at relativistic speed?

In summary, length contraction can almost never be realistically observed for macroscopic bodies. However, it does play an important role for *images*.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Relativistic films – aberration and Doppler effect

We have encountered several ways in which observations change when an observer moves at high speed. First of all, Lorentz contraction and aberration lead to *distorted* images. Secondly, aberration increases the viewing angle beyond the roughly 180 degrees that humans are used to in everyday life. A relativistic observer who looks in the direction of motion sees light that is invisible for a resting observer, because for the latter, it comes from behind. Thirdly, the Doppler effect produces *colour-shifted* images. Fourthly, the rapid motion changes the *brightness* and *contrast* of the image: the so-called *searchlight effect*. Each of these changes depends on the direction of sight; they are shown in Figure 247.

Modern computers enable us to simulate the observations made by rapid observers with photographic quality, and even to produce simulated films.* The images of Figure 246 are particularly helpful in allowing us to understand image distortion. They show the viewing angle, the circle which distinguish objects in front of the observer from those behind the observer, the coordinates of the observer's feet and the point on the horizon toward which the observer is moving. Adding these markers in your head when watching other pictures or films may help you to understand more clearly what they show.

We note that the shape of the image seen by a moving observer is a *distorted* version of that seen by one at rest at the same point. A moving observer, however, does not see different things than a resting one at the same point. Indeed, light cones are independent of observer motion.

The Lorentz contraction is measurable; however, it cannot be photographed. This surprising distinction was discovered only in 1959. Measuring implies simultaneity at the object's position; photographing implies simultaneity at the observer's position. On a photograph, the Lorentz contraction is modified by the effects due to different light travel times from the different parts of an object; the result is a change in shape that is reminiscent of, but not exactly the same as, a rotation. The total deformation is an angle-dependent aberration. We discussed aberration at the beginning of this section. Aberration transforms circles into circles: such transformations are called *conformal*.

Ref. 344

Page 403

The images of Figure 248, produced by Daniel Weiskopf, also include the Doppler effect and the brightness changes. They show that these effects are at least as striking as the distortion due to aberration.

This leads to the *pearl necklace paradox*. If the relativistic motion transforms spheres into spheres, and rods into shorter rods, what happens to a pearl necklace moving along its own long axis? Does it get shorter?

Challenge 670 s

Which is the best seat in a bus?

Let us explore another surprise of special relativity. Imagine two twins inside two identically accelerated cars, one in front of the other, starting from standstill at time $t = 0$, as

Ref. 342

* See for example images and films at www.anu.edu.au/Physics/Searle by Anthony Searle, at www.tat.physik.uni-tuebingen.de/~weiskopf/gallery/index.html by Daniel Weiskopf, at www.itp.uni-hannover.de/~dragon/stonehenge/stone1.htm by Norbert Dragon and Nicolai Mokros, or at www.tempolimit-lichtgeschwindigkeit.de by Hanns Ruder's group.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009


v/c = 0,000 gamma = 1,00 kappa = 1,000
theta = 45° x = -335 y = 0 z = 115
v/c = 0,000 gamma = 1,00 kappa = 1,000
theta = 45° x = -200 y = 0 z = 50
v/c = 0,969 gamma = 4,05 kappa = 0,125
theta = 146° x = -200 y = 0 z = 50
v/c = 0,969 gamma = 4,05 kappa = 0,125
theta = 146° x = -100 y = 0 z = 50
v/c = 0,969 gamma = 4,05 kappa = 0,125
theta = 146° x = 0 y = 0 z = 50
v/c = 0,969 gamma = 4,05 kappa = 0,125
theta = 146° x = 100 y = 0 z = 50
v/c = 0,969 gamma = 4,05 kappa = 0,125
theta = 146° x = 172 y = 0 z = 50

FIGURE 246 Flying through twelve vertical columns (shown in the two uppermost images) with 0.9 times the speed of light as visualized by Nicolai Mokros and Norbert Dragon, showing the effect of speed and position on distortions (© Nicolai Mokros)

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 247 Flying through three straight and vertical columns with 0.9 times the speed of light as visualized by Daniel Weiskopf: on the left with the original colours; in the middle including the Doppler effect; and on the right including brightness effects, thus showing what an observer would actually see (© Daniel Weiskopf)

FIGURE 248 What a researcher standing and one running rapidly through a corridor observe (ignoring colour effects) (© Daniel Weiskopf)

described by an observer at rest with respect to both of them. (There is no connecting rope now.) Both cars contain the same amount of fuel. We easily deduce that the acceleration of the two twins stops, when the fuel runs out, at the same time in the frame of the outside observer. In addition, the distance between the cars has remained the same all along for the outside observer, and the two cars continue rolling with an identical constant velocity v, as long as friction is negligible. If we call the events at which the front car and back car engines switch off f and b, their time coordinates in the outside frame are related simply by $t_f = t_b$. By using the Lorentz transformations you can deduce for

Challenge 671 e

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 249 For the athlete on the left, the judge moving in the opposite direction sees both feet off the ground at certain times, but not for the athlete on the right

Challenge 672 e

the frame of the freely rolling twins the relation

$$t_b = \gamma \Delta x \, v/c^2 + t_f \,, \tag{153}$$

which means that the front twin has aged *more* than the back twin! Thus, in accelerated systems, ageing is position-dependent.

For choosing a seat in a bus, though, this result does not help. It is true that the best seat in an accelerating bus is the back one, but in a decelerating bus it is the front one. At the end of a trip, the choice of seat does not matter.

Challenge 673 s

Is it correct to deduce that people on high mountains age faster than people in valleys, so that living in a valley helps postponing grey hair?

How fast can one walk?

To walk means to move the feet in such a way that at least one of them is on the ground at any time. This is one of the rules athletes have to follow in Olympic walking competitions; they are disqualified if they break it. A student athlete was thinking about the theoretical maximum speed he could achieve in the Olympics. The ideal would be that each foot accelerates instantly to (almost) the speed of light. The highest walking speed is achieved by taking the second foot off the ground at exactly the same instant at which the first is put down. By 'same instant', the student originally meant 'as seen by a competition judge at rest with respect to Earth'. The motion of the feet is shown in the left diagram of Figure 249; it gives a limit speed for walking of half the speed of light. But then the student noticed that a *moving* judge will see both feet off the ground and thus disqualify

Ref. 345

the athlete for running. To avoid disqualification by *any* judge, the second foot has to wait for a light signal from the first. The limit speed for Olympic walking is thus only one third of the speed of light.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 250 A simple example of motion that can be faster than light



FIGURE 251 Another example of faster-than-light motion

Is the speed of shadow greater than the speed of light?

Actually, motion faster than light does exist and is even rather common. Special relativity only constrains the motion of mass and energy. However, non-material points or non-energy-transporting features and images *can* move faster than light. There are several simple examples. To be clear, we are not talking about *proper* velocity, which in these cases cannot be defined anyway. (Why?)

Page 425
Challenge 674 s

The following examples show speeds that are genuinely higher than the speed of light in vacuum.

Consider the point marked X in Figure 250, the point at which scissors cut paper. If the scissors are closed rapidly enough, the point moves faster than light. Similar examples can also be found in every window frame, and in fact in any device that has twisting parts.

Another example of superluminal motion is a music record – an old-fashioned LP – disappearing into its sleeve, as shown in Figure 251. The point where the edge of the record meets the edge of the sleeve can travel faster than light.

Another example suggests itself when we remember that we live on a spherical planet. Imagine you lie on the floor and stand up. Can you show that the initial speed with which the horizon moves away from you can be larger than that of light?

Challenge 675 s

Finally, a standard example is the motion of a spot of light produced by shining a laser beam onto the Moon. If the laser is moved, the spot can easily move faster than light. The same applies to the light spot on the screen of an oscilloscope when a signal of sufficiently high frequency is fed to the input.

All these are typical examples of the *speed of shadows*, sometimes also called the *speed of darkness*. Both shadows and darkness can indeed move faster than light. In fact, there is no limit to their speed. Can you find another example?

Challenge 676 s

In addition, there is an ever-increasing number of experimental set-ups in which the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

phase velocity or even the group velocity of light is higher than c. They regularly make headlines in the newspapers, usually along the lines of 'light moves faster than light'. We
Page 751 will discuss this surprising phenomenon in more detail later on. In fact, these cases can also be seen – with some imagination – as special cases of the 'speed of shadow' phenomenon.

For a different example, imagine we are standing at the exit of a tunnel of length l. We see a car, whose speed we know to be v, entering the other end of the tunnel and driving towards us. We know that it entered the tunnel because the car is no longer in the Sun or because its headlights were switched on at that moment. At what time t, after we see it entering the tunnel, does it drive past us? Simple reasoning shows that t is given by

$$t = l/v - l/c \,. \tag{154}$$

In other words, the approaching car seems to have a velocity v_{appr} of

$$v_{\text{appr}} = \frac{l}{t} = \frac{vc}{c - v} \,, \tag{155}$$

which is higher than c for any car velocity v higher than $c/2$. For cars this does not happen too often, but astronomers know a type of bright object in the sky called a *quasar* (a contraction of 'quasi-stellar object'), which sometimes emits high-speed gas jets. If the emission is in or near the direction of the Earth, its apparent speed – even the purely transverse component – is higher than c. Such situations are now regularly observed
Ref. 346 with telescopes.

Note that to a second observer at the *entrance* of the tunnel, the apparent speed of the car *moving away* is given by

$$v_{\text{leav}} = \frac{vc}{c + v} \,, \tag{156}$$

which is *never* higher than $c/2$. In other words, objects are never seen departing with more than half the speed of light.

The story has a final twist. We have just seen that motion faster than light can be observed in several ways. But could an *object* moving faster than light be observed at all? Surprisingly, it could be observed only in rather unusual ways. First of all, since such an imaginary object, usually called a *tachyon*, moves faster than light, we can never see it approaching. If it can be seen at all, a tachyon can only be seen departing. Seeing a tachyon would be similar to hearing a supersonic jet. Only *after* a tachyon has passed nearby, assuming that it is visible in daylight, could we notice it. We would first see a flash of light, corresponding to the bang of a plane passing with supersonic speed. Then we would see *two* images of the tachyon, appearing somewhere in space and departing in opposite directions, as can be deduced from Figure 252. Even if one of the two images were approaching us, it would be getting fainter and smaller. This is, to say the least, rather unusual behaviour. Moreover, if you wanted to look at a tachyon at night, illuminating it with a torch, you would have to turn your head in the direction opposite to the arm with the torch! This requirement also follows from the space-time diagram: can
Challenge 677 e you see why? Nobody has ever seen such phenomena. Tachyons, if they existed, would

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 252 Hypothetical space-time diagram for tachyon observation



FIGURE 253 If O's stick is parallel to R's and R's is parallel to G's, then O's stick and G's stick are not

Ref. 347
Page 445

be strange objects: they would accelerate when they lose energy, a zero-energy tachyon would be the fastest of all, with infinite speed, and the direction of motion of a tachyon depends on the motion of the observer. No object with these properties has ever been observed. Worse, as we just saw, tachyons would seem to appear from nothing, defying laws of conservation; and note that, just as tachyons cannot be seen in the usual sense, they cannot be touched either, since both processes are due to electromagnetic interactions, as we will see later in our ascent of Motion Mountain. Tachyons therefore cannot be objects in the usual sense. In the quantum part of our adventure we will show that quantum theory actually *rules out* the existence of (real) tachyons. However, quantum theory also *requires* the existence of 'virtual' tachyons, as we will discover.

Parallel to parallel is not parallel – Thomas rotation

Relativity has strange consequences indeed. Any two observers can keep a stick parallel to the other's, even if they are in motion with respect to each other. But strangely, given a a chain of sticks for which any two adjacent ones are parallel, the first and the last sticks will *not* generally be parallel. In particular, they *never* will be if the motions of the various observers are in different directions, as is the case when the velocity vectors form a loop.

The simplest set-up is shown in Figure 253. In special relativity, a general concatena-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Ref. 348 tion of pure boosts does not give a pure boost, but a boost plus a rotation. As a result, the end points of chains of parallel sticks are usually not parallel.

An example of this effect appears in rotating motion. If we walk in a fast circle holding a stick, always keeping the stick parallel to the direction it had just before, at the end of the circle the stick will have an angle with respect to the original direction. Similarly, the axis of a rotating body circling a second body will *not* be pointing in the same direction after one turn. This effect is called *Thomas precession*, after Llewellyn Thomas, who discovered it in 1925, a full 20 years after the birth of special relativity. It had escaped the attention of dozens of other famous physicists. Thomas precession is important in the inner working of atoms; we will return to it in a later section of our adventure. These surprising phenomena are purely relativistic, and are thus measurable *only* in the case of speeds comparable to that of light.

A never-ending story – temperature and relativity

The literature on temperature is confusing. Albert Einstein and Wolfgang Pauli agreed on the following result: the temperature T seen by an observer moving with speed v is related to the temperature T_0 measured by the observer at rest with respect to the heat bath via

$$T = T_0\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}\,. \tag{157}$$

A moving observer thus always measures lower values than a resting one.

In 1908, Max Planck used this expression, together with the corresponding transformation for heat, to deduce that the entropy is invariant under Lorentz transformations. Being the discoverer of the Boltzmann constant k, Planck proved in this way that the constant is a relativistic invariant.

Not all researchers agree on the expression. Others maintain that T and T_0 should be interchanged in the temperature transformation. Also, powers other than the simple
Ref. 349 square root have been proposed. The origin of these discrepancies is simple: temperature is only defined for equilibrium situations, i.e., for baths. But a bath for one observer is not a bath for the other. For low speeds, a moving observer sees a situation that is *almost* a heat bath; but at higher speeds the issue becomes tricky. Temperature is deduced from the speed of matter particles, such as atoms or molecules. For moving observers, there is no good way to measure temperature. The naively measured temperature value even depends on the energy range of matter particles that is measured! In short, thermal equilibrium is not an observer-invariant concept. Therefore, *no* temperature transformation formula is correct. (With certain additional assumptions, Planck's expression does seem to hold, however.) In fact, there are not even any experimental observations that would allow such a formula to be checked. Realizing such a measurement is a challenge for future experimenters – but not for relativity itself.

RELATIVISTIC MECHANICS

Because the speed of light is constant and velocities do not add up, we need to rethink the definitions of mass, momentum and energy. We thus need to recreate a theory of

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 254 An inelastic collision of two identical particles seen from two different inertial frames of reference

mechanics from scratch.

Mass in relativity

Page 91 In Galilean physics, the mass ratio between two bodies was defined using collisions; it was given by the negative inverse of the velocity change ratio

$$\frac{m_2}{m_1} = -\frac{\Delta v_1}{\Delta v_2} \,. \tag{158}$$

However, experiments show that the expression must be different for speeds near that of light. In fact, experiments are not needed: thinking alone can show this. Can you do so? Challenge 678 ny

There is only one solution to this problem. The two Galilean conservation theorems $\sum_i m_i \boldsymbol{v}_i = \text{const}$ for momentum and $\sum_i m_i = \text{const}$ for mass have to be changed into Ref. 350

$$\sum_i \gamma_i m_i \boldsymbol{v}_i = \text{const} \tag{159}$$

and

$$\sum_i \gamma_i m_i = \text{const} \,. \tag{160}$$

These expressions, which will remain valid throughout the rest of our ascent of Motion Mountain, imply, among other things, that teleportation is *not* possible in nature. (Can you confirm this?) Obviously, in order to recover Galilean physics, the relativistic correction (factors) γ_i have to be almost equal to 1 for everyday velocities, that is, for velocities nowhere near the speed of light. Challenge 679 s

Even if we do not know the value of the relativistic correction factor, we can deduce it from the collision shown in Figure 254.

In the first frame of reference (A) we have $\gamma_v mv = \gamma_V MV$ and $\gamma_v m + m = \gamma_V M$. From the observations of the second frame of reference (B) we deduce that V composed with V gives v, in other words, that Challenge 680 e

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

$$v = \frac{2V}{1 + V^2/c^2} \,. \tag{161}$$

When these equations are combined, the relativistic correction γ is found to depend on the magnitude of the velocity v through

$$\gamma_v = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}} \,. \tag{162}$$

With this expression, and a generalization of the situation of Galilean physics, the *mass* ratio between two colliding particles is defined as the ratio

$$\frac{m_1}{m_2} = -\frac{\Delta(\gamma_2 v_2)}{\Delta(\gamma_1 v_1)} \,. \tag{163}$$

(We do not give here the generalized mass definition, mentioned in the chapter on Galilean mechanics, that is based on acceleration ratios, because it contains some subtleties, which we will discover shortly.) The correction factors γ_i ensure that the mass defined by this equation is the same as the one defined in Galilean mechanics, and that it is the same for all types of collision a body may have.* In this way, mass remains a quantity characterizing the difficulty of accelerating a body, and it can still be used for *systems* of bodies as well.

Page 94

Following the example of Galilean physics, we call the quantity

$$\boldsymbol{p} = \gamma m \boldsymbol{v} \tag{164}$$

the (*linear*) *relativistic* (*three-*) *momentum* of a particle. Again, the total momentum is a *conserved* quantity for any system not subjected to external influences, and this conservation is a direct consequence of the way mass is defined.

For low speeds, or $\gamma \approx 1$, relativistic momentum is the same as that of Galilean physics, and is proportional to velocity. But for high speeds, momentum increases faster than velocity, tending to infinity when approaching light speed.

Why relativistic snooker is more difficult

There is a well-known property of collisions between a moving sphere or particle and a resting one of the *same mass* that is important when playing snooker, pool or billiards. After such a collision, the two spheres will depart at a *right angle* from each other, as shown in Figure 255.

However, experiments show that the right angle rule does *not* apply to relativistic collisions. Indeed, using the conservation of momentum and a bit of dexterity you can calculate that

Challenge 682 e

$$\tan\theta \tan\varphi = \frac{2}{\gamma + 1} \,, \tag{165}$$

Challenge 681 e

* The results below also show that $\gamma = 1 + T/mc^2$, where T is the kinetic energy of a particle.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 255 A useful rule for playing non-relativistic snooker

where the angles are defined in Figure 256. It follows that the sum $\varphi + \theta$ is *smaller* than a right angle in the relativistic case. Relativistic speeds thus completely change the game of snooker. Indeed, every accelerator physicist knows this: for electrons or protons, these angles can easily be deduced from photographs taken in cloud chambers, which show the tracks left by particles when they move through them. All such photographs confirm the above expression. In fact, the shapes of detectors are chosen according to expression (165), as sketched in Figure 256. If the formula – and relativity – were wrong, most of these detectors would not work, as they would miss most of the particles after the collision. If relativity were wrong, detectors would have to be much larger. In fact, these experiments also prove the formula for the composition of velocities. Can you show this?

Ref. 317

Challenge 683 ny

Mass is concentrated energy

Let us go back to the collinear and inelastic collision of Figure 254. What is the mass M of the final system? Calculation shows that

Challenge 684 s

$$M/m = \sqrt{2(1+\gamma_v)} > 2\,. \tag{166}$$

In other words, the mass of the final system is *larger* than the sum of the two original masses m. In contrast to Galilean mechanics, the sum of all masses in a system is *not* a conserved quantity. Only the sum $\sum_i \gamma_i m_i$ of the corrected masses is conserved.

Relativity provides the solution to this puzzle. Everything falls into place if, for the *energy* E of an object of mass m and velocity v, we use the expression

$$E = \gamma mc^2 = \frac{mc^2}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}}\,, \tag{167}$$

applying it both to the total system and to each component. The conservation of the corrected mass can then be read as the conservation of energy, simply without the factor c^2. In the example of the two identical masses sticking to each other, the two particles are thus each described by mass and energy, and the resulting system has an energy E given by the sum of the energies of the two particles. In particular, it follows that the energy

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 256 The dimensions of detectors for particle accelerators with single beams are based on the relativistic snooker angle rule – as an example, the HARP experiment at CERN (© CERN)

E_0 of a body *at rest* and its mass m are related by

$$E_0 = mc^2 \,, \tag{168}$$

which is perhaps the most beautiful and famous discovery of modern physics. Since c^2 is so large, we can say that *mass is concentrated energy*. In other words, special relativity says that every mass has energy, and that every form of energy in a system has mass. Increasing the energy of a system increases its mass, and decreasing the energy content decreases the mass. In short, if a bomb explodes inside a closed box, the mass, weight and momentum of the box are the same before and after the explosion, but the combined mass of the debris inside the box will be *smaller* than before. All bombs – not only nuclear ones – thus take their energy from a reduction in mass. In addition, every action of a system – such as a caress, a smile or a look – takes its energy from a reduction in mass.

The kinetic energy T is thus given by

$$T = \gamma mc^2 - mc^2 = \frac{1}{2}mv^2 + \frac{1\cdot 3}{2\cdot 4}m\frac{v^4}{c^2} + \frac{1\cdot 3\cdot 5}{2\cdot 4\cdot 6}m\frac{v^6}{c^4} + \ldots \tag{169}$$

Challenge 685 e (using the binomial theorem) which reduces to the Galilean value only for low speeds.

The mass–energy equivalence $E = \gamma mc^2$ implies that taking *any* energy from matter results in a mass decrease. When a person plays the piano, thinks or runs, its mass de-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

creases. When a cup of tea cools down or when a star shines, its mass decreases. The mass–energy equivalence pervades all of nature.

By the way, we should be careful to distinguish the transformation of *mass* into energy from the transformation of *matter* into energy. The latter is much more rare. Can you give some examples? Challenge 686 s

The mass–energy relation (167) means the death of many science fiction fantasies. It implies that there are *no* undiscovered sources of energy on or near Earth. If such sources existed, they would be measurable through their mass. Many experiments have looked for, and are still looking for, such effects with a negative result. There is no free energy in nature.*

The mass–energy relation $m = E_0/c^2$ also implies that one needs about 90 thousand million kJ (or 21 thousand million kcal) to increase one's weight by one single gram. Of course, dieticians have slightly different opinions on this matter! In fact, humans do get their everyday energy from the material they eat, drink and breathe by reducing its combined mass before expelling it again. However, this *chemical mass defect* appearing when fuel is burned cannot yet be measured by weighing the materials before and after the reaction: the difference is too small, because of the large conversion factor involved. Indeed, for any chemical reaction, bond energies are about 1 aJ (6 eV) per bond; this gives a weight change of the order of one part in 10^{10}, too small to be measured by weighing people or determining mass differences between food and excrement. Therefore, for everyday chemical processes mass can be taken to be constant, in accordance with Galilean physics.

The mass–energy equivalence has been confirmed by all experiments performed so far. The measurement is simplest for the *nuclear mass defect*. The most precise experiment, from 2005, confirmed the mass–energy relation to more than 6 digits, by comparing the masses difference of nuclei before and after neutron capture on one hand, and emitted gamma ray energy on the other hand. Ref. 351

Modern methods of mass measurement of single molecules have even made it possible to measure the *chemical* mass defect, by comparing the mass of a single molecule with that of its constituent atoms. David Pritchard's group has developed so-called *Penning traps*, which allow masses to be determined from the measurement of frequencies; the attainable precision of these cyclotron resonance experiments is sufficient to confirm $\Delta E_0 = \Delta m c^2$ for chemical bonds. In the future, increased precision will even allow bond energies to be determined in this way with precision. Since binding energy is often radiated as light, we can say that these modern techniques make it possible to *weigh* light. Ref. 352

Thinking about light and its mass was the basis for Einstein's first derivation of the mass–energy relation. When an object emits two equal light beams in opposite directions, its energy decreases by the emitted amount. Since the two light beams are equal in energy and momentum, the body does not move. If we describe the same situation from the viewpoint of a moving observer, we see again that the *rest energy* of the object is Challenge 687 e

$$E_0 = mc^2 \,. \tag{170}$$

* There may be two extremely diluted, yet undiscovered, form of energy, called *dark matter* and (confusingly) *dark energy*, scattered throughout the universe. They are deduced from (quite difficult) mass measurements. The issue has not yet been finally resolved. Page 568

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

In summary, all physical processes, including collisions, need relativistic treatment whenever the energy involved is a sizeable fraction of the rest energy.

Every energy increase produces a mass increase. Therefore also heating a body makes it heavier. However, this effect is so small that nobody has measured it up to this day. It is a challenge for experiments of the future to do this one day.

How are energy and momentum related? The definitions of momentum (164) and
Challenge 688 e energy (167) lead to two basic relations. First of all, their magnitudes are related by

$$m^2c^4 = E^2 - p^2c^2 \tag{171}$$

for all relativistic systems, be they objects or, as we will see below, radiation. For the momentum *vector* we get the other important relation

$$\boldsymbol{p} = \frac{E}{c^2}\boldsymbol{v}\,, \tag{172}$$

Challenge 689 e which is equally valid for *any* type of moving energy, be it an object or a beam or a pulse of radiation.* We will use both relations often in the rest of our ascent of Motion Mountain, including the following discussion.

Collisions, virtual objects and tachyons

We have just seen that in relativistic collisions the conservation of total energy and momentum are intrinsic consequences of the definition of mass. Let us now have a look at collisions in more detail, using these new concepts. A *collision* is a process, i.e., a series of events, for which

— the total momentum before the interaction and after the interaction is the same;
— the momentum is exchanged in a small region of space-time;
— for small velocities, the Galilean description is valid.

In everyday life an *impact*, i.e., a short-distance interaction, is the event at which both objects change momentum. But the two colliding objects are located at *different* points
Ref. 353 when this happens. A collision is therefore described by a space-time diagram such as the left-hand one in Figure 257, reminiscent of the Orion constellation. It is easy to check that
Challenge 690 e the process described by such a diagram is a collision according to the above definition.

The right-hand side of Figure 257 shows the same process seen from another, Greek, frame of reference. The Greek observer says that the first object has changed its momentum *before* the second one. That would mean that there is a short interval when momentum and energy are *not* conserved!

The only way to make sense of the situation is to assume that there is an exchange of a third object, drawn with a dotted line. Let us find out what the properties of this object are. If we give numerical subscripts to the masses, energies and momenta of the
Challenge 691 e two bodies, and give them a prime after the collision, the unknown mass m obeys

* In 4-vector notation, we can write $\boldsymbol{v}/c = \boldsymbol{p}/P_0$, where $P_0 = E/c$.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 257 Space-time diagram of a collision for two observers

$$m^2c^4 = (E_1 - E_1')^2 - (p_1 - p_1')^2c^2 = 2m_1^2c^4 - 2E_1E_1'\left(\frac{1 - v_1v_1'}{c^2}\right) < 0\ . \qquad (173)$$

This is a strange result, because it means that the unknown mass is an *imaginary* number![*] On top of that, we also see directly from the second graph that the exchanged object moves faster than light. It is a *tachyon*, from the Greek ταχύς 'rapid'. In other words, collisions involve motion that is faster than light! We will see later that collisions are indeed the *only* processes where tachyons play a role in nature. Since the exchanged objects appear only during collisions, never on their own, they are called *virtual* objects, to distinguish them from the usual, *real* objects, which can move freely without restriction.[**] We will study their properties later on, when we come to discuss quantum theory.

In nature, a tachyon is always a virtual object. Real objects are always *bradyons* – from the Greek βραδύς 'slow' – or objects moving slower than light. Note that tachyons, despite their high velocity, do not allow the transport of energy faster than light; and that they do not violate causality if and only if they are emitted or absorbed with equal probability. Challenge 692 ny Can you confirm all this?

When we study quantum theory, we will also discover that a general contact interaction between objects is described not by the exchange of a *single* virtual object, but by a continuous *stream* of virtual particles. For standard collisions of everyday objects, the interaction turns out to be electromagnetic. In this case, the exchanged particles are virtual photons. In other words, when one hand touches another, when it pushes a stone, or when a mountain supports the trees on it, streams of virtual photons are continuously exchanged. Page 1012

[*] It is usual to change the mass–energy and mass–momentum relation of tachyons to $E = \pm mc^2/\sqrt{v^2/c^2 - 1}$ and $p = \pm mv/\sqrt{v^2/c^2 - 1}$; this amounts to a redefinition of m. After the redefinition, tachyons have *real* mass. The energy and momentum relations show that tachyons lose energy and momentum when they get faster. (Provocatively, a single tachyon in a box could provide us with all the energy we need.) Both signs for the energy and momentum relations must be retained, because otherwise the equivalence of all inertial observers would not be generated. Tachyons thus do not have a minimum energy or a minimum

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 258 There is no consistent way to define a relativistic centre of mass

There is an additional secret hidden in collisions. In the right-hand side of Figure 257, the tachyon is emitted by the first object and absorbed by the second one. However, it is easy to imagine an observer for which the opposite happens. In short, the direction of travel of a tachyon depends on the observer! In fact, this is a hint about *antimatter*. In space-time diagrams, matter and antimatter travel in opposite directions. Also the connection between relativity and antimatter will become more apparent in quantum theory.

Challenge 693 s

Page 1049

Systems of particles – no centre of mass

Relativity also forces us to eliminate the cherished concept of *centre of mass*. We can see this already in the simplest example possible: that of two equal objects colliding.

Figure 258 shows that from the viewpoint in which one of two colliding particles is at rest, there are at least three different ways to define the centre of mass. In other words, the centre of mass is not an observer-invariant concept. We can deduce from the figure that the concept only makes sense for systems whose components move with *small* velocities relative to each other. For more general systems, centre of mass is not uniquely definable. Will this hinder us in our ascent? No. We are more interested in the motion of single particles than that of composite objects or systems.

Ref. 354

momentum.

** More precisely, a virtual particle does not obey the relation $m^2c^4 = E^2 - p^2c^2$, valid for real particles.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Why is most motion so slow?

For most everyday systems, the time intervals measured by two different observers are practically equal; only at large relative speeds, typically at more than a few per cent of the speed of light, is there a noticeable difference. Most such situations are microscopic. We have already mentioned the electrons inside a television tube or inside a particle accelerator. The particles making up cosmic radiation are another example: their high energy has produced many of the mutations that are the basis of evolution of animals and plants on this planet. Later we will discover that the particles involved in radioactivity are also relativistic.

But why don't we observe any rapid *macroscopic* bodies? Moving bodies, including observers, with relativistic velocities have a property not found in everyday life: when they are involved in a collision, part of their energy is converted into new matter via $E = \gamma mc^2$. In the history of the universe this has happened so many times that practically all the bodies still in relativistic motion are microscopic particles.

A second reason for the disappearance of rapid relative motion is radiation damping. Challenge 694 s Can you imagine what happens to charges during collisions, or in a bath of light?

In short, almost all matter in the universe moves with small velocity relative to other matter. The few known counter-examples are either very old, such as the quasar jets mentioned above, or stop after a short time. The huge energies necessary for macroscopic relativistic motion are still found in supernova explosions, but they cease to exist after only a few weeks. In summary, the universe is mainly filled with slow motion because it Page 577 is *old*. We will determine its age shortly.

The history of the mass–energy equivalence formula of De Pretto and Einstein

Albert Einstein took several months after his first paper on special relativity to deduce the expression

$$E = \gamma mc^2 \tag{174}$$

which is often called the most famous formula of physics. He published it in a second, Ref. 306 separate paper towards the end of 1905. Arguably, the formula could have been discovered thirty years earlier, from the theory of electromagnetism.

In fact, at least one person did deduce the result before Einstein. In 1903 and 1904, *before* Einstein's first relativity paper, a little-known Italian engineer, Olinto De Pretto, was the first to calculate, discuss and publish the formula $E = mc^2$.* It might well be that Einstein got the idea for the formula from De Pretto, possibly through Einstein's friend Michele Besso or other Italian-speaking friends he met when he visited his parents, who were living in Italy at the time. Of course, the value of Einstein's efforts is not diminished by this.

Ref. 355 In fact, a similar formula had also been deduced in 1904 by Friedrich Hasenöhrl and published again in Annalen der Physik in 1905, before Einstein, though with an incorrect numerical prefactor, due to a calculation mistake. The formula $E = mc^2$ is also part of

* Umberto Bartocci, mathematics professor of the University of Perugia in Italy, published the details of this surprising story in several papers. The full account is found in his book Umberto Bartocci, *Albert Einstein e Olinto De Pretto: la vera storia della formula più famosa del mondo*, Ultreja, 1998.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 259 The space-time diagram of a moving object T

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

several expressions in two publications in 1900 by Henri Poincaré. Also Paul Langevin knew it, and Einstein said of him that he would surely have discovered the theory of special relativity had it not been known before. The real hero in the story might well be Tolver Preston, who discussed the equivalence of mass and energy already in 1875, in his book *Physics of the Ether*. The mass–energy equivalence was thus indeed floating in the air, only waiting to be discovered.

In the 1970s, there a similar story occurred: a simple relation between the gravitational acceleration and the temperature of the vacuum was discovered. The result had been waiting to be discovered for over 50 years. Indeed, a number of similar, anterior results were found in the libraries. Could other simple relations be hidden in modern physics waiting to be found?

Page 1207

Challenge 695 s

4-VECTORS

To describe motion consistently for *all* observers, we have to introduce some new quantities. First of all, motion of particles is seen as a sequence of events. To describe events with precision, we use event coordinates, also called *4-coordinates*. These are written as

$$\boldsymbol{X} = (ct, \boldsymbol{x}) = (ct, x, y, z) = X^i \,. \tag{175}$$

In this way, an event is a point in four-dimensional space-time, and is described by four coordinates. The coordinates are called the zeroth, namely time $X^0 = ct$, the first, usually called $X^1 = x$, the second, $X^2 = y$, and the third, $X^3 = z$. One can then define a *distance d* between events as the length of the difference vector. In fact, one usually uses the square of the length, to avoid those unwieldy square roots. In special relativity, the magnitude ('squared length') of a vector is always defined through

$$\boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{X} = {X_0}^2 - {X_1}^2 - {X_2}^2 - {X_3}^2 = ct^2 - x^2 - y^2 - z^2 = X_a X^a = \eta_{ab} X^a X^b = \eta^{ab} X_a X_b \,. \tag{176}$$

In this equation we have introduced for the first time two notations that are useful in relativity. First of all, we automatically sum over repeated indices. Thus, $X_a X^a$ means the sum of all products $X_a X^a$ as a ranges over all indices. Secondly, for every 4-vector $\boldsymbol{X}$ we distinguish two ways to write the coordinates, namely coordinates with superscripts and coordinates with subscripts. (In three dimensions, we only use subscripts.) They are related by the following general relation

$$X_a = \eta_{ab} X^b = (ct, -x, -y, -z) \,, \tag{177}$$

where we have introduced the so-called *metric* η^{ab}, an abbreviation of the matrix*

$$\eta^{ab} = \eta_{ab} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{178}$$

Don't panic: this is all, and it won't get more difficult! (A generalization of this matrix is used in general relativity.) We now go back to physics.

The magnitude of a position or distance vector, also called the space-time *interval*, is essentially the proper time times c. The *proper time* is the time shown by a clock moving in a straight line and with constant velocity from the starting point to the end point in space-time. The difference from the usual 3-vectors is that the magnitude of the interval can be positive, negative or even zero. For example, if the start and end points in space-time require motion with the speed of light, the proper time is zero (this is required for null vectors). If the motion is slower than the speed of light, the squared proper time is positive and the distance is timelike. For negative intervals and thus imaginary proper times, the distance is spacelike.** A simplified overview is given by Figure 259.

Page 424

Now we are ready to calculate and measure motion in four dimensions. The measurements are based on one central idea. We cannot define the velocity of a particle as the derivative of its coordinates with respect to time, since time and temporal sequences depend on the observer. The solution is to define all observables with respect to the just-mentioned *proper time* τ, which is defined as the time shown by a clock attached to the object. In relativity, motion and change are always measured with respect to clocks attached to the moving system. In particular, the *relativistic velocity* or *4-velocity* $\boldsymbol{U}$ of a body is thus defined as the rate of change of the event coordinates or *4-coordinates* $\boldsymbol{X} = (ct, \boldsymbol{x})$ with respect to proper time, i.e., as

$$\boldsymbol{U} = \frac{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{X}}{\mathrm{d}\tau} \,. \tag{179}$$

The coordinates $\boldsymbol{X}$ are measured in the coordinate system defined by the inertial observer chosen. The value of the velocity $\boldsymbol{U}$ depends on the observer or coordinate system used;

* Note that 30 % of all physics textbooks use the negative of η as the metric, the so-called *spacelike convention*, and thus have opposite signs in this definition. In this text, as in 70 % of all physics texts, we use the *timelike convention*.

** In the latter case, the negative of the magnitude, which is a positive number, is called the squared *proper distance*. The proper distance is the length measured by an odometer as the object moves along.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

so the velocity depends on the observer, as it does in everyday life. Using $\mathrm{d}t = \gamma\,\mathrm{d}\tau$ and thus

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}\tau} = \frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t}\frac{\mathrm{d}t}{\mathrm{d}\tau} = \gamma\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t} \quad \text{, where as usual} \quad \gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}}\,, \tag{180}$$

we get the relation with the 3-velocity $\boldsymbol{v} = \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}/\mathrm{d}t$:

$$u^0 = \gamma c\,,\ u^i = \gamma v_i \quad \text{or} \quad \boldsymbol{U} = (\gamma c, \gamma \boldsymbol{v})\,. \tag{181}$$

For small velocities we have $\gamma \approx 1$, and then the last three components of the 4-velocity are those of the usual, Galilean 3-velocity. For the magnitude of the 4-velocity $\boldsymbol{U}$ we find $\boldsymbol{U}\boldsymbol{U} = U_a U^a = \eta_{ab} U^a U^b = c^2$, which is therefore independent of the magnitude of the 3-velocity $\boldsymbol{v}$ and makes it a timelike vector, i.e., a vector *inside* the light cone.*

Note that the magnitude of a 4-vector can be zero even though all its components are different from zero. Such a vector is called *null*. Which motions have a null velocity vector? Challenge 697 s

Similarly, the *relativistic acceleration* or *4-acceleration* $\boldsymbol{B}$ of a body is defined as

$$\boldsymbol{B} = \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{U}/\mathrm{d}\tau = \mathrm{d}^2\boldsymbol{X}/\mathrm{d}\tau^2\,. \tag{183}$$

Using $\mathrm{d}\gamma/\mathrm{d}\tau = \gamma\mathrm{d}\gamma/\mathrm{d}t = \gamma^4\boldsymbol{v}a/c^2$, we get the following relations between the four components of $\boldsymbol{B}$ and the 3-acceleration $\boldsymbol{a} = \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{v}/\mathrm{d}t$: Ref. 356

$$B^0 = \gamma^4\frac{\boldsymbol{v}a}{c} \quad , \quad B^i = \gamma^2 a_i + \gamma^4\frac{(\boldsymbol{v}a)v_i}{c^2}\,. \tag{184}$$

The magnitude B of the 4-acceleration is easily found via $\boldsymbol{B}B = \eta_{cd}B^cB^d = -\gamma^4(a^2 + \gamma^2(\boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{a})^2/c^2) = -\gamma^6(a^2 - (\boldsymbol{v}\times\boldsymbol{a})^2/c^2)$. Note that it does depend on the value of the 3-acceleration $\boldsymbol{a}$. The magnitude of the 4-acceleration is also called the *proper* acceleration because $\boldsymbol{B}^2 = -a^2$ if $v = 0$. (What is the connection between 4-acceleration and 3-acceleration for an observer moving with the same speed as the object?) Challenge 698 s We note that 4-acceleration lies *outside* the light cone, i.e., that it is a spacelike vector, and that $\boldsymbol{B}\boldsymbol{U} = \eta_{cd}B^cU^d = 0$, which means that the 4-acceleration is always perpendicular to the

* In general, a *4-vector* is defined as a quantity (h_0, h_1, h_2, h_3), which transforms as

$$\begin{aligned} h'_0 &= \gamma_V(h_0 - h_1 V/c) \\ h'_1 &= \gamma_V(h_1 - h_0 V/c) \\ h'_2 &= h_2 \\ h'_3 &= h_3 \end{aligned} \tag{182}$$

when changing from one inertial observer to another moving with a relative velocity V in the x direction; the corresponding generalizations for the other coordinates are understood. This relation allows one to deduce the transformation laws for any 3-vector. Can you deduce the velocity composition formula (142) from this definition, applying it to 4-velocity? Challenge 696 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 260 Energy–momentum is tangent to the world line

4-velocity.* We also note that accelerations, in contrast to velocities, cannot be called relativistic: the difference between b_i and a_i, or between their two magnitudes, does not depend on the value of a_i, but only on the value of the speed v. In other words, accelerations require relativistic treatment only when the involved velocities are relativistic. If the velocities involved are low, even the highest accelerations can be treated with Galilean methods.

When the acceleration $\boldsymbol{a}$ is parallel to the velocity $\boldsymbol{v}$, we get $B = \gamma^3 a$; when $\boldsymbol{a}$ is perpendicular to $\boldsymbol{v}$, as in circular motion, we get $B = \gamma^2 a$. We will use this result below.

Page 459

4-MOMENTUM

To describe motion, we also need the concept of momentum. The *4-momentum* is defined as

$$\boldsymbol{P} = m\boldsymbol{U} \tag{187}$$

and is therefore related to the 3-momentum $\boldsymbol{p}$ by

$$\boldsymbol{P} = (\gamma mc, \gamma m\boldsymbol{v}) = (E/c, \boldsymbol{p}) \,. \tag{188}$$

For this reason 4-momentum is also called the *energy–momentum 4-vector*. In short, *the 4-momentum of a body is given by mass times 4-displacement per proper time*. This is the simplest possible definition of momentum and energy. The concept was introduced by Max Planck in 1906. The energy–momentum 4-vector, also called *momenergy*, like the

* Similarly, the *relativistic jerk* or *4-jerk* $\boldsymbol{J}$ of a body is defined as

$$\boldsymbol{J} = \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{B}/\mathrm{d}\tau = \mathrm{d}^2\boldsymbol{U}/\mathrm{d}\tau^2 \,. \tag{185}$$

Challenge 699 e For the relation with the 3-jerk $\boldsymbol{j} = \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{a}/\mathrm{d}t$ we then get

$$\boldsymbol{J} = (J^0, J^i) = \left(\frac{\gamma^5}{c}(\boldsymbol{jv} + a^2 + 4\gamma^2 \frac{(\boldsymbol{va})^2}{c^2}) \,,\, \gamma^3 j_i + \frac{\gamma^5}{c^2}((\boldsymbol{jv})v_i + a^2 v_i + 4\gamma^2 \frac{(\boldsymbol{va})^2 v_i}{c^2} + 3(\boldsymbol{va})a_i) \right) \tag{186}$$

Challenge 700 ny which we will use later on. Surprisingly, $\boldsymbol{J}$ does not vanish when $\boldsymbol{j}$ vanishes. Why not?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

4-velocity, is *tangent* to the world line of a particle. This connection, shown in Figure 260, follows directly from the definition, since

$$(E/c, \boldsymbol{p}) = (\gamma mc, \gamma m\boldsymbol{v}) = m(\gamma c, \gamma \boldsymbol{v}) = m(\mathrm{d}t/\mathrm{d}\tau, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}/\mathrm{d}\tau) \,. \tag{189}$$

The (square of the) length of momenergy, namely $\boldsymbol{PP} = \eta_{ab} P^a P^b$, is by definition the same for all inertial observers; it is found to be

$$E^2/c^2 - p^2 = m^2 c^2 \,, \tag{190}$$

thus confirming a result given above. We have already mentioned that energies or situations are called *relativistic* if the kinetic energy $T = E - E_0$ is not negligible when compared to the rest energy $E_0 = mc^2$. A particle whose kinetic energy is much higher than its rest mass is called *ultrarelativistic*. Particles in accelerators or in cosmic rays fall into this category. (What is their energy–momentum relation?) Challenge 701 s

In contrast to Galilean mechanics, relativity implies an absolute zero for the energy. One cannot extract more energy than mc^2 from a system of mass m. In particular, a zero value for potential energy is fixed in this way. In short, relativity shows that energy is bounded from below.

Note that by the term 'mass' m we always mean what is sometimes called the *rest mass*. This name derives from the bad habit of many science fiction and secondary-school books of calling the product γm the *relativistic mass*. Workers in the field usually (but not unanimously) reject this concept, as did Einstein himself, and they also reject the often-heard expression that '(relativistic) mass increases with velocity'. Relativistic mass and energy would then be two words for the same concept: this way to talk is at the level of the tabloid press. Ref. 357

Not all Galilean energy contributes to mass. Potential energy in an outside field does not. Relativity forces us into precise energy bookkeeping. 'Potential energy' in relativity is an abbreviation for 'energy reduction of the outside field'.

Can you show that for two particles with momenta P_1 and P_2, one has $P_1P_2 = m_1E_2 = M_2E_1 = c^2\gamma v_{12} m_1 m_2$, where v_{12} is their relative velocity? Challenge 702 s

4-FORCE

The 4-force $\boldsymbol{K}$ is defined as

$$\boldsymbol{K} = \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{P}/\mathrm{d}\tau = m\boldsymbol{B} \,. \tag{191}$$

Therefore force remains equal to mass times acceleration in relativity. From the definition of $\boldsymbol{K}$ we deduce the relation with 3-force $\boldsymbol{F} = \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{p}/\mathrm{d}t = m\mathrm{d}(\gamma\boldsymbol{v})/\mathrm{d}t$, namely* Ref. 356, Ref. 358

$$\boldsymbol{K} = (K^0, K^i) = \left(\gamma^4 m\boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{a}/c, \gamma^2 m a_i + \gamma^4 v_i \frac{m\boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{a}}{c^2}\right) = \left(\frac{\gamma}{c}\frac{\mathrm{d}E}{\mathrm{d}t}, \gamma\frac{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{p}}{\mathrm{d}t}\right) = \left(\gamma\frac{\boldsymbol{F}v}{c}, \gamma\boldsymbol{F}\right) \,. \tag{192}$$

* Some authors define 3-force as $\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{p}/\mathrm{d}\tau$; then $\boldsymbol{K}$ looks slightly different. In any case, it is important to note that in relativity, 3-force $\boldsymbol{F} = \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{p}/\mathrm{d}t$ is indeed proportional to 3-acceleration $\boldsymbol{a}$; however, force and acceleration are not parallel to each other. In fact, for rest-mass-preserving forces one finds $\boldsymbol{F} = \gamma m\boldsymbol{a} + (\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{v})\boldsymbol{v}/c^2$. In contrast, in relativity 3-momentum is *not* proportional to 3-velocity, although it is parallel to it. Challenge 703 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 261 On the definition of relative velocity

Challenge 704 e The 4-force, like the 4-acceleration, is orthogonal to the 4-velocity. The meaning of the zeroth component of the 4-force can easily be discerned: it is the *power* required to accelerate the object. One has $\boldsymbol{KU} = c^2 \mathrm{d}m/\mathrm{d}\tau = \gamma^2(\mathrm{d}E/\mathrm{d}t - \boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{v})$: this is the proper rate at which the internal energy of a system increases. The product $\boldsymbol{KU}$ vanishes only for rest-mass-conserving forces. Particle collisions that lead to reactions do not belong to this class. In everyday life, the rest mass is preserved, and then one gets the Galilean expression $\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{v} = \mathrm{d}E/\mathrm{d}t$.

Rotation in relativity

If at night we turn around our own axis while looking at the sky, the stars move with a velocity much higher than that of light. Most stars are masses, not images. Their speed should be limited by that of light. How does this fit with special relativity?

This example helps to clarify in another way what the limit velocity actually is. Physically speaking, a rotating sky does *not* allow superluminal energy transport, and thus does not contradict the concept of a limit speed. Mathematically speaking, the speed of light limits relative velocities *only* between objects that come *near* to each other, as shown on the left of Figure 261. To compare velocities of distant objects is only possible if all velocities involved are constant in time; this is not the case in the present example. The differential version of the Lorentz transformations make this point particularly clear. In many general cases, relative velocities of *distant* objects can be higher than the speed Page 436 of light. We encountered one example earlier, when discussing the car in the tunnel, and Page 466 we will encounter a few more examples shortly.

With this clarification, we can now briefly consider *rotation* in relativity. The first question is how lengths and times change in a rotating frame of reference. You may want to check that an observer in a rotating frame agrees with a non-rotating colleague on the radius of a rotating body; however, both find that the rotating body, even if it is Challenge 705 e rigid, has a circumference *different* from the one it had before it started rotating. Sloppily speaking, the value of π *changes* for rotating observers. The ratio between the circumfer- Challenge 706 e ence c and the radius r turns out to be $c/r = 2\pi\gamma$: it increases with rotation speed. This Ref. 359 counter-intuitive result is often called *Ehrenfest's paradox*. Among other things, it shows that space-time for an observer on a rotating disc is *not* the Minkowski space-time of special relativity.

Rotating bodies behave strangely in many ways. For example, one gets into trouble when one tries to synchronize clocks mounted on a rotating circle, as shown in Figure 262 If one starts synchronizing the clock at O_2 with that at O_1, and so on, continuing up to clock O_n, one finds that the last clock is *not* synchronized with the first. This result

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 262 Observers on a rotating object

reflects the change in circumference just mentioned. In fact, a careful study shows that the measurements of length and time intervals lead all observers O_k to conclude that they live in a rotating space-time. Rotating discs can thus be used as an introduction to general relativity, where spatial curvature and its effects form the central topic. More about this in the next chapter.

Is angular velocity limited? Yes: the tangential speed in an inertial frame of reference cannot exceed that of light. The limit thus depends on the *size* of the body in question. Challenge 707 s That leads to a neat puzzle: can one *see* an object rotating very rapidly?

We mention that 4-angular momentum is defined naturally as

$$l^{ab} = x^a p^b - x^b p^a \,. \tag{193}$$

In other words, 4-angular momentum is a *tensor*, not a vector, as shown by its two indices. Challenge 708 ny Angular momentum is conserved in special relativity. The moment of inertia is naturally defined as the proportionality factor between angular velocity and angular momentum.

Challenge 709 ny Obviously, for a rotating particle, the rotational energy is part of the rest mass. You may want to calculate the fraction for the Earth and the Sun. It is not large. By the way, Challenge 710 ny how would you determine whether a microscopic particle, too small to be seen, is rotating?

In relativity, rotation and translation combine in strange ways. Imagine a cylinder in uniform rotation along its axis, as seen by an observer at rest. As Max von Laue has discussed, the cylinder will appear *twisted* to an observer moving along the rotation axis. Challenge 711 e Can you confirm this?

Challenge 712 ny Here is a last puzzle about rotation. Velocity is relative; this means that the measured value depends on the observer. Is this the case also for angular velocity?

Wave motion

In Galilean physics, a wave is described by a wave vector and a frequency. In special relativity, the two are combined in the wave 4-vector, given by

$$\boldsymbol{L} = \frac{1}{\lambda}\left(\frac{\omega}{c}, \boldsymbol{n}\right) \,, \tag{194}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

where λ is the wavelength, ω the wave velocity, and $\boldsymbol{n}$ the normed direction vector. Suppose an observer with 4-velocity $\boldsymbol{U}$ finds that a wave $\boldsymbol{L}$ has frequency ν. Show that

$$\nu = \boldsymbol{L}\boldsymbol{U} \tag{195}$$

Challenge 713 ny Ref. 311 Challenge 714 ny

must be obeyed. Interestingly, the wave velocity ω transforms in a different way than particle velocity except in the case $\omega = c$. Also the aberration formula for wave motion differs from that for particles, except in the case $\omega = c$.

The action of a free particle – how do things move?

Page 194

If we want to describe relativistic motion of a free particle in terms of an extremal principle, we need a definition of the action. We already know that physical action is a measure of the change occurring in a system. For an inertially moving or free particle, the only change is the ticking of its proper clock. As a result, the action of a free particle will be proportional to the elapsed proper time. In order to get the standard unit of energy times time, or Js, for the action, the first guess for the action of a free particle is

$$S = -mc^2 \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \mathrm{d}\tau \,, \tag{196}$$

where τ is the proper time along its path. This is indeed the correct expression. It implies conservation of (relativistic) energy and momentum, as the change in proper time is maximal for straight-line motion with constant velocity. Can you confirm this? Indeed, in nature, all particles move in such a way that their proper time is maximal. In other words, we again find that in nature things change as little as possible. Nature is like a wise old man: its motions are as slow as possible. If you prefer, every change is maximally effective. As we mentioned before, Bertrand Russell called this the *law of cosmic laziness*.

Challenge 715 ny

The expression (196) for the action is due to Max Planck. In 1906, by exploring it in detail, he found that the quantum of action $\hbar$, which he had discovered together with the Boltzmann constant, is a relativistic invariant (like the Boltzmann constant k). Can you imagine how he did this?

Challenge 716 ny

The action can also be written in more complex, seemingly more frightening ways. These equivalent ways to write it are particularly appropriate to prepare for general relativity:

$$S = \int L \,\mathrm{d}t = -mc^2 \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{1}{\gamma} \,\mathrm{d}t = -mc \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \sqrt{u_a u^a} \,\mathrm{d}\tau = -mc \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \sqrt{\eta^{ab} \frac{\mathrm{d}x_a}{\mathrm{d}s} \frac{\mathrm{d}x_b}{\mathrm{d}s}} \,\mathrm{d}s \,, \tag{197}$$

where s is some arbitrary, but monotonically increasing, function of τ, such as τ itself. As usual, the *metric* $\eta^{\alpha\beta}$ of special relativity is

$$\eta^{ab} = \eta_{ab} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{198}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

You can easily confirm the form of the action (197) by deducing the equation of motion in the usual way. Challenge 717 ny

In short, nature is not in a hurry: every object moves in a such way that its own clock shows the *longest* delay possible, compared with any alternative motion nearby.* This general principle is also valid for particles under the influence of gravity, as we will see in the section on general relativity, and for particles under the influence of electric or magnetic interactions. In fact, it is valid in all cases of (macroscopic) motion found in nature. For the moment, we just note that the longest proper time is realized when the difference between kinetic and potential energy is minimal. (Can you confirm this?) For the Galilean case, the longest proper time thus implies the smallest average difference between the two energy types. We thus recover the principle of least action in its Galilean formulation. Challenge 719 ny

Earlier on, we saw that the action measures the change going on in a system. Special relativity shows that nature minimizes change by maximizing proper time. In nature, *proper time is always maximal*. In other words, things move along paths of *maximal ageing*. Can you explain why 'maximal ageing' and 'cosmic laziness' are equivalent? Page 194 Challenge 720 ny

We thus again find that nature is the opposite of a Hollywood film: nature changes in the most economical way possible. The deeper meaning of this result is left to your personal thinking: enjoy it!

Conformal transformations – why is the speed of light constant?

The distinction between space and time in special relativity depends on the observer. On the other hand, all inertial observers agree on the position, shape and orientation of the light cone at a point. Thus, in the theory of relativity, the light cones are the basic physical 'objects'. Given the importance of light cones, we might ask if inertial observers are the only ones that observe the same light cones. Interestingly, it turns out that *other* observers do as well.

The first such category of observers are those using units of measurement in which all time and length intervals are multiplied by a *scale factor* λ. The transformations among these points of view are given by

$$x_a \mapsto \lambda x_a \tag{199}$$

and are called *dilations*.

A second category of additional observers are found by applying the so-called *special conformal transformations*. These are compositions of an *inversion*

$$x_a \mapsto \frac{x_a}{x^2} \tag{200}$$

with a *translation* by a vector b_a, namely

$$x_a \mapsto x_a + b_a \,, \tag{201}$$

* If neutrinos were massless, the action (197) would not be applicable for them. Why? Can you find an alternative for this (admittedly academic) case? Challenge 718 ny

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

and a second inversion. Thus the special conformal transformations are

$$x_a \mapsto \frac{x_a + b_a x^2}{1 + 2b_a x^a + b^2 x^2} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{x_a}{x^2} \mapsto \frac{x_a}{x^2} + b_a \,. \tag{202}$$

These transformations are called *conformal* because they do not change angles of (in-
Challenge 721 ny finitesimally) small shapes, as you may want to check. They therefore leave the *form* (of infinitesimally small objects) unchanged. For example, they transform infinitesimal circles into infinitesimal circles. They are called *special* because the *full* conformal group includes the dilations and the inhomogeneous Lorentz transformations as well.*

Note that the way in which special conformal transformations leave light cones invari-
Challenge 723 ny ant is rather subtle.

Since dilations do not commute with time translations, there is no conserved quantity associated with this symmetry. (The same is true of Lorentz boosts.) In contrast, rotations and spatial translations do commute with time translations and thus do lead to conserved quantities.

In summary, vacuum is conformally invariant – in the special sense just mentioned – and thus also dilation invariant. This is another way to say that vacuum alone is not sufficient to define lengths, as it does not fix a scale factor. As we would expect, matter is necessary to do so. Indeed, (special) conformal transformations are not symmetries of situations containing matter. Only vacuum is conformally invariant; nature as a whole is not.

However, conformal invariance, or the invariance of light cones, is sufficient to allow velocity measurements. Conformal invariance is also *necessary* for velocity measure-
Challenge 724 ny ments, as you might want to check.

We have seen that conformal invariance implies inversion symmetry: that is, that the large and small scales of a vacuum are related. This suggest that the constancy of the speed of light is related to the existence of inversion symmetry. This mysterious connection gives us a glimpse of the adventures we will encounter in the final part of our ascent of Motion Mountain. Conformal invariance turns out to be an important property that will lead to some incredible insights.**

Challenge 722 ny * The set of all *special* conformal transformations forms a group with four parameters; adding dilations and the inhomogeneous Lorentz transformations one gets fifteen parameters for the *full* conformal group. The conformal group is locally isomorphic to SU(2,2) and to the simple group SO(4,2): these concepts are
Page 875 explained in Appendix B. Note that all this is true only for *four* space-time dimensions; in *two* dimensions – the other important case, especially in string theory – the conformal group is isomorphic to the group of arbitrary analytic coordinate transformations, and is thus infinite-dimensional.

** The conformal group does not appear only in the kinematics of special relativity: it is the symmetry group of all physical interactions, such as electromagnetism, provided that all the particles involved have zero mass, as is the case for the photon. A field that has mass cannot be conformally invariant; therefore conformal invariance is not an exact symmetry of all of nature. Can you confirm that a mass term $m\varphi^2$ in
Challenge 725 ny a Lagrangian is not conformally invariant?

However, since all particles observed up to now have masses that are many orders of magnitude smaller than the Planck mass, it can be said that they have almost vanishing mass; conformal symmetry can then be seen as an *approximate* symmetry of nature. In this view, all massive particles should be seen as small corrections, or perturbations, of massless, i.e., conformally invariant, fields. Therefore, for the construction of a fundamental theory, conformally invariant Lagrangians are often assumed to provide a good starting

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 263 The simplest situation for an inertial and an accelerated observer

ACCELERATING OBSERVERS

So far, we have only studied what inertial, or free-flying, observers say to each other when they talk about the same observation. For example, we saw that moving clocks always run slow. The story gets even more interesting when one or both of the observers are accelerating.

One sometimes hears that special relativity cannot be used to describe accelerating observers. That is wrong, just as it is wrong to say that Galilean physics cannot be used for accelerating observers. Special relativity's only limitation is that it cannot be used in non-flat, i.e., curved, space-time. Accelerating bodies do exist in flat space-times, and therefore they can be discussed in special relativity.

Ref. 360 As an appetizer, let us see what an accelerating, Greek, observer says about the clock of an inertial, Roman, one, and vice versa. Assume that the Greek observer, shown in Figure 263, moves along the path $\boldsymbol{x}(t)$, as observed by the inertial Roman one. In general, the Roman/Greek clock rate ratio is given by $\Delta\tau/\Delta t = (\tau_2 - \tau_1)/(t_2 - t_1)$. Here the Greek coordinates are constructed with a simple procedure: take the two sets of events defined by $t = t_1$ and $t = t_2$, and let τ_1 and τ_2 be the points where these sets intersect the time axis of the Greek observer.* We assume that the Greek observer is inertial and moving with velocity v as observed by the Roman one. The clock ratio of a Greek observer is then given by

$$\frac{\Delta\tau}{\Delta t} = \frac{\mathrm{d}\tau}{\mathrm{d}t} = \sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2} = \frac{1}{\gamma_v} \,, \tag{203}$$

Challenge 726 ny a formula we are now used to. We find again that moving clocks run slow.

Ref. 360 For accelerated motions, the differential version of the above reasoning is necessary. The Roman/Greek clock rate ratio is again $\mathrm{d}\tau/\mathrm{d}t$, and τ and $\tau + \mathrm{d}\tau$ are calculated in the same way from the times t and $t + \mathrm{d}t$. Assume again that the Greek observer moves along the path $\boldsymbol{x}(t)$, as measured by the Roman one. We find directly that

$$\tau = t - \boldsymbol{x}(t)\boldsymbol{v}(t)/c^2 \tag{204}$$

and thus

$$\tau + \mathrm{d}\tau = (t + \mathrm{d}t) - [\boldsymbol{x}(t) - \mathrm{d}t\boldsymbol{v}(t)][\boldsymbol{v}(t) + \mathrm{d}t\boldsymbol{a}(t)]/c^2 \,. \tag{205}$$

approximation.

* These sets form what mathematicians call *hypersurfaces*.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Together, these equations yield

$$\text{`}\mathrm{d}\tau/\mathrm{d}t\text{'} = \gamma_v(1 - \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}/c^2 - \boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{a}/c^2) \ . \tag{206}$$

This shows that accelerated clocks can run *fast* or slow, depending on their position $\boldsymbol{x}$ and the sign of their acceleration $\boldsymbol{a}$. There are quotes in the above equation because we can see directly that the Greek observer notes

$$\text{`}\mathrm{d}t/\mathrm{d}\tau\text{'} = \gamma_v \ , \tag{207}$$

which is *not* the inverse of equation (206). This difference becomes most apparent in the simple case of two clocks with the same velocity, one of which has a constant acceleration g towards the origin, whereas the other moves inertially. We then have

$$\text{`}\mathrm{d}\tau/\mathrm{d}t\text{'} = 1 + gx/c^2 \tag{208}$$

and

$$\text{`}\mathrm{d}t/\mathrm{d}\tau\text{'} = 1 \ . \tag{209}$$

We will discuss this situation shortly. But first we must clarify the concept of acceleration.

Acceleration for inertial observers

Accelerations behave differently from velocities under change of viewpoint. Let us first take the simple case in which the object and two inertial observers all move along the x-axis. If the Roman inertial observer measures an acceleration $a = \mathrm{d}v/\mathrm{d}t = \mathrm{d}^2x/\mathrm{d}t^2$, and the Greek observer, also inertial, measures an acceleration $\alpha = \mathrm{d}\omega/\mathrm{d}\tau = \mathrm{d}^2\xi/\mathrm{d}\tau^2$, we get

Ref. 312

$$\gamma_v^3 a = \gamma_\omega^3 \alpha \ . \tag{210}$$

This relation shows that accelerations are *not* Lorentz invariant, unless the velocities are small compared to the speed of light. This is in contrast to our everyday experience, where accelerations are independent of the speed of the observer.

Expression (210) simplifies if the accelerations are measured at a time t at which ω vanishes – i.e., if they are measured by the so-called *comoving* inertial observer. In that case the acceleration relation is given by

$$a_\mathrm{c} = a\gamma_v^3 \tag{211}$$

and the acceleration $a_\mathrm{c} = \alpha$ is also called proper acceleration, as its value describes what the Greek, comoving observer *feels*: proper acceleration describes the experience of being pushed into the back of the accelerating seat.

In general, the observer's speed and the acceleration are not parallel. We can calculate how the value of 3-acceleration $\boldsymbol{a}$ measured by a general inertial observer is related to the value $\boldsymbol{a}_\mathrm{c}$ measured by the comoving observer using expressions (184) and (182). We

Ref. 361

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

get the generalization of (211):

$$\boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{a}_c = \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{a}\gamma_v^3 \tag{212}$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{a} = \frac{1}{\gamma_v^2}\left(\boldsymbol{a}_c - \frac{(1-\gamma_v)(\boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{a}_c)\boldsymbol{v}}{v^2} - \frac{\gamma_v(\boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{a}_c)\boldsymbol{v}}{c^2}\right) . \tag{213}$$

Squaring yields the relation

$$a^2 = \frac{1}{\gamma_v^4}\left(a_c^2 - \frac{(\boldsymbol{a}_c\boldsymbol{v})^2}{c^2}\right) \tag{214}$$

Page 450

which we know already in a slightly different form. It shows (again) that the comoving or proper 3-acceleration is always larger than the 3-acceleration measured by an outside inertial observer. The faster the outside inertial observer is moving, the smaller the acceleration he observes. Acceleration is not a relativistic invariant. The expression also shows that whenever the speed is perpendicular to the acceleration, a boost yields a factor γ_v^2, whereas a speed parallel to the acceleration gives the already mentioned γ_v^3 dependence.

Challenge 727 e

We see that acceleration complicates many issues, and it requires a deeper investigation. To keep matters simple, from now on we only study *constant* accelerations. Interestingly, this situation serves also as a good introduction to black holes and, as we will see shortly, to the universe as a whole.

Page 604

Accelerating frames of reference

How do we check whether we live in an inertial frame of reference? Let us first define the term. An *inertial frame* (*of reference*) has two defining properties. First, lengths and distances measured with a ruler are described by Euclidean geometry. In other words, rulers behave as they do in daily life. In particular, distances found by counting how many rulers (rods) have to be laid down end to end to reach from one point to another – the so-called *rod distances* – behave as in everyday life. For example, they obey Pythagoras' theorem in the case of right-angled triangles. Secondly, the speed of light is constant. In other words, any two observers in that frame, independent of their time and of the position, make the following observation: the ratio c between twice the rod distance between two points and the time taken by light to travel from one point to the other and back is always the same.

Equivalently, an inertial frame is one for which all clocks always remain synchronized and whose geometry is Euclidean. In particular, in an inertial frame all observers at fixed coordinates always remain at rest with respect to each other. This last condition is, however, a more general one. There are other, non-inertial, situations where this is still the case.

Non-inertial frames, or *accelerating frames*, are a useful concept in special relativity. In fact, we all live in such a frame. We can use special relativity to describe it in the same way that we used Galilean physics to describe it at the beginning of our journey.

A general *frame of reference* is a continuous set of observers remaining at rest with respect to each other. Here, 'at rest with respect to each other' means that the time for a

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 264 The hyperbolic motion of an rectilinearly, uniformly accelerating observer Ω

light signal to go from one observer to another and back again is constant over time, or equivalently, that the rod distance between the two observers is constant. Any frame of reference can therefore also be called a *rigid* collection of observers. We therefore note that a general frame of reference is *not* the same as a set of coordinates; the latter is usually *not* rigid. If all the rigidly connected observers have constant coordinate values, we speak of a *rigid coordinate system*. Obviously, these are the most useful when it comes to describing accelerating frames of reference.*

Ref. 363 Note that if two observers both move with a velocity $\boldsymbol{v}$, as measured in some *inertial* frame, they observe that they are at rest with respect to each other *only* if this velocity is *constant*. Again we find, as above, that two people tied to each other by a rope, and at a distance such that the rope is under tension, will see the rope break (or hang loose) if they accelerate together to (or decelerate from) relativistic speeds in precisely the same way. Relativistic acceleration requires careful thinking.

Challenge 728 ny

An observer who always *feels* the *same* force on his body is called *uniformly* accelerating. More precisely, a uniformly accelerating observer is an observer whose acceleration at every moment, measured by the inertial frame with respect to which the observer is at rest *at that moment*, always has the same value $\boldsymbol{B}$. It is important to note that uniform acceleration is *not* uniformly accelerating when always observed from the *same* inertial frame. This is an important difference from the Galilean case.

For uniformly accelerated motion in the sense just defined, we need

$$\boldsymbol{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{B} = -g^2 \tag{215}$$

Ref. 364 where g is a constant independent of t. The simplest case is uniformly accelerating mo-

Ref. 362 * There are essentially only two other types of rigid coordinate frames, apart from the inertial frames:

— The frame $ds^2 = dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2 - c^2 dt^2 (1 + g_k x_k/c^2)^2$ with arbitrary, but constant, acceleration of the origin. The acceleration is $\boldsymbol{a} = -\boldsymbol{g}(1 + \boldsymbol{g}x/c^2)$.
— The uniformly rotating frame $ds^2 = dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2 + 2\omega(-y\,dx + x\,dy)dt - (1 - r^2\omega^2/c^2)dt$. Here the z-axis is the rotation axis, and $r^2 = x^2 + y^2$.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

tion that is also *rectilinear*, i.e., for which the acceleration $\boldsymbol{a}$ is parallel to $\boldsymbol{v}$ at one instant of time and (therefore) for all other times as well. In this case we can write, using 3-vectors,

Challenge 729 ny

$$\gamma^3 \boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{g} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\mathrm{d}\gamma \boldsymbol{v}}{\mathrm{d}t} = \boldsymbol{g} \,. \tag{216}$$

Taking the direction we are talking about to be the x-axis, and solving for $v(t)$, we get

$$v = \frac{gt}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{g^2 t^2}{c^2}}} \,, \tag{217}$$

where it was assumed that $v(0) = 0$. We note that for small times we get $v = gt$ and for large times $v = c$, both as expected. The momentum of the accelerated observer increases linearly with time, again as expected. Integrating, we find that the accelerated observer moves along the path

Challenge 730 ny

$$x(t) = \frac{c^2}{g} \sqrt{1 + \frac{g^2 t^2}{c^2}} \,, \tag{218}$$

where it is assumed that $x(0) = c^2/g$, in order to keep the expression simple. Because of this result, visualized in Figure 264, a rectilinearly and uniformly accelerating observer is said to undergo *hyperbolic* motion. For small times, the world-line reduces to the usual $x = gt^2/2 + x_0$, whereas for large times it is $x = ct$, as expected. The motion is thus uniformly accelerated only for the moving body itself, *not* for an outside observer.

The proper time τ of the accelerated observer is related to the time t of the inertial frame in the usual way by $\mathrm{d}t = \gamma \mathrm{d}\tau$. Using the expression for the velocity $v(t)$ of equation (217) we get*

Ref. 364, Ref. 365

$$t = \frac{c}{g} \sinh \frac{g\tau}{c} \quad \text{and} \quad x = \frac{c^2}{g} \cosh \frac{g\tau}{c} \tag{219}$$

for the relationship between proper time τ and the time t and position x measured by the external, inertial Roman observer. We will encounter this relation again during our study of black holes.

Does all this sound boring? Just imagine accelerating on a motorbike at $g = 10\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$ for the proper time τ of 25 years. That would bring you beyond the end of the known universe! Isn't that worth a try? Unfortunately, neither motorbikes nor missiles that accelerate like this exist, as their fuel tanks would have to be enormous. Can you confirm this?

Challenge 731 s

Ref. 366

* Use your favourite mathematical formula collection – every student should have one – to deduce this. The *hyperbolic sine* and the *hyperbolic cosine* are defined by $\sinh y = (\mathrm{e}^y - \mathrm{e}^{-y})/2$ and $\cosh y = (\mathrm{e}^y + \mathrm{e}^{-y})/2$. They imply that $\int \mathrm{d}y/\sqrt{y^2 + a^2} = \operatorname{arsinh} y/a = \operatorname{Arsh} y/a = \ln(y + \sqrt{y^2 + a^2})$.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

For uniform acceleration, the coordinates transform as

$$\begin{aligned} t &= \left(\frac{c}{g} + \frac{\xi}{c}\right) \sinh \frac{g\tau}{c} \\ x &= \left(\frac{c^2}{g} + \xi\right) \cosh \frac{g\tau}{c} \\ y &= \upsilon \\ z &= \zeta \,, \end{aligned} \tag{220}$$

where τ now is the time coordinate in the Greek frame. We note also that the space-time interval $\mathrm{d}\sigma$ satisfies

$$\mathrm{d}\sigma^2 = (1 + g\xi/c^2)^2 c^2 \mathrm{d}\tau^2 - \mathrm{d}\xi^2 - \mathrm{d}\upsilon^2 - \mathrm{d}\zeta^2 = c^2 \mathrm{d}t^2 - \mathrm{d}x^2 - \mathrm{d}y^2 - \mathrm{d}z^2 \,, \tag{221}$$

and since for $\mathrm{d}\tau = 0$ distances are given by Pythagoras' theorem, the Greek reference frame is indeed rigid.

Ref. 367

After this forest of formulae, let's tackle a simple question, shown in Figure 264. The inertial, Roman observer O sees the Greek observer Ω departing with acceleration g, moving further and further away, following equation (218). What does the Greek observer say about his Roman colleague? With all the knowledge we have now, that is easy to answer. At each point of his trajectory Ω sees that O has the coordinate $\tau = 0$ (can you confirm this?), which means that the distance to the Roman observer, as seen by the Greek one, is the same as the space-time interval OΩ. Using expression (218), we see that this is

Challenge 732 e

Ref. 368

$$d_{\mathrm{O}\Omega} = \sqrt{\xi^2} = \sqrt{x^2 - c^2 t^2} = c^2/g \,, \tag{222}$$

which, surprisingly enough, is constant in time! In other words, the Greek observer will observe that he stays at a constant distance from the Roman one, in complete contrast to what the Roman observer says. Take your time to check this strange result in some other way. We will need it again later on, to explain why the Earth does not explode. (Can you guess how that is related to this result?)

Challenge 733 s

The composition theorem for accelerations is more complex than for velocities. A good explanation of this was published by Mishra. If we call a_{nm} the acceleration of system n by observer m, we are seeking to express the object acceleration a_{01} as function of the value a_{02} measured by the other observer, the relative acceleration a_{12}, and the proper acceleration a_{22} of the other observer: see Figure 265. Here we will only study one-dimensional situations, where all observers and all objects move along one axis. (For clarity, we also write $v_{11} = v$ and $v_{02} = u$.) In Galilean physics we have the general connection

Ref. 369

Challenge 734 e

$$a_{01} = a_{02} - a_{12} + a_{22} \tag{223}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 265 The definitions necessary to deduce the composition behaviour of accelerations

because accelerations behave simply. In special relativity, one gets

$$a_{01} = a_{02}\frac{(1-v^2/c^2)^{3/2}}{(1-uv/c^2)^3} - a_{12}\frac{(1-u^2/c^2)(1-v^2/c^2)^{-1/2}}{(1-uv/c^2)^2} + a_{22}\frac{(1-u^2/c^2)(1-v^2/c^2)^{3/2}}{(1-uv/c^2)^3} \tag{224}$$

Challenge 735 ny and you might enjoy checking the expression.

Page 440 Challenge 736 ny Can you state how the acceleration ratio enters into the definition of mass in special relativity?

Event horizons

There are many surprising properties of accelerated motion. Of special interest is the trajectory, in the coordinates ξ and τ of the rigidly accelerated frame, of an object located at the departure point $x = x_0 = c^2/g$ at all times t. One gets the two relations*

Challenge 737 ny

$$\xi = -\frac{c^2}{g}\left(1 - \operatorname{sech}\frac{g\tau}{c}\right)$$
$$\mathrm{d}\xi/\mathrm{d}\tau = -c\,\operatorname{sech}\frac{g\tau}{c}\tanh\frac{g\tau}{c}\,. \tag{226}$$

These equations are strange. For large times τ the coordinate ξ approaches the limit value $-c^2/g$ and $\mathrm{d}\xi/\mathrm{d}\tau$ approaches zero. The situation is similar to that of a car accelerating

* The functions appearing above, the *hyperbolic secant* and the *hyperbolic tangent*, are defined using the expressions from the footnote on page 462:

$$\operatorname{sech}\ y = \frac{1}{\cosh\ y} \quad \text{and} \quad \tanh\ y = \frac{\sinh\ y}{\cosh\ y}\,. \tag{225}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 266 Hyperbolic motion and event horizons

away from a woman standing on a long road. Seen from the car, the woman moves away; however, after a while, the only thing one notices is that she is slowly approaching the horizon. In Galilean physics, both the car driver and the woman on the road see the other person approaching their horizon; in special relativity, only the accelerated observer makes this observation.

A graph of the situation helps to clarify the result. In Figure 266 we can see that light emitted from any event in regions II and III cannot reach the Greek observer. Those events are hidden from him and cannot be observed. Strangely enough, however, light from the Greek observer *can* reach region II. The boundary between the part of space-time that can be observed and the part that cannot is called the *event horizon*. In relativity, event horizons act like one-way gates for light and other signals. For completeness, the graph also shows the past event horizon. Can you confirm that event horizons are *black*?

Challenge 738 ny

So, not all events observed in an inertial frame of reference can be observed in a uniformly accelerating frame of reference. Uniformly accelerating frames of reference produce event horizons at a distance $-c^2/g$. For example, a person who is standing can never see further than this distance below his feet.

By the way, is it true that a light beam cannot catch up with an observer in hyperbolic motion, if the observer has a sufficient head start?

Challenge 739 s

Here is a more advanced challenge, which prepares us for general relativity. What is the *shape* of the horizon seen by a uniformly accelerated observer?

Challenge 740 s

Acceleration changes colours

We saw earlier that a moving receiver sees different colours from the sender. So far, we discussed this colour shift, or Doppler effect, for inertial motion only. For accelerating frames the situation is even stranger: sender and receiver do not agree on colours even if they are at *rest* with respect to each other. Indeed, if light is emitted in the direction of the acceleration, the formula for the space-time interval gives

Ref. 364, Ref. 370

$$d\sigma^2 = \left(1 + \frac{g_0 x}{c^2}\right)^2 c^2 dt^2 \qquad (227)$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

in which g_0 is the proper acceleration of an observer located at $x = 0$. We can deduce in a straightforward way that Challenge 741 ny

$$\frac{f_r}{f_s} = 1 - \frac{g_r h}{c^2} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{g_s h}{c^2}} \tag{228}$$

where h is the rod distance between the source and the receiver, and where $g_s = g_0/(1 + g_0 x_s/c^2)$ and $g_r = g_0/(1 + g_o x_r/c^2)$ are the proper accelerations measured at the source and at the detector. In short, the frequency of light decreases when light moves in the direction of acceleration. By the way, does this have an effect on the colour of trees along their vertical extension? Challenge 742 s

The formula usually given, namely

$$\frac{f_r}{f_s} = 1 - \frac{gh}{c^2}\,, \tag{229}$$

is only correct to a first approximation. In accelerated frames of reference, we have to be careful about the meaning of every quantity. For everyday accelerations, however, the differences between the two formulae are negligible. Can you confirm this? Challenge 743 ny

Can light move faster than c?

What speed of light does an accelerating observer measure? Using expression (229) above, an accelerated observer deduces that

$$v_{\text{light}} = c\left(1 + \frac{gh}{c^2}\right) \tag{230}$$

which is higher than c for light moving in front of or 'above' him, and lower than c for light moving behind or 'below' him. This strange result follows from a basic property of any accelerating frame of reference. In such a frame, even though all observers are at rest with respect to each other, clocks do *not* remain synchronized. This change of the speed of light has also been confirmed by experiment.* Thus, the speed of light is only constant when it is defined as $c = \mathrm{d}x/\mathrm{d}t$, *and* if $\mathrm{d}x$ and $\mathrm{d}t$ are measured with a ruler located at a point *inside* the interval $\mathrm{d}x$ and a clock read off *during* the interval $\mathrm{d}t$. If the speed of light is defined as $\Delta x/\Delta t$, or if the ruler defining distances or the clock measuring times is located away from the propagating light, the speed of light is different from c for accelerating observers! This is the same effect you can experience when you turn around your vertical axis at night: the star velocities you observe are much higher than the speed of light.

Note that this result does not imply that signals or energy can be moved faster than c. You may want to check this for yourself. Challenge 744 s

In fact, all these effects are negligible for distances l that are much less than c^2/a. For an acceleration of $9.5\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$ (about that of free fall), distances would have to be of the order of one light year, or $9.5 \cdot 10^{12}$ km, in order for any sizable effects to be observed. In short, *c is the speed of light relative to* nearby *matter only.*

* The propagation delays to be discussed in general relativity can be seen as confirmations of this effect. Page 535

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 267 Clocks and the measurement of the speed of light as two-way velocity

By the way, everyday gravity is equivalent to a constant acceleration. So, why then do distant objects, such as stars, not move faster than light, following expression (230)?

Challenge 745 s

What is the speed of light?

We have seen that the speed of light, as usually defined, is given by c only if either the observer is inertial or the observer measures the speed of light passing nearby (rather than light passing at a distance). In short, the speed of light has to be measured locally. But this condition does not eliminate all subtleties.

An additional point is often forgotten. Usually, length is measured by the time it takes light to travel. In such a case the speed of light will obviously be constant. But how does one check the constancy? One needs to eliminate length measurements. The simplest way to do this is to reflect light from a mirror, as shown in Figure 267. The constancy of the speed of light implies that if light goes up and down a short straight line, then the clocks at the two ends measure times given by

$$t_3 - t_1 = 2\,(t_2 - t_1)\ . \tag{231}$$

Here it is assumed that the clocks have been synchronised according to the prescription on page 428. If the factor were not exactly two, the speed of light would not be constant. In fact, all experiments so far have yielded a factor of two, within measurement errors.*

* The subtleties of the one-way and two-way speed of light have been a point of discussion for a long time. It has been often argued that a factor different than two, which would lead to a distinction between the one-way speed of light and the two-way speed of light, cannot be ruled out by experiment, as long as the two-way speed of light remains c for all observers.

Many experiments on the one-way velocity of light are explained and discussed in Ref. 317. Zhang says in his summary on page 171, that the one-way velocity of light is indeed independent of the light source; however, no experiment really shows that it is equal to the two-way velocity. Moreover, almost all so-called 'one-way' experiments are in fact still hidden 'two-way' experiments (see his page 150).

Ref. 371

Ref. 372 In 2004, Hans Ohanian showed that the question can be settled by discussing how a non-standard one-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

This result is sometimes expressed by saying that it is impossible to measure the *one-way velocity of light*; only the *two-way* velocity of light is measurable. Do you agree? Challenge 746 s

Limits on the length of solid bodies

An everyday solid object breaks when some part of it moves with respect to some other part with more than the speed of sound c of the material.* For example, when an object hits the floor and its front end is stopped within a distance d, the object breaks at the latest when

$$\frac{v^2}{c^2} \geqslant \frac{2d}{l} \,. \tag{232}$$

In this way, we see that we can avoid the breaking of fragile objects by packing them into foam rubber – which increases the stopping distance – of roughly the same thickness as the object's size. This may explain why boxes containing presents are usually so much larger than their contents!

The fracture limit can also be written in a different way. To avoid breaking, the acceleration a of a solid body with length l must obey

$$la < c^2 \,, \tag{233}$$

where c is the speed of sound, which is the speed limit for the material parts of solids. Let us now repeat the argument in relativity, using the speed of light instead of that of sound. Imagine accelerating the front of a *solid* body with some *proper* acceleration a. The back end cannot move with an acceleration α equal or larger than infinity, or if one prefers, it cannot move with more than the speed of light. A quick check shows that therefore the length l of a solid body must obey Ref. 373 Challenge 747 s

$$l\alpha < c^2/2 \,, \tag{234}$$

where c is now the speed of light. The speed of light thus limits the size of solid bodies. For example, for 9.8 m/s^2, the acceleration of good motorbike, this expression gives a length limit of 9.2 Pm, about a light year. Not a big restriction: most motorbikes are shorter.

However, there are other, more interesting situations. The highest accelerations achievable today are produced in particle accelerators. Atomic nuclei have a size of a few femtometres. Can you deduce at which energies they break when smashed together in an accelerator? In fact, inside a nucleus, the nucleons move with accelerations of the order of $v^2/r \approx \hbar^2/m^2r^3 \approx 10^{31}\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$; this is one of the highest values found in nature. Challenge 748 ny

Note that Galilean physics and relativity produce a similar conclusion: a limiting speed, be it that of sound or that of light, makes it impossible for solid bodies to be *rigid*. When we push one end of a body, the other end always moves a little bit later.

way speed of light would affect dynamics. He showed that a non-standard one-way speed of light would introduce pseudoaccelerations and pseudoforces (similar to the Coriolis acceleration and force); since these pseudoaccelerations and pseudoforces are not observed, the one-way speed of light is the same as the two-way speed of light.

* The (longitudinal) speed of sound is about 5.9 km/s for glass, iron or steel; about 4.5 km/s for gold; and about 2 km/s for lead. Other sound speeds are given on page 230.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

A puzzle: does the speed limit imply a relativistic 'indeterminacy relation'

$$\Delta l \, \Delta a \leqslant c^2 \tag{235}$$

Page 1459 for the length and acceleration indeterminacies?

What does all this mean for the size of elementary particles? Take two electrons a distance d apart, and call their size l. The acceleration due to electrostatic repulsion then
Challenge 749 ny leads to an upper limit for their size given by

$$l < \frac{4\pi\varepsilon_0 c^2 d^2 m}{e^2} \,. \tag{236}$$

The nearer electrons can get, the smaller they must be. The present experimental limit gives a size smaller than 10^{-19} m. Can electrons be exactly point-like? We will come back to this question during our study of general relativity and quantum theory.

SPECIAL RELATIVITY IN FOUR SENTENCES

This section of our ascent of Motion Mountain can be quickly summarized.

— All (free floating) observers find that there is a unique, perfect velocity in nature, namely a common maximum energy velocity, which is realized by massless radiation such as light or radio signals, but cannot be achieved by material systems.
— Therefore, even though space-time is the same for every observer, times and lengths vary from one observer to another, as described by the Lorentz transformations (146) and (147), and as confirmed by experiment.
— Collisions show that a maximum speed implies that mass is concentrated energy, and that the total energy of a body is given by $E = \gamma mc^2$, as again confirmed by experiment.
— Applied to accelerated objects, these results lead to numerous counter-intuitive consequences, such as the twin paradox, the appearance of event horizons and the appearance of short-lived tachyons in collisions.

Special relativity shows that motion, though limited in speed, is relative, defined using the propagation of light, conserved, reversible and deterministic.

Could the speed of light vary?

The speed of massless light is the limit speed. Assuming that all light is indeed massless, could the speed of light still change from place to place, or as time goes by? This tricky question still makes a fool out of many physicists. The first answer is usually a loud: 'Yes, of course! Just look at what happens when the value of c is changed in formulae.' (In fact, there have even been attempts to build 'variable speed of light theories'.) However, this
Ref. 374 often-heard answer is wrong.

Since the speed of light enters into our definition of time and space, it thus enters, even if we do not notice it, into the construction of all rulers, all measurement standards

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

and all measuring instruments. Therefore there is no way to detect whether the value actually varies. No imaginable experiment could detect a variation of the limit speed, as the limit speed is the basis for all measurements. 'That is intellectual cruelty!', you might say. 'All experiments show that the speed of light is invariant; we had to swallow one counter-intuitive result after another to accept the constancy of the speed of light, and now we are supposed to admit that there is no other choice?' Yes, we are. That is the irony of progress in physics. The observer-invariance of the speed of light is counter-intuitive and astonishing when compared to the lack of observer-invariance at everyday, Galilean speeds. But had we taken into account that every speed measurement is – whether we like it or not – a comparison with the speed of light, we would not have been astonished by the constancy of the speed of light; rather, we would have been astonished by the strange properties of *small* speeds.

Challenge 750 s

In short, there is in principle *no* way to check the invariance of a standard. To put it another way, the truly surprising aspect of relativity is not the invariance of c; it is the disappearance of c from the formulae of everyday motion.

What happens near the speed of light?

As one approaches the speed of light, the quantities in the Lorentz transformation diverge. A division by zero is impossible: indeed, neither masses nor observers can move at the speed of light. However, this is only half the story.

No observable actually diverges in nature. Approaching the speed of light as nearly as possible, even special relativity breaks down. At extremely large Lorentz contractions, there is no way to ignore the curvature of space-time; indeed, gravitation has to be taken into account in those cases. Near horizons, there is no way to ignore the fluctuations of speed and position; quantum theory has to be taken into account there. The exploration of these two limitations define the next two stages of our ascent of Motion Mountain.

At the start of our adventure, during our exploration of Galilean physics, once we had defined the basic concepts of velocity, space and time, we turned our attention to gravitation. The invariance of the speed of light has forced us to change these basic concepts. We now return to the study of gravitation in the light of this invariance.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 16

GENERAL RELATIVITY: GRAVITATION, MAXIMUM SPEED AND MAXIMUM FORCE

General relativity is easy. Nowadays, it can be made as intuitive as universal gravity and its inverse square law – by using the right approach. The main ideas of general relativity, like those of special relativity, are accessible to secondary-school students. Black holes, gravitational waves, space-time curvature and the limits of the universe can then be understood as easily as the Doppler effect or the twins paradox.

We will discover that, just as special relativity is based on a maximum speed c, general relativity is based on a maximum force $c^4/4G$ or on a maximum power $c^5/4G$. We first show that all known experimental data are consistent with these limits. In fact, we find that the maximum force and the maximum power are achieved only on insurmountable limit surfaces; these limit surfaces are called *horizons*. We will then be able to deduce the field equations of general relativity. In particular, the existence of a maximum for force or power implies that space-time is curved. It explains why the sky is dark at night, and it shows that the universe is of finite size.

We also discuss the main counter-arguments and paradoxes arising from the limits. The resolutions of the paradoxes clarify why the limits have remained dormant for so long, both in experiments and in teaching.

After this introduction, we will study the effects of relativistic gravity in more detail. In particular, we will study the consequences of space-time curvature for the motions of bodies and of light in our everyday environment. For example, the inverse square law will be modified. (Can you explain why this is necessary in view of what we have learned so far?) Most fascinating of all, we will discover how to move and bend the vacuum. Then we will study the universe at large; finally, we will explore the most extreme form of gravity: black holes.

Challenge 751 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 268 Effects of gravity: a dripping stalactite (© Richard Cindric) and the rings of Saturn, photographed when the Sun is hidden behind the planet (CICLOPS, JPL, ESA, NASA)

Maximum force – general relativity in one statement

> One of the principal objects of theoretical research in any department of knowledge is to find the point of view from which the subject appears in its greatest simplicity.
>
> Willard Gibbs

Ref. 375

We just saw that the theory of *special* relativity appears when we recognize the speed limit c in nature and take this limit as a basic principle. At the turn of the twenty-first century it was shown that *general* relativity can be approached by using a similar basic principle:

Ref. 376, Ref. 378

▷ *There is in nature a maximum force:*

$$F \leqslant \frac{c^4}{4G} = 3.0 \cdot 10^{43}\,\mathrm{N}\,. \tag{237}$$

In nature, no force in any muscle, machine or system can exceed this value. For the curious, the value of the force limit is the energy of a (Schwarzschild) black hole divided by twice its radius. The force limit can be understood intuitively by noting that (Schwarzschild) black holes are the densest bodies possible for a given mass. Since there is a limit to how much a body can be compressed, forces – whether gravitational, electric, centripetal or of any other type – cannot be arbitrary large.

Alternatively, it is possible to use another, equivalent statement as a basic principle:

▷ *There is a maximum power in nature:*

$$P \leqslant \frac{c^5}{4G} = 9.1 \cdot 10^{51}\,\mathrm{W}\,. \tag{238}$$

No power of any lamp, engine or explosion can exceed this value. The maximum power is realized when a (Schwarzschild) black hole is radiated away in the time that light takes to travel along a length corresponding to its diameter. We will see below precisely what black holes are and why they are connected to these limits.

The existence of a maximum force or power implies the full theory of general rela-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

tivity. In order to prove the correctness and usefulness of this approach, a sequence of arguments is required. The sequence is the same as for the establishment of the limit speed in special relativity. First of all, we have to gather all observational evidence for the claimed limit. Secondly, in order to establish the limit as a principle of nature, we have to show that general relativity follows from it. Finally, we have to show that the limit applies in all possible and imaginable situations. Any apparent paradoxes will need to be resolved.

These three steps structure this introduction to general relativity. We start the story by explaining the origin of the idea of a limiting value.

The force and power limits

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries many physicists took pains to avoid the concept of force. Heinrich Hertz made this a guiding principle of his work, and wrote an influential textbook on classical mechanics without ever using the concept. The fathers of quantum theory, who all knew this text, then dropped the term 'force' completely from the vocabulary of microscopic physics. Meanwhile, the concept of 'gravitational force' was eliminated from general relativity by reducing it to a 'pseudo-force'. Force fell out of fashion.

Nevertheless, the maximum force principle does make sense, provided that we visualize it by means of the useful definition: *force is the flow of momentum per unit time*. Momentum cannot be created or destroyed. We use the term 'flow' to remind us that momentum, being a conserved quantity, can only change by inflow or outflow. In other words, change of momentum always takes place through some boundary surface. This fact is of central importance. Whenever we think about force at a point, we mean the momentum 'flowing' through a surface at that point. General relativity states this idea usually as follows: force keeps bodies from following geodesics. The mechanism underlying a measured force is not important. In order to have a concrete example to guide the discussion it can be helpful to imagine force as electromagnetic in origin. In fact, any type of force is possible.

The maximum force principle thus boils down to the following: if we imagine any physical surface (and cover it with observers), the integral of momentum flow through the surface (measured by all those observers) never exceeds a certain value. It does not matter how the surface is chosen, as long as it is physical, i.e., as long as we can fix observers* onto it.

This principle imposes a limit on muscles, the effect of hammers, the flow of material, the acceleration of massive bodies, and much more. No system can create, measure or experience a force above the limit. No particle, no galaxy and no bulldozer can exceed it.

The existence of a force limit has an appealing consequence. In nature, forces can be measured. Every measurement is a comparison with a standard. The force limit provides a *natural* unit of force which fits into the system of natural units** that Max Planck de-

* Observers in general relativity, like in special relativity, are massive physical systems that are small enough so that their influence on the system under observation is negligible.

** When Planck discovered the quantum of action, he had also noticed the possibility to define natural units. On a walk with his seven-year-old son in the forest around Berlin, he told him that he had made a discovery as important as the discovery of universal gravity.

Page 979

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 51 How to convince yourself and others that there is a maximum force $c^4/4G$ (or a maximum power $c^5/4G$) in nature

ISSUE	METHOD
Force values > $c^4/4G$ are not observed	check all observations
Force values > $c^4/4G$ are either non-local or not due to energy transport	check all observations
Force values > $c^4/4G$ cannot be produced	check all attempts
Force values > $c^4/4G$ cannot be imagined	solve all paradoxes
A maximum force value $c^4/4G$ is consistent	1 – show that all consequences, however weird, are confirmed by observation 2 – deduce the theory of general relativity from it and check it

rived from c, G and h (or $\hbar$). The maximum force thus provides a standard of force valid in every place and at every instant of time.

The limit value of $c^4/4G$ differs from Planck's proposed unit in two ways. First, the numerical factor is different (Planck had in mind the value c^4/G). Secondly, the force unit is a *limiting* value. In this respect, the maximum force plays the same role as the maximum speed. As we will see later on, this limit property is valid for all other Planck units as well, once the numerical factors have been properly corrected. The factor 1/4 has no deeper meaning: it is just the value that leads to the correct form of the field equations of general relativity. The factor 1/4 in the limit is also required to recover, in everyday situations, the inverse square law of universal gravitation. When the factor is properly taken into account, the maximum force (or power) is simply given by the (corrected) Planck energy divided by the (corrected) Planck length or Planck time.

Ref. 377
Page 1458
Page 491

The expression for the maximum force involves the speed of light c and the gravitational constant G; it thus qualifies as a statement on relativistic gravitation. The fundamental principle of special relativity states that speed v obeys $v \leqslant c$ for all observers. Analogously, the basic principle of general relativity states that in all cases force F and power P obey $F \leqslant c^4/4G$ and $P \leqslant c^5/4G$. It does not matter whether the observer measures the force or power while moving with high velocity relative to the system under observation, during free fall, or while being strongly accelerated. However, we will see that it is essential that the observer records values measured *at his own location* and that the observer is *realistic*, i.e., made of matter and not separated from the system by a horizon. These conditions are the same that must be obeyed by observers measuring velocity in special relativity.

Since physical power is force times speed, and since nature provides a speed limit,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

the force bound and the power bound are equivalent. We have already seen that force
Page 452 and power appear together in the definition of 4-force; we can thus say that the upper bound is valid for every component of a force, as well as for its magnitude. The power bound limits the output of car and motorcycle engines, lamps, lasers, stars, gravitational radiation sources and galaxies. It is equivalent to $1.2 \cdot 10^{49}$ horsepower. The maximum power principle states that there is no way to move or get rid of energy more quickly than that.

The power limit can be understood intuitively by noting that every engine produces *exhausts*, i.e., some matter or energy that is left behind. For a lamp, a star or an evaporating black hole, the exhausts are the emitted radiation; for a car or jet engine they are hot gases; for a water turbine the exhaust is the slowly moving water leaving the turbine; for a rocket it is the matter ejected at its back end; for a photon rocket or an electric motor it is electromagnetic energy. Whenever the power of an engine gets close to the limit value, the exhausts increase dramatically in mass–energy. For extremely high exhaust masses, the gravitational attraction from these exhausts – even if they are only radiation – prevents further acceleration of the engine with respect to them. The maximum power principle thus expresses that there is a built-in braking mechanism in nature; this braking mechanism is gravity.

Yet another, equivalent limit appears when the maximum power is divided by c^2.

▷ *There is a maximum rate of mass change in nature:*

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}m}{\mathrm{d}t} \leqslant \frac{c^3}{4G} = 1.0 \cdot 10^{35}\,\mathrm{kg/s}\,. \tag{239}$$

This bound imposes a limit on pumps, jet engines and fast eaters. Indeed, the rate of flow of water or any other material through tubes is limited. The mass flow limit is obviously equivalent to either the force or the power limit.

The claim of a maximum force, power or mass change in nature seems almost too fantastic to be true. Our first task is therefore to check it empirically as thoroughly as we can.

The experimental evidence

Like the maximum speed principle, the maximum force principle must first of all be checked experimentally. Michelson spent a large part of his research life looking for possible changes in the value of the speed of light. No one has yet dedicated so much effort to testing the maximum force or power. However, it is straightforward to confirm that no experiment, whether microscopic, macroscopic or astronomical, has ever measured force values larger than the stated limit. Many people have claimed to have produced speeds larger than that of light. So far, nobody has ever claimed to have produced a force larger than the limit value.

The large accelerations that particles undergo in collisions inside the Sun, in the most powerful accelerators or in reactions due to cosmic rays correspond to force values much smaller than the force limit. The same is true for neutrons in neutron stars, for quarks inside protons, and for all matter that has been observed to fall towards black holes. Furthermore, the search for space-time singularities, which would allow forces to achieve or

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

exceed the force limit, has been fruitless.

In the astronomical domain, all forces between stars or galaxies are below the limit value, as are the forces in their interior. Not even the interactions between any two halves of the universe exceed the limit, whatever physically sensible division between the two halves is taken. (The meaning of 'physically sensible division' will be defined below; for divisions that are *not* sensible, exceptions to the maximum force claim *can* be constructed. You might enjoy searching for such an exception.)

Page 489

Challenge 752 s

Astronomers have also failed to find any region of space-time whose curvature (a concept to be introduced below) is large enough to allow forces to exceed the force limit. Indeed, none of the numerous recent observations of black holes has brought to light forces larger than the limit value or objects smaller than the corresponding black hole radii. Observations have also failed to find a situation that would allow a rapid observer to observe a force value that exceeds the limit due to the relativistic boost factor.

The power limit can also be checked experimentally. It turns out that the power – or luminosity – of stars, quasars, binary pulsars, gamma ray bursters, galaxies or galaxy clusters can indeed be a sizeable fraction of the power limit. However, no violation of the limit has ever been observed. In fact, the sum of all light output from all stars in the universe does not exceed the limit. Similarly, even the brightest sources of gravitational waves, merging black holes, do not exceed the power limit. Only the brightness of evaporating black holes in their final phase could equal the limit. But so far, none has ever been observed. (The fact that single sources in the universe can approach the power limit, while the universe also has to obey it, is the power paradox. More about it below.)

Ref. 379

Page 490

Similarly, all observed mass flow rates are orders of magnitude below the corresponding limit. Even physical systems that are mathematical analogues of black holes – for example, silent acoustical black holes or optical black holes – do not invalidate the force and power limits that hold in the corresponding systems.

The experimental situation is somewhat disappointing. Experiments do not contradict the limit values. But neither do the data do much to confirm them. The reason is the lack of horizons in everyday life and in experimentally accessible systems. The maximum speed at the basis of special relativity is found almost everywhere; maximum force and maximum power are found almost nowhere. Below we will propose some dedicated tests of the limits that could be performed in the future.

Page 495

Deducing general relativity*

In order to establish the maximum force and power limits as fundamental physical principles, it is not sufficient to show that they are consistent with what we observe in nature. It is necessary to show that they imply the complete theory of general relativity. (This section is only for readers who already know the field equations of general relativity. Other readers may skip to the next section.)

Page 481

In order to derive the theory of relativity we need to study those systems that *realize* the limit under scrutiny. In the case of the special theory of relativity, the main system that realizes the limit speed is light. For this reason, light is central to the exploration of special relativity. In the case of general relativity, the systems that realize the

* This section can be skipped at first reading. (The mentioned proof dates from December 2003.)

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 269 Showing the equivalence of the maximum force or power with the field equations of general relativity

limit are less obvious. We note first that a maximum force (or power) cannot be realized throughout a *volume* of space. If this were possible, a simple boost* could transform the force (or power) to a higher value. Therefore, nature can realize maximum force and power only on surfaces, not volumes. In addition, these surfaces must be unattainable. These unattainable surfaces are basic to general relativity; they are called *horizons*. Maximum force and power only appear on horizons. We have encountered horizons in special relativity, where they were defined as surfaces that impose limits to observation. (Note the contrast with everyday life, where a horizon is only a line, not a surface.) The present definition of a horizon as a surface of maximum force (or power) is equivalent to the definition as a surface beyond which no signal may be received. In both cases, a horizon is a surface beyond which interaction is impossible.

Ref. 377

Page 465

The connection between horizons and the maximum force is a central point of relativistic gravity. It is as important as the connection between light and the maximum speed in special relativity. In special relativity, we showed that the fact that light speed is the maximum speed in nature implies the Lorentz transformations. In general relativity, we will now prove that the maximum force in nature, which we can call the *horizon force*, implies the field equations of general relativity. To achieve this aim, we start with the realization that all horizons have an energy flow across them. The flow depends on the horizon curvature, as we will see. This connection implies that horizons cannot be planes, as an infinitely extended plane would imply an infinite energy flow.

The deduction of the equations of general relativity has only two steps, as shown in Figure 269. In the first step, we show that the maximum force or power principle implies the first 'law' of horizon mechanics. In the second step, we show that the first 'law' implies the field equations of general relativity.

The simplest finite horizon is a static sphere, corresponding to a Schwarzschild black hole. A spherical horizon is characterized by its radius of curvature R, or equivalently, by its surface gravity a; the two quantities are related by $2aR = c^2$. Now, the energy flowing through any horizon is always finite in extension, when measured along the propagation direction. One can thus speak more specifically of an energy pulse. Any energy pulse through a horizon is thus characterized by an energy E and a proper length L. When the energy pulse flows perpendicularly through a horizon, the rate of momentum change, or force, for an observer at the horizon is

$$F = \frac{E}{L} \,. \tag{240}$$

* A *boost* was defined in special relativity as a change of viewpoint to a second observer *moving* in relation to the first.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Our goal is to show that the existence of a maximum force implies general relativity. Now, maximum force is realized on horizons. We thus need to insert the maximum possible values on both sides of equation (240) and to show that general relativity follows.

Using the maximum force value and the area $4\pi R^2$ for a spherical horizon we get

$$\frac{c^4}{4G} = \frac{E}{LA} 4\pi R^2 \,. \tag{241}$$

The fraction E/A is the energy per area flowing through any area A that is part of a horizon. The insertion of the maximum values is complete when one notes that the length L of the energy pulse is limited by the radius R. The limit $L \leqslant R$ follows from geometrical considerations: seen from the concave side of the horizon, the pulse must be shorter than the radius of curvature. An independent argument is the following. The length L of an object accelerated by a is limited, by special relativity, by $L \leqslant c^2/2a$. Special relativity already shows that this limit is related to the appearance of a horizon. Together with relation (241), the statement that horizons are surfaces of maximum force leads to the following important relation for static, spherical horizons:

Ref. 380

$$E = \frac{c^2}{8\pi G} a A \,. \tag{242}$$

This *horizon equation* relates the energy flow E through an area A of a spherical horizon with surface gravity a. It states that the energy flowing through a horizon is limited, that this energy is proportional to the area of the horizon, and that the energy flow is proportional to the surface gravity. (The horizon equation is also called the *first law of black hole mechanics* or the *first law of horizon mechanics*.)

Ref. 381

The above derivation also yields the intermediate result

$$E \leqslant \frac{c^4}{16\pi G} \frac{A}{L} \,. \tag{243}$$

This form of the horizon equation states more clearly that no surface other than a horizon can achieve the maximum energy flow, when the area and pulse length (or surface gravity) are given. No other domain of physics makes comparable statements: they are intrinsic to the theory of gravitation.

An alternative derivation of the horizon equation starts with the emphasis on power instead of on force, using $P = E/T$ as the initial equation.

It is important to stress that the horizon equations (242) and (243) follow from only two assumptions: first, there is a maximum speed in nature, and secondly, there is a maximum force (or power) in nature. No specific theory of gravitation is assumed. The horizon equation might even be testable experimentally, as argued below. (We also note that the horizon equation – or, equivalently, the force or power limit – implies a maximum mass change rate in nature given by $\mathrm{d}m/\mathrm{d}t \leqslant c^3/4G$.)

Next, we have to generalize the horizon equation from static and spherical horizons to general horizons. Since the maximum force is assumed to be valid for *all* observers, whether inertial or accelerating, the generalization is straightforward. For a horizon that

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

is irregularly curved or time-varying the horizon equation becomes

$$\delta E = \frac{c^2}{8\pi G}\, a\, \delta A \,. \tag{244}$$

This differential relation – it might be called the *general horizon equation* – is valid for any horizon. It can be applied separately for every piece δA of a dynamic or spatially changing horizon. The general horizon equation (244) has been known to be equivalent to general relativity at least since 1995, when this equivalence was (implicitly) shown by Jacobson. We will show that the differential horizon equation has the same role for general relativity as the equation $\mathrm{d}x = c\,\mathrm{d}t$ has for special relativity. From now on, when we speak of the horizon equation, we mean the general, differential form (244) of the relation.

Ref. 382

It is instructive to restate the behaviour of energy pulses of length L in a way that holds for any surface, even one that is not a horizon. Repeating the above derivation, one gets

$$\frac{\delta E}{\delta A} \leqslant \frac{c^4}{16\pi G}\,\frac{1}{L} \,. \tag{245}$$

Equality is only realized when the surface A is a horizon. In other words, whenever the value $\delta E/\delta A$ in a physical system approaches the right-hand side, a horizon starts to form. This connection will be essential in our discussion of apparent counter-examples to the limit principles.

If one keeps in mind that on a horizon the pulse length L obeys $L \leqslant c^2/2a$, it becomes clear that the general horizon equation is a consequence of the maximum force $c^4/4G$ or the maximum power $c^5/4G$. In addition, the horizon equation takes also into account maximum speed, which is at the origin of the relation $L \leqslant c^2/2a$. The horizon equation thus follows purely from these two limits of nature.

The remaining part of the argument is simply the derivation of general relativity from the general horizon equation. This derivation was implicitly provided by Jacobson, and the essential steps are given in the following paragraphs. (Jacobson did not stress that his derivation was valid also for continuous space-time, or that his argument could also be used in classical general relativity.) To see the connection between the general horizon equation (244) and the field equations, one only needs to generalize the general horizon equation to general coordinate systems and to general directions of energy–momentum flow. This is achieved by introducing tensor notation that is adapted to curved space-time.

Ref. 382

To generalize the general horizon equation, one introduces the general surface element $\mathrm{d}\Sigma$ and the local boost Killing vector field k that generates the horizon (with suitable norm). Jacobson uses these two quantities to rewrite the left-hand side of the general horizon equation (244) as

$$\delta E = \int T_{ab} k^a \mathrm{d}\Sigma^b \,, \tag{246}$$

where T_{ab} is the energy–momentum tensor. This expression obviously gives the energy at the horizon for arbitrary coordinate systems and arbitrary energy flow directions.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Jacobson's main result is that the factor $a\,\delta A$ in the right hand side of the general horizon equation (244) can be rewritten, making use of the (purely geometric) Raychaudhuri equation, as

$$a\,\delta A = c^2 \int R_{ab} k^a \mathrm{d}\Sigma^b \,, \tag{247}$$

where R_{ab} is the Ricci tensor describing space-time curvature. This relation describes how the local properties of the horizon depend on the local curvature.

Combining these two steps, the general horizon equation (244) becomes

$$\int T_{ab} k^a \mathrm{d}\Sigma^b = \frac{c^4}{8\pi G} \int R_{ab} k^a \mathrm{d}\Sigma^b \,. \tag{248}$$

Jacobson then shows that this equation, together with local conservation of energy (i.e., vanishing divergence of the energy–momentum tensor) can only be satisfied if

$$T_{ab} = \frac{c^4}{8\pi G} \left(R_{ab} - (\frac{R}{2} + \Lambda) g_{ab} \right) \,, \tag{249}$$

where R is the Ricci scalar and Λ is a constant of integration the value of which is not determined by the problem. The above equations are the full field equations of general relativity, including the cosmological constant Λ. The field equations thus follow from the horizon equation. They are therefore shown to be valid at horizons.

Since it is possible, by choosing a suitable coordinate transformation, to position a horizon at any desired space-time point, the field equations must be valid over the whole of space-time. This observation completes Jacobson's argument. Since the field equations follow, via the horizon equation, from the maximum force principle, we have also shown that at every space-time point in nature the same maximum force holds: the value of the maximum force is an invariant and a constant of nature.

In other words, the field equations of general relativity are a direct consequence of the limit on energy flow at horizons, which in turn is due to the existence of a maximum force (or power). In fact, as Jacobson showed, the argument works in both directions. Maximum force (or power), the horizon equation, and general relativity are equivalent.

In short, *the maximum force principle is a simple way to state that, on horizons, energy flow is proportional to area and surface gravity*. This connection makes it possible to deduce the full theory of general relativity. In particular, a maximum force value is sufficient to tell space-time how to curve. We will explore the details of this relation shortly. Note that if no force limit existed in nature, it would be possible to 'pump' any desired amount of energy through a given surface, including any horizon. In this case, the energy flow would not be proportional to area, horizons would not have the properties they have, and general relativity would not hold. We thus get an idea how the maximum flow of energy, the maximum flow of momentum and the maximum flow of mass are all connected to horizons. The connection is most obvious for black holes, where the energy, momentum or mass are those falling into the black hole.

Page 606

By the way, since the derivation of general relativity from the maximum force principle or from the maximum power principle is now established, we can rightly call these

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

limits *horizon force* and *horizon power*. Every experimental or theoretical confirmation of the field equations indirectly confirms their existence.

Space-time is curved

Imagine two observers who start moving parallel to each other and who continue straight ahead. If after a while they discover that they are not moving parallel to each other any more, then they can deduce that they have moved on a curved surface (try it!) or in a curved space. In particular, this happens near a horizon. The derivation above showed that a finite maximum force implies that all horizons are curved; the curvature of horizons in turn implies the curvature of space-time. If nature had only flat horizons, there would be no space-time curvature. The existence of a maximum force implies that space-time is curved.

Challenge 753 s

A horizon so strongly curved that it forms a closed boundary, like the surface of a sphere, is called a black hole. We will study black holes in detail below. The main property of a black hole, like that of any horizon, is that it is impossible to detect what is 'behind' the boundary.*

Page 604

The analogy between special and general relativity can thus be carried further. In special relativity, maximum speed implies $dx = c\,dt$, and the change of time depends on the observer. In general relativity, maximum force (or power) implies the horizon equation $\delta E = \frac{c^2}{8\pi G}\, a\, \delta A$ and the observation that space-time is curved.

The maximum force (or power) thus has the same double role in general relativity as the maximum speed has in special relativity. In special relativity, the speed of light is the maximum speed; it is also the proportionality constant that connects space and time, as the equation $dx = c\,dt$ makes apparent. In general relativity, the horizon force is the maximum force; it also appears (with a factor 2π) in the field equations as the proportionality constant connecting energy and curvature. The maximum force thus describes both the elasticity of space-time and – if we use the simple image of space-time as a medium – the maximum tension to which space-time can be subjected. This double role of a material constant as proportionality factor and as limit value is well known in materials science.

Does this analogy make you think about aether? Do not worry: physics has no need for the concept of aether, because it is indistinguishable from vacuum. General relativity does describe the vacuum as a sort of material that can be deformed and move.

Page 757

Why is the maximum force also the proportionality factor between curvature and energy? Imagine space-time as an elastic material. The elasticity of a material is described by a numerical material constant. The simplest definition of this material constant is the ratio of stress (force per area) to strain (the proportional change of length). An exact definition has to take into account the geometry of the situation. For example, the shear modulus G (or μ) describes how difficult it is to move two parallel surfaces of a material against each other. If the force F is needed to move two parallel surfaces of area A and length l against each other by a distance Δl, one defines the shear modulus G by

$$\frac{F}{A} = G\frac{\Delta l}{l} \,. \tag{250}$$

* Analogously, in special relativity it is impossible to detect what moves faster than the light barrier.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The shear modulus for metals and alloys ranges between 25 and 80 GPa. The continuum theory of solids shows that for any crystalline solid without any defect (a 'perfect' solid) there is a so-called theoretical shear stress: when stresses higher than this value are applied, the material breaks. The theoretical shear stress, in other words, the maximum stress in a material, is given by

$$G_{\text{tss}} = \frac{G}{2\pi} \,. \tag{251}$$

The maximum stress is thus essentially given by the shear modulus. This connection is similar to the one we found for the vacuum. Indeed, imagining the vacuum as a material
Ref. 383 that can be bent is a helpful way to understand general relativity. We will use it regularly in the following.

What happens when the vacuum is stressed with the maximum force? Is it also torn apart like a solid? Yes: in fact, when vacuum is torn apart, particles appear. We will find out more about this connection later on: since particles are quantum entities, we need to study quantum theory first, before we can describe the effect in the last part of our mountain ascent.

Conditions of validity of the force and power limits

The maximum force value is valid only under certain assumptions. To clarify this point, we can compare it to the maximum speed. The speed of light (in vacuum) is an upper limit for motion of systems with *momentum* or *energy* only. It can, however, be exceeded for motions of non-material points. Indeed, the cutting point of a pair of scissors, a laser light spot on the Moon, or the group velocity or phase velocity of wave groups can exceed
Page 435 the speed of light. In addition, the speed of light is a limit only if measured *near* the moving mass or energy: the Moon moves faster than light if one turns around one's axis in a second; distant points in a Friedmann universe move apart from each other with speeds larger than the speed of light. Finally, the observer must be *realistic*: the observer must be made of matter and energy, and thus move more slowly than light, and must be able to observe the system. No system moving at or above the speed of light can be an
Ref. 384 observer.

The same three conditions apply in general relativity. In particular, relativistic gravity forbids point-like observers and test masses: they are not realistic. Surfaces moving faster than light are also not realistic. In such cases, counter-examples to the maximum force
Challenge 754 s claim can be found. Try and find one – many are possible, and all are fascinating. We will explore some of the most important ones below.

Another point should be stressed. General relativity implies a maximum power and force. The reverse, the deduction of general relativity's field equations from the maximum power of force, is correct only under the assumption that gravity is purely geometric. This is the essential statement of general relativity. If the mechanism of gravity would be based on other fields, such as hitherto unknown particles, the equivalence between gravity and a maximum force would not be given.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

GEDANKEN EXPERIMENTS AND PARADOXES ABOUT THE FORCE LIMIT

> Wenn eine Idee am Horizonte eben aufgeht, ist gewöhnlich die Temperatur der Seele dabei sehr kalt. Erst allmählich entwickelt die Idee ihre Wärme, und am heissesten ist diese (das heisst sie tut ihre grössten Wirkungen), wenn der Glaube an die Idee schon wieder im Sinken ist.
>
> Friedrich Nietzsche*

The last, but central, step in our discussion of the force limit is the same as in the discussion of the speed limit. We need to show that any *imaginable* experiment – not only any real one – satisfies the hypothesis. Following a tradition dating back to the early twentieth century, such an imagined experiment is called a *Gedanken experiment*, from the German Gedankenexperiment, meaning 'thought experiment'.

In order to dismiss all imaginable attempts to exceed the maximum speed, it is sufficient to study the properties of velocity addition and the divergence of kinetic energy near the speed of light. In the case of maximum force, the task is much more involved. Indeed, stating a maximum force, a maximum power and a maximum mass change easily provokes numerous attempts to contradict them. We will now discuss some of these.

* *

The brute force approach. The simplest attempt to exceed the force limit is to try to accelerate an object with a force larger than the maximum value. Now, acceleration implies the transfer of energy. This transfer is limited by the horizon equation (244) or the limit (245). For any attempt to exceed the force limit, the flowing energy results in the appearance of a horizon. But a horizon prevents the force from exceeding the limit, because it imposes a limit on interaction.

Page 468

We can explore this limit directly. In special relativity we found that the acceleration of an object is limited by its length. Indeed, at a distance given by $c^2/2a$ in the direction opposite to the acceleration a, a *horizon* appears. In other words, an accelerated body breaks, at the latest, at that point. The force F on a body of mass M and radius R is thus limited by

$$F \leqslant \frac{M}{2R}\, c^2 \,. \tag{252}$$

It is straightforward to add the (usually small) effects of gravity. To be observable, an accelerated body must remain *larger* than a black hole; inserting the corresponding radius $R = 2GM/c^2$ we get the force limit (237). *Dynamic* attempts to exceed the force limit thus fail.

* *

The rope attempt. We can also try to generate a higher force in a *static* situation, for

* 'When an idea is just rising on the horizon, the soul's temperature with respect to it is usually very cold. Only gradually does the idea develop its warmth, and it is hottest (which is to say, exerting its greatest influence) when belief in the idea is already once again in decline.' Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900), German philosopher and scholar. This is aphorism 207 – *Sonnenbahn der Idee* – from his text *Menschliches Allzumenschliches – Der Wanderer und sein Schatten*.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

example by pulling two ends of a rope in opposite directions. We assume for simplicity that an unbreakable rope exists. Any rope works because the potential energy between its atoms can produce high forces between them. To produce a rope force exceeding the limit value, we need to store large (elastic) energy in the rope. This energy must enter from the ends. When we increase the tension in the rope to higher and higher values, more and more (elastic) energy must be stored in smaller and smaller distances. To exceed the force limit, we would need to add more energy per distance and area than is allowed by the horizon equation. A horizon thus inevitably appears. But there is no way to stretch a rope across a horizon, even if it is unbreakable. A horizon leads either to the breaking of the rope or to its detachment from the pulling system. Horizons thus make it impossible to generate forces larger than the force limit. In fact, the assumption of infinite wire strength is unnecessary: the force limit cannot be exceeded even if the strength of the wire is only finite.

We note that it is not important whether an applied force pulls – as for ropes or wires – or pushes. In the case of *pushing* two objects against each other, an attempt to increase the force value without end will equally lead to the formation of a horizon, due to the limit provided by the horizon equation. By definition, this happens precisely at the force limit. As there is no way to use a horizon to push (or pull) on something, the attempt to achieve a higher force ends once a horizon is formed. Static forces cannot exceed the limit value.

* *

The braking attempt. A force limit provides a maximum momentum change per time. We can thus search for a way to *stop* a moving physical system so abruptly that the maximum force might be exceeded. The non-existence of rigid bodies in nature, already known from special relativity, makes a completely sudden stop impossible; but special relativity on its own provides no lower limit to the stopping time. However, the inclusion of gravity does. Stopping a moving system implies a transfer of energy. The energy flow per area cannot exceed the value given by the horizon equation. Thus one cannot exceed the force limit by stopping an object.

Page 468

Similarly, if a rapid system is *reflected* instead of stopped, a certain amount of energy needs to be transferred and stored for a short time. For example, when a tennis ball is reflected from a large wall its momentum changes and a force is applied. If many such balls are reflected at the same time, surely a force larger than the limit can be realized? It turns out that this is impossible. If one attempted it, the energy flow at the wall would reach the limit given by the horizon equation and thus create a horizon. In that case, no reflection is possible any more. So the limit cannot be exceeded.

* *

The classical radiation attempt. Instead of systems that pull, push, stop or reflect *matter*, we can explore systems where *radiation* is involved. However, the arguments hold in exactly the same way, whether photons, gravitons or other particles are involved. In particular, mirrors, like walls, are limited in their capabilities.

It is also impossible to create a force larger than the maximum force by concentrating a large amount of light onto a surface. The same situation as for tennis balls arises: when the limit value E/A given by the horizon equation (245) is reached, a horizon appears

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

that prevents the limit from being broken.

* *

The brick attempt. The force and power limits can also be tested with more concrete Gedanken experiments. We can try to exceed the force limit by stacking weight. But even building an infinitely high brick tower does not generate a sufficiently strong force on its foundations: integrating the weight, taking into account its decrease with height, yields a finite value that cannot reach the force limit. If we continually increase the mass density of the bricks, we need to take into account that the tower and the Earth will change into a black hole. And black holes, as mentioned above, do not allow the force limit to be exceeded.

* *

The boost attempt. A boost can apparently be chosen in such a way that a force value F in one frame is transformed into any desired value F' in another frame. However, this result is not physical. To be more concrete, imagine a massive observer, measuring the value F, at rest with respect to a large mass, and a second observer moving towards the charged mass with relativistic speed, measuring the value F'. Both observers can be thought as being as small as desired. If one transforms the force field at rest F applying the Lorentz transformations, the force F' for the moving observer can reach extremely high values, as long as the speed is high enough. However, a force must be measured by an observer located at the specific point. One has thus to check what happens when the rapid observer moves towards the region where the force is supposed to exceed the force limit. Suppose the observer has a mass m and a radius r. To be an observer, it must be larger than a black hole; in other words, its radius must obey $r > 2Gm/c^2$, implying that the observer has a non-vanishing size. When the observer dives into the force field surrounding the sphere, there will be an energy flow E towards the observer determined by the transformed field value and the crossing area of the observer. This interaction energy can be made as small as desired, by choosing a sufficiently small observer, but the energy is never zero. When the moving observer approaches the large massive charge, the interaction energy increases. Before the observer arrives at the point where the force was supposed to be higher than the force limit, the interaction energy will reach the horizon limits (244) or (245) for the observer. Therefore, a horizon appears and the moving observer is prevented from observing anything at all, in particular any value above the horizon force.

Ref. 385

The same limitation appears when electrical or other interactions are studied using a test observer that is charged. In summary, boosts cannot beat the force limit.

* *

The divergence attempt. The force on a test mass m at a radial distance d from a Schwarzschild black hole (for $\Lambda = 0$) is given by

Ref. 379

$$F = \frac{GMm}{d^2\sqrt{1 - \frac{2GM}{dc^2}}} \,. \tag{253}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

In addition, the inverse square law of universal gravitation states that the force between two masses m and M is

$$F = \frac{GMm}{d^2} \,. \tag{254}$$

Both expressions can take any value; this suggest that no maximum force limit exists.

A detailed investigation shows that the maximum force still holds. Indeed, the force in the two situations diverges only for non-physical point-like masses. However, the maximum force implies a minimum approach distance to a mass m given by

$$d_{\min} = \frac{2Gm}{c^2} \,. \tag{255}$$

The minimum approach distance – in simple terms, this would be the corresponding black hole radius – makes it impossible to achieve zero distance between two masses or between a horizon and a mass. This implies that a mass can never be point-like, and that there is a (real) minimum approach distance, proportional to the mass. If this minimum approach distance is introduced in equations (253) and (254), one gets

$$F = \frac{c^4}{4G} \frac{Mm}{(M+m)^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{M}{M+m}}} \leqslant \frac{c^4}{4G} \tag{256}$$

and

$$F = \frac{c^4}{4G} \frac{Mm}{(M+m)^2} \leqslant \frac{c^4}{4G} . \tag{257}$$

The maximum force value is thus never exceeded, as long as we take into account the size of observers.

* *

The consistency problem. If observers cannot be point-like, one might question whether it is still correct to apply the original definition of momentum change or energy change as the integral of values measured by observers attached to a given surface. In general relativity, observers cannot be point-like, but they can be as small as desired. The original definition thus remains applicable when taken as a limit procedure for ever-decreasing observer size. Obviously, if quantum theory is taken into account, this limit procedure comes to an end at the Planck length. This is not an issue for general relativity, as long as the typical dimensions in the situation are much larger than this value.

* *

The quantum problem. If quantum effects are neglected, it is possible to construct surfaces with sharp angles or even fractal shapes that overcome the force limit. However, such surfaces are not physical, as they assume that lengths smaller than the Planck length can be realized or measured. The condition that a surface be physical implies that it must have an intrinsic indeterminacy given by the Planck length. A detailed study shows that quantum effects do not allow the horizon force to be exceeded.

Challenge 755 ny

Ref. 377

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

The relativistically extreme observer attempt. Any extreme observer, whether in rapid inertial or in accelerated motion, has no chance to beat the limit. In classical physics we are used to thinking that the interaction necessary for a measurement can be made as small as desired. This statement, however, is not valid for all observers; in particular, extreme observers cannot fulfil it. For them, the measurement interaction is large. As a result, a horizon forms that prevents the limit from being exceeded.

* *

The microscopic attempt. We can attempt to exceed the force limit by accelerating a small particle as strongly as possible or by colliding it with other particles. High forces do indeed appear when two high energy particles are smashed against each other. However, if the combined energy of the two particles became high enough to challenge the force limit, a horizon would appear before they could get sufficiently close.

In fact, quantum theory gives exactly the same result. Quantum theory by itself al-
Ref. 386 ready provides a limit to acceleration. For a particle of mass m it is given by

$$a \leqslant \frac{2mc^3}{\hbar} \,. \tag{258}$$

Here, $\hbar = 1.1 \cdot 10^{-34}$ Js is the quantum of action, a fundamental constant of nature. In particular, this acceleration limit is satisfied in particle accelerators, in particle collisions and in pair creation. For example, the spontaneous generation of electron–positron pairs in intense electromagnetic fields or near black hole horizons does respect the limit (258). Inserting the maximum possible mass for an elementary particle, namely the (corrected)
Page 1469 Planck mass, we find that equation (258) then states that the horizon force is the upper bound for elementary particles.

* *

The compaction attempt. Are black holes really the most dense form of matter or energy? The study of black hole thermodynamics shows that mass concentrations with higher
Ref. 379 density than black holes would contradict the principles of thermodynamics. In black hole thermodynamics, surface and entropy are related: reversible processes that reduce entropy could be realized if physical systems could be compressed to smaller values than the black hole radius. As a result, the size of a black hole is the limit size for a mass in nature. Equivalently, the force limit cannot be exceeded in nature.

* *

The force addition attempt. In special relativity, composing velocities by a simple vector addition is not possible. Similarly, in the case of forces such a naive sum is incorrect; any attempt to add forces in this way would generate a horizon. If textbooks on relativity had explored the behaviour of force vectors under addition with the same care with which they explored that of velocity vectors, the force bound would have appeared much earlier in the literature. (Obviously, general relativity is required for a proper treatment.)

* *

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 270 The mountain attempt to exceed the maximum mass flow value

Challenge 756 r Can you propose and resolve another attempt to exceed the force or power limit?

GEDANKEN EXPERIMENTS WITH THE POWER LIMIT AND THE MASS FLOW LIMIT

Like the force bound, the power bound must be valid for all *imaginable* systems. Here are some attempts to refute it.

* *

The cable-car attempt. Imagine an engine that accelerates a mass with an unbreakable and massless wire (assuming that such a wire could exist). As soon as the engine reached the power bound, either the engine or the exhausts would reach the horizon equation. When a horizon appears, the engine cannot continue to pull the wire, as a wire, even an infinitely strong one, cannot pass a horizon. The power limit thus holds whether the engine is mounted inside the accelerating body or outside, at the end of the wire pulling it.

* *

The mountain attempt. It is possible to define a surface that is so strangely bent that it passes *just below* every nucleus of every atom of a mountain, like the surface A in Figure 270. All atoms of the mountain above sea level are then *just above* the surface, barely touching it. In addition, imagine that this surface is moving *upwards* with almost the speed of light. It is not difficult to show that the mass flow through this surface is higher than the mass flow limit. Indeed, the mass flow limit $c^3/4G$ has a value of about 10^{35} kg/s. In a time of 10^{-22} s, the diameter of a nucleus divided by the speed of light, only 10^{13} kg need to flow through the surface: that is the mass of a mountain.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

This surface seems to provide a counter-example to the limit. However, a closer look shows that this is not the case. The problem is the expression 'just below'. Nuclei are quantum particles and have an indeterminacy in their position; this indeterminacy is essentially the nucleus–nucleus distance. As a result, in order to be sure that the surface of interest has all atoms *above* it, the shape cannot be that of surface A in Figure 270. It must be a flat plane that remains below the whole mountain, like surface B in the figure. However, a flat surface beneath a mountain does not allow the mass change limit to be exceeded.

* *

The multiple atom attempt. One can imagine a number of atoms equal to the number of the atoms of a mountain that all lie with large spacing (roughly) in a single plane. Again, the plane is moving upwards with the speed of light. But also in this case the indeterminacy in the atomic positions makes it impossible to say that the mass flow limit has been exceeded.

* *

The multiple black hole attempt. Black holes are typically large and the indeterminacy in their position is thus negligible. The mass limit $c^3/4G$, or power limit $c^5/4G$, corresponds to the flow of a single black hole moving through a plane at the speed of light. Several black holes crossing a plane together at just under the speed of light thus seem to beat the limit. However, the surface has to be physical: an observer must be possible on each of its points. But no observer can cross a black hole. A black hole thus effectively punctures the plane surface. No black hole can ever be said to cross a plane surface; even less so a multiplicity of black holes. The limit remains valid.

* *

The multiple neutron star attempt. The mass limit seems to be in reach when several neutron stars (which are slightly less dense than a black hole of the same mass) cross a plane surface at the same time, at high speed. However, when the speed approaches the speed of light, the crossing time for points far from the neutron stars and for those that actually cross the stars differ by large amounts. Neutron stars that are almost black holes cannot be crossed in a short time in units of a coordinate clock that is located far from the stars. Again, the limit is not exceeded.

* *

The luminosity attempt. The existence of a maximum luminosity bound has been dis-
Ref. 379 cussed by astrophysicists. In its full generality, the maximum bound on power, i.e., on energy per time, is valid for any energy flow *through any physical surface whatsoever*. The physical surface may even run across the whole universe. However, not even bringing together all lamps, all stars and all galaxies of the universe yields a surface which has a larger power output than the proposed limit.

The surface must be *physical*.* A surface is *physical* if an observer can be placed on each of its points. In particular, a physical surface may not cross a horizon, or have local

* It can also be called *physically sensible*.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

detail finer than a certain minimum length. This minimum length will be introduced later on; it is given by the corrected Planck length. If a surface is not physical, it may provide a counter-example to the power or force limits. However, these counter-examples make no statements about nature. (*Ex falso quodlibet.*[*])

Page 1403
Challenge 757 s

* *

The many lamp attempt, or *power paradox*. An absolute power limit imposes a limit on the rate of energy transport through any imaginable surface. At first sight, it may seem that the combined power emitted by two radiation sources that each emit 3/4 of the maximum value should give 3/2 times that value. However, two such lamps would be so massive that they would form a black hole. No amount of radiation that exceeds the limit can leave. Again, since the horizon limit (245) is achieved, a horizon appears that swallows the light and prevents the force or power limit from being exceeded.

* *

The light concentration attempt. Another approach is to shine a powerful, short and spherical flash of light onto a spherical mass. At first sight it seems that the force and power limits can be exceeded, because light energy can be concentrated into small volumes. However, a high concentration of light energy forms a black hole or induces the mass to form one. There is no way to pump energy into a mass at a faster rate than that dictated by the power limit. In fact, it is impossible to group light sources in such a way that their total output is larger than the power limit. Every time the force limit is approached, a horizon appears that prevents the limit from being exceeded.

* *

The black hole attempt. One possible system in nature that actually *achieves* the power limit is the final stage of black hole evaporation. However, even in this case the power limit is not exceeded, but only equalled.

* *

The saturation attempt. If the universe already saturates the power limit, a new source would break it, or at least imply that another elsewhere must close down. Can you find the fallacy in this argument?

Challenge 758 ny

* *

The water flow attempt. One could try to pump water as rapidly as possible through a large tube of cross-section A. However, when a tube of length L filled with water flowing at speed v gets near to the mass flow limit, the gravity of the water *waiting* to be pumped through the area A will slow down the water that is being pumped through the area. The limit is again reached when the cross-section A turns into a horizon.

Checking that no system – from microscopic to astrophysical – ever exceeds the maximum power or maximum mass flow is a further test of general relativity. It may seem easy to find a counter-example, as the surface may run across the whole universe or envelop

[*] Anything can be deduced from a falsehood.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

any number of elementary particle reactions. However, no such attempt succeeds.

In summary, in all situations where the force, power or mass-flow limit is challenged, whenever the energy flow reaches the black hole mass–energy density in space or the corresponding momentum flow in time, an event horizon appears; this horizon makes it impossible to exceed the limits. All three limits are confirmed both in observation and in theory. Values exceeding the limits can neither be generated nor measured. Gedanken experiments also show that the three bounds are the tightest ones possible. Obviously, all three limits are open to future tests and to further Gedanken experiments. (If you can think of a good one, let the author know.)

Challenge 759 r

Hide and seek

The absence of horizons in everyday life is the *first* reason why the maximum force principle remained undiscovered for so long. Experiments in everyday life do not highlight the force or power limits. The *second* reason why the principle remained hidden is the erroneous belief in point particles. This is a theoretical reason. (Prejudices against the concept of force in general relativity have also been a factor.) The principle of maximum force – or of maximum power – has thus remained hidden for so long because of a 'conspiracy' of nature that hid it both from theorists and from experimentalists.

For a thorough understanding of general relativity it is essential to remember that point particles, point masses and point-like observers do not exist. They are approximations only applicable in Galilean physics or in special relativity. In general relativity, horizons prevent their existence. The habit of believing that the size of a system can be made as small as desired while keeping its mass constant prevents the force or power limit from being noticed.

An intuitive understanding of general relativity

> Wir leben zwar alle unter dem gleichen Himmel, aber wir haben nicht alle den gleichen Horizont.*
>
> Konrad Adenauer

The concepts of horizon force and horizon power can be used as the basis for a direct, intuitive approach to general relativity.

* *

What is gravity? Of the many possible answers we will encounter, we now have the first: gravity is the 'shadow' of the maximum force. Whenever we experience gravity as weak, we can remember that a different observer at the same point and time would experience the maximum force. Searching for the precise properties of that observer is a good exercise. Another way to put it: if there were no maximum force, gravity would not exist.

* *

The maximum force implies universal gravity. To see this, we study a simple planetary

* 'We all live under the same sky, but we do not have the same horizon.' Konrad Adenauer (1876–1967), West German Chancellor.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

system, i.e., one with small velocities and small forces. A simple planetary system of size L consists of a (small) satellite circling a central mass M at a radial distance $R = L/2$. Let a be the acceleration of the object. Small velocity implies the condition $aL \ll c^2$, deduced from special relativity; small force implies $\sqrt{4GMa} \ll c^2$, deduced from the force limit. These conditions are valid for the system as a whole and for all its components. Both expressions have the dimensions of speed squared. Since the system has only one characteristic speed, the two expressions $aL = 2aR$ and $\sqrt{4GMa}$ must be proportional, yielding

$$a = f\frac{GM}{R^2} \,, \tag{259}$$

where the numerical factor f must still be determined. To determine it, we study the escape velocity necessary to leave the central body. The escape velocity must be smaller than the speed of light for any body larger than a black hole. The escape velocity, derived from expression (259), from a body of mass M and radius R is given by $v_{\text{esc}}^2 = 2fGM/R$. The minimum radius R of objects, given by $R = 2GM/c^2$, then implies that $f = 1$. Therefore, for low speeds and low forces, the inverse square law describes the orbit of a satellite around a central mass.

* *

If empty space-time is elastic, like a piece of metal, it must also be able to oscillate. Any physical system can show oscillations when a deformation brings about a restoring force. We saw above that there is such a force in the vacuum: it is called gravitation. In other words, vacuum must be able to oscillate, and since it is extended, it must also be able to sustain waves. Indeed, gravitational waves are predicted by general relativity, as we will Page 525 see below.

* *

If curvature and energy are linked, the maximum speed must also hold for gravitational energy. Indeed, we will find that gravity has a finite speed of propagation. The inverse square law of everyday life cannot be correct, as it is inconsistent with any speed limit. More about the corrections induced by the maximum speed will become clear shortly. In addition, since gravitational waves are waves of massless energy, we would expect the Page 525 maximum speed to be their propagation speed. This is indeed the case, as we will see.

* *

A body cannot be denser than a (non-rotating) black hole of the same mass. The maximum force and power limits that apply to horizons make it impossible to squeeze mass into smaller horizons. The maximum force limit can therefore be rewritten as a limit for the size L of physical systems of mass m:

$$L \geqslant \frac{4Gm}{c^2} \,. \tag{260}$$

If we call twice the radius of a black hole its 'size', we can state that no physical system

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

of mass m is smaller than this value.* The size limit plays an important role in general relativity. The opposite inequality, $m \geqslant \sqrt{A/16\pi}\, c^2/G$, which describes the maximum 'size' of black holes, is called the *Penrose inequality* and has been proven for many physi-
Ref. 387, Ref. 388, Ref. 389 cally realistic situations. The Penrose inequality can be seen to imply the maximum force limit, and vice versa. The maximum force principle, or the equivalent minimum size of matter–energy systems, thus prevents the formation of naked singularities, and implies the validity of the so-called *cosmic censorship*.

* *

There is a power limit for all energy sources. In particular, the value $c^5/4G$ limits the luminosity of all gravitational sources. Indeed, all formulae for gravitational wave emission
Ref. 379 imply this value as an upper limit. Furthermore, numerical relativity simulations never exceed it: for example, the power emitted during the simulated merger of two black holes is below the limit.

* *

Perfectly plane waves do not exist in nature. Plane waves are of infinite extension. But neither electrodynamic nor gravitational waves can be infinite, since such waves would carry more momentum per time through a plane surface than is allowed by the force limit. The non-existence of plane gravitational waves also precludes the production of singularities when two such waves collide.

* *

In nature, there are no infinite forces. There are thus no naked singularities in nature. Horizons prevent the appearance of naked singularities. In particular, the big bang was *not* a singularity. The mathematical theorems by Penrose and Hawking that seem to imply the existence of singularities tacitly assume the existence of point masses – often in the form of 'dust' – in contrast to what general relativity implies. Careful re-evaluation of each such proof is necessary.

* *

The force limit means that space-time has a limited stability. The limit suggests that space-time can be torn into pieces. This is indeed the case. However, the way that this happens is not described by general relativity. We will study it in the last part of this text.

* *

The maximum force is the standard of force. This implies that the gravitational constant G is constant in space and time – or at least, that its variations across space and time
Ref. 390 cannot be detected. Present data support this claim to a high degree of precision.

* *

The maximum force principle implies that gravitational energy – as long as it can be defined – *falls* in gravitational fields in the same way as other type of energy. As a result,

* The maximum value for the mass to size limit is obviously equivalent to the maximum mass change given above.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Ref. 379 the maximum force principle predicts that the Nordtvedt effect vanishes. The Nordtvedt effect is a hypothetical periodical change in the orbit of the Moon that would appear if the gravitational energy of the Earth–Moon system did not fall, like other mass–energy, in the gravitational field of the Sun. Lunar range measurements have confirmed the absence of this effect.

* *

If horizons are surfaces, we can ask what their colour is. This question will be explored
Page 604 later on.

* *

Page 1468 Later on we will find that quantum effects cannot be used to exceed the force or power
Challenge 760 e limit. (Can you guess why?) Quantum theory also provides a limit to motion, namely a lower limit to action; however, this limit is independent of the force or power limit. (A dimensional analysis already shows this: there is no way to define an action by combinations of c and G.) Therefore, even the combination of quantum theory and general relativity does not help in overcoming the force or power limits.

An intuitive understanding of cosmology

A maximum power is the simplest possible explanation of Olbers' paradox. Power and luminosity are two names for the same observable. The sum of all luminosities in the universe is finite; the light and all other energy emitted by all stars, taken together, is finite. If one assumes that the universe is homogeneous and isotropic, the power limit $P \leqslant c^5/4G$ must be valid across any plane that divides the universe into two halves. The part of the universe's luminosity that arrives on Earth is then so small that the sky is dark at night. In fact, the actually measured luminosity is still smaller than this calculation, as a large part of the power is not visible to the human eye (since most of it is matter anyway). In other words, the night is dark because of nature's power limit. This explanation is *not* in contrast to the usual one, which uses the finite lifetime of stars, their finite density, their finite size, and the finite age and the expansion of the universe. In fact, the combination of all these usual arguments simply implies and repeats in more complex words that the power limit cannot be exceeded. However, this more simple explanation seems to be absent in the literature.

The existence of a maximum force in nature, together with homogeneity and isotropy, implies that the visible universe is of *finite size*. The opposite case would be an infinitely large, homogeneous and isotropic universe. But in that case, any two halves of the universe would attract each other with a force above the limit (provided the universe were sufficiently old). This result can be made quantitative by imagining a sphere whose centre lies at the Earth, which encompasses all the universe, and whose radius decreases with time almost as rapidly as the speed of light. The mass flow $\mathrm{d}m/\mathrm{d}t = \rho A v$ is predicted to reach the mass flow limit $c^3/4G$; thus one has

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}m}{\mathrm{d}t} = \rho_0 4\pi R_0^2 c = \frac{c^3}{4G} \quad , \tag{261}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Ref. 391 a relation also predicted by the Friedmann models. The precision measurements of the cosmic background radiation by the WMAP satellite confirm that the present-day total energy density ρ_0 (including dark matter and dark energy) and the horizon radius R_0 just reach the limit value. The maximum force limit thus predicts the observed size of the universe.

A finite power limit also suggests that a finite age for the universe can be deduced. Challenge 761 s Can you find an argument?

Experimental challenges for the third millennium

The lack of direct tests of the horizon force, power or mass flow is obviously due to the lack of horizons in the environment of all experiments performed so far. Despite the difficulties in reaching the limits, their values are observable and falsifiable.

In fact, the force limit might be tested with high-precision measurements in binary pulsars or binary black holes. Such systems allow precise determination of the positions of the two stars. The maximum force principle implies a relation between the position Ref. 377 error Δx and the energy error ΔE. For all systems one has

$$\frac{\Delta E}{\Delta x} \leqslant \frac{c^4}{4G} \,. \tag{262}$$

For example, a position error of 1 mm gives a mass error of below $3 \cdot 10^{23}$ kg. In everyday life, all measurements comply with this relation. Indeed, the left side is so much smaller than the right side that the relation is rarely mentioned. For a direct check, only systems which might achieve direct equality are interesting. Dual black holes or dual pulsars are such systems.

It might be that one day the amount of matter falling into some black hole, such as the one at the centre of the Milky Way, might be measured. The limit $\mathrm{d}m/\mathrm{d}t \leqslant c^3/4G$ could then be tested directly.

The power limit implies that the highest luminosities are only achieved when systems emit energy at the speed of light. Indeed, the maximum emitted power is only achieved when all matter is radiated away as rapidly as possible: the emitted power $P = Mc^2/(R/v)$ cannot reach the maximum value if the body radius R is larger than that of a black hole (the densest body of a given mass) or the emission speed v is lower than that of light. The sources with highest luminosity must therefore be of maximum density and emit entities without rest mass, such as gravitational waves, electromagnetic waves or (maybe) gluons. Candidates to detect the limit are black holes in formation, in evaporation or undergoing mergers.

A candidate surface that reaches the limit is the night sky. The night sky is a horizon. Provided that light, neutrino, particle and gravitational wave flows are added together, the limit $c^5/4G$ is predicted to be reached. If the measured power is smaller than the limit (as it seems to be at present), this might even give a hint about new particles yet to be discovered. If the limit were exceeded or not reached, general relativity would be shown to be incorrect. This might be an interesting future experimental test.

The power limit implies that a wave whose integrated intensity approaches the force limit cannot be plane. The power limit thus implies a limit on the product of intensity

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

I (given as energy per unit time and unit area) and the size (curvature radius) R of the front of a wave moving with the speed of light c:

$$4\pi R^2 I \leqslant \frac{c^5}{4G} \,. \tag{263}$$

Obviously, this statement is difficult to check experimentally, whatever the frequency and type of wave might be, because the value appearing on the right-hand side is extremely large. Possibly, future experiments with gravitational wave detectors, X-ray detectors, gamma ray detectors, radio receivers or particle detectors might allow us to test relation (263) with precision. (You might want to predict which of these experiments will confirm the limit first.)

Challenge 762 e

The lack of direct experimental tests of the force and power limits implies that *indirect tests* become particularly important. All such tests study the motion of matter or energy and compare it with a famous consequence of the force and power limits: the field equations of general relativity. This will be our next topic.

A summary of general relativity

There is a simple axiomatic formulation of general relativity: the horizon force $c^4/4G$ and the horizon power $c^5/4G$ are the highest possible force and power values. No contradicting observation is known. No counter-example has been imagined. General relativity follows from these limits. Moreover, the limits imply the darkness of the night and the finiteness of the size of the universe.

The principle of maximum force has obvious applications for the teaching of general relativity. The principle brings general relativity to the level of first-year university, and possibly to well-prepared secondary school, students: only the concepts of maximum force and horizon are necessary. Space-time curvature is a consequence of horizon curvature.

The concept of a maximum force points to an additional aspect of gravitation. The cosmological constant Λ is not fixed by the maximum force principle. (However, the principle does fix its sign to be positive.) Present measurements give the result $\Lambda \approx 10^{-52}\,/\mathrm{m}^2$. A positive cosmological constant implies the existence of a negative energy volume density $-\Lambda c^4/G$. This value corresponds to a negative pressure, as pressure and energy density have the same dimensions. Multiplication by the (numerically corrected) Planck area $2G\hbar/c^3$, the smallest area in nature, gives a force value

Challenge 763 ny

Page 587

Page 1466

$$F = 2\Lambda\hbar c = 0.60 \cdot 10^{-77}\,\mathrm{N} \,. \tag{264}$$

This is also the gravitational force between two (numerically corrected) Planck masses $\sqrt{\hbar c/8G}$ located at the cosmological distance $1/4\sqrt{\Lambda}$. If we make the somewhat wishful assumption that expression (264) is the smallest possible force in nature (the numerical factors are not yet verified), we get the fascinating conjecture that the full theory of general relativity, including the cosmological constant, may be defined by the combination of a *maximum* and a *minimum* force in nature. (Can you find a smaller force?)

Challenge 764 d

Proving the minimum force conjecture is more involved than for the case of the maxi-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

mum force. So far, only some hints are possible. Like the maximum force, the minimum force must be compatible with gravitation, must not be contradicted by any experiment, and must withstand any Gedanken experiment. A quick check shows that the minimum force, as we have just argued, allows us to deduce gravitation, is an invariant, and is not contradicted by any experiment. There are also hints that there may be no way to generate or measure a smaller value. For example, the minimum force corresponds to the energy per length contained by a photon with a wavelength of the size of the universe. It is hard – but maybe not impossible – to imagine the production of a still smaller force.

We have seen that the maximum force principle and general relativity fail to fix the value of the cosmological constant. Only a unified theory can do so. We thus get two requirements for such a theory. First, any unified theory must predict the same upper limit to force. Secondly, a unified theory must fix the cosmological constant. The appearance of $\hbar$ in the conjectured expression for the minimum force suggests that the minimum force is determined by a combination of general relativity and quantum theory. The proof of this suggestion and the direct measurement of the minimum force are two important challenges for our ascent beyond general relativity.

We are now ready to explore the consequences of general relativity and its field equations in more detail. We start by focusing on the concept of space-time curvature in everyday life, and in particular, on its consequences for the observation of motion.

Acknowledgement

The author thanks Steve Carlip, Corrado Massa, Tom Helmond, Gary Gibbons, Heinrich Neumaier and Peter Brown for interesting discussions on these topics.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 17

THE NEW IDEAS ON SPACE, TIME AND GRAVITY

> Sapere aude.*
>
> Horace *Epistulae*, 1, 2, 40.

Gravitational influences do transport energy.** Our description of motion must therefore be precise enough to imply that this transport can happen at most with the speed of light. Henri Poincaré stated this requirement as long ago as 1905. The results following from this principle will be fascinating: we will find that empty space can move, that the universe has a finite age and that objects can be in permanent free fall. It will turn out that empty space can be bent, although it is much stiffer than steel. Despite these strange consequences, the theory and all its predictions have been confirmed by all experiments.

The theory of universal gravitation, which describes motion due to gravity using the relation $a = GM/r^2$, allows speeds higher than that of light. Indeed, the speed of a mass in orbit is not limited. It is also unclear how the values of a and r depend on the observer. So this theory cannot be correct. In order to reach the correct description, called *general relativity* by Albert Einstein, we have to throw quite a few preconceptions overboard.

Ref. 392, Ref. 393

Rest and free fall

The opposite of motion in daily life is a body at rest, such as a child sleeping or a rock defying the waves. A body is at rest whenever it is not disturbed by other bodies. In the Galilean description of the world, rest is the *absence of velocity*. In special relativity, rest became *inertial motion*, since no inertially moving observer can distinguish its own motion from rest: nothing disturbs him. Both the rock in the waves and the rapid protons crossing the galaxy as cosmic rays are at rest. The inclusion of gravity leads us to an even more general definition.

Challenge 765 e

If any body moving inertially is to be considered at rest, then any body in free fall must also be. Nobody knows this better than Joseph Kittinger, the man who in August 1960 stepped out of a balloon capsule at the record height of 31.3 km. At that altitude, the air is so thin that during the first minute of his free fall he felt completely at rest, as if he were floating. Although an experienced parachutist, he was so surprised that he had to turn upwards in order to convince himself that he was indeed moving away from his balloon! Despite his lack of any sensation of movement, he was falling at up to 274 m/s or 988 km/h with respect to the Earth's surface. He only started feeling something when

Ref. 394

* 'Venture to be wise.' Horace is Quintus Horatius Flaccus, (65–8 BCE), the great Roman poet.

** The details of this statement are far from simple. They are discussed on page 525 and page 559.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 271 Inside an accelerating train or bus

he encountered the first substantial layers of air. That was when his free fall started to be disturbed. Later, after four and a half minutes of fall, his special parachute opened; and nine minutes later he landed in New Mexico.

Kittinger and all other observers in free fall, such as the cosmonauts circling the Earth or the passengers in parabolic aeroplane flights,* make the same observation: it is impossible to distinguish anything happening in free fall from what would happen at rest. This impossibility is called the *principle of equivalence*; it is one of the starting points of general relativity. It leads to the most precise – and final – definition of rest: *rest is free fall*. Rest is lack of disturbance; so is free fall.

The set of all free-falling observers at a point in space-time generalizes the special-relativistic notion of the set of the inertial observers at a point. This means that we must describe motion in such a way that not only inertial but also freely falling observers can talk to each other. In addition, a full description of motion must be able to describe gravitation and the motion it produces, and it must be able to describe motion for any observer imaginable. General relativity realizes this aim.

As a first step, we put the result in simple words: true *motion is the opposite of free fall*. This statement immediately rises a number of questions: Most trees or mountains are not
Challenge 766 s in free fall, thus they are not at rest. What motion are they undergoing? And if free fall is rest, what is weight? And what then is gravity anyway? Let us start with the last question.

What is gravity? – A second answer

In the beginning, we described gravity as the shadow of the maximum force. But there is a second way to describe it, more related to everyday life. As William Unruh likes to
Ref. 395 explain, the constancy of the speed of light for all observers implies a simple conclusion: *gravity is the uneven running of clocks at different places*.** Of course, this seemingly ab-
Challenge 768 e surd definition needs to be checked. The definition does not talk about a single situation seen by different observers, as we often did in special relativity. The definition depends of the fact that neighbouring, identical clocks, fixed against each other, run differently in the presence of a gravitational field when watched by the *same* observer; moreover, this difference is directly related to what we usually call gravity. There are two ways to check this connection: by experiment and by reasoning. Let us start with the latter method, as it is cheaper, faster and more fun.

* Nowadays it is possible to book such flights in specialized travel agents.

** Gravity is also the uneven length of metre bars at different places, as we will see below. Both effects are needed to describe it completely; but for daily life on Earth, the clock effect is sufficient, since it is much
Challenge 767 s larger than the length effect, which can usually be neglected. Can you see why?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

An observer feels no difference between gravity and constant acceleration. We can thus study constant acceleration and use a way of reasoning we have encountered already in the chapter on special relativity. We assume light is emitted at the back end of a train of length Δh that is accelerating forward with acceleration g, as shown in Figure 271. The light arrives at the front after a time $t = \Delta h/c$. However, during this time the accelerating train has picked up some additional velocity, namely $\Delta v = gt = g\Delta h/c$. As a result, because of the Doppler effect we encountered in our discussion of special relativity, the frequency f of the light arriving at the front has changed. Using the expression of the Doppler effect, we thus get*

Page 431

Challenge 769 e

$$\frac{\Delta f}{f} = \frac{g\Delta h}{c^2} \,. \tag{265}$$

The sign of the frequency change depends on whether the light motion and the train acceleration are in the same or in opposite directions. For actual trains or buses, the frequency change is quite small; nevertheless, it is measurable. Acceleration induces frequency changes in light. Let us compare this effect of acceleration with the effects of gravity.

Challenge 771 s

To measure time and space, we use light. What happens to light when gravity is involved? The simplest experiment is to let light fall or rise. In order to deduce what must happen, we add a few details. Imagine a conveyor belt carrying masses around two wheels, a low and a high one, as shown in Figure 272. The descending, grey masses are slightly larger. Whenever such a larger mass is near the bottom, some mechanism – not shown in the figure – converts the mass surplus to light, in accordance with the equation $E = mc^2$, and sends the light up towards the top.** At the top, one of the lighter, white masses passing by absorbs the light and, because of its added weight, turns the conveyor belt until it reaches the bottom. Then the process repeats.***

Ref. 396

As the grey masses on the descending side are always heavier, the belt would turn for ever and this system could continuously *generate* energy. However, since energy conservation is at the basis of our definition of time, as we saw in the beginning of our walk, the whole process must be impossible. We have to conclude that the light changes its energy when climbing. The only possibility is that the light arrives at the top with a frequency *different* from the one at which it is emitted from the bottom.****

Page 219

In short, it turns out that rising light is gravitationally red-shifted. Similarly, the light descending from the top of a tree down to an observer is *blue-shifted*; this gives a darker colour to the top in comparison with the bottom of the tree. General relativity thus says that trees have different shades of green along their height.***** How big is the effect? The result deduced from the drawing is again the one of formula (265). That is what we

Challenge 774 e

* The expression $v = gt$ is valid only for non-relativistic speeds; nevertheless, the conclusion of this section is not affected by this approximation.

Challenge 770 e

** As in special relativity, here and in the rest of our mountain ascent, the term 'mass' always refers to rest mass.

*** Can this process be performed with 100% efficiency?

Challenge 772 s

**** The precise relation between energy and frequency of light is described and explained in our discussion on quantum theory, on page 997. But we know already from classical electrodynamics that the energy of light depends on its intensity and on its frequency.

***** How does this argument change if you include the illumination by the Sun?

Challenge 773 ny

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 272 The necessity of blue- and red-shift of light: why trees are greener at the bottom

would, as light moving in an accelerating train and light moving in gravity are equivalent situations, as you might want to check yourself. The formula gives a relative change of frequency of only $1.1 \cdot 10^{-16}$ /m near the surface of the Earth. For trees, this so-called *gravitational red-shift* or *gravitational Doppler effect* is far too small to be observable, at least using normal light.

Challenge 775 s

Ref. 397

In 1911, Einstein proposed an experiment to check the change of frequency with height by measuring the red-shift of light emitted by the Sun, using the famous Fraunhofer lines as colour markers. The results of the first experiments, by Schwarzschild and others, were unclear or even negative, due to a number of other effects that induce colour changes at high temperatures. But in 1920 and 1921, Grebe and Bachem, and independently Perot, confirmed the gravitational red-shift with careful experiments. In later years, technological advances made the measurements much easier, until it was even possible to measure the effect on Earth. In 1960, in a classic experiment using the Mössbauer effect, Pound and Rebka confirmed the gravitational red-shift in their university tower using γ radiation.

Page 1041

Ref. 398

But our two thought experiments tell us much more. Let us use the same arguments as in the case of special relativity: a colour change implies that clocks run differently at different heights, just as they run differently in the front and in the back of a train. The time difference $\Delta\tau$ is predicted to depend on the height difference Δh and the acceleration of gravity g according to

$$\frac{\Delta\tau}{\tau} = \frac{\Delta f}{f} = \frac{g\Delta h}{c^2} \,. \tag{266}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Therefore, in gravity, *time is height-dependent*. That was exactly what we claimed above. In fact, *height makes old*. Can you confirm this conclusion? Challenge 776 ny

In 1972, by flying four precise clocks in an aeroplane while keeping an identical one on the ground, Hafele and Keating found that clocks indeed run differently at different altitudes according to expression (266). Subsequently, in 1976, the team of Vessot shot a precision clock based on a maser – a precise microwave generator and oscillator – upwards on a missile. The team compared the maser inside the missile with an identical maser on the ground and again confirmed the above expression. In 1977, Briatore and Leschiutta showed that a clock in Torino indeed ticks more slowly than one on the top of the Monte Rosa. They confirmed the prediction that on Earth, for every 100 m of height gained, people age more rapidly by about 1 ns per day. This effect has been confirmed for all systems for which experiments have been performed, such as several planets, the Sun and numerous other stars. Ref. 399 Ref. 400 Ref. 401 Challenge 777 ny

Do these experiments show that time changes or are they simply due to clocks that function badly? Take some time and try to settle this question. We will give one argument only: gravity does change the colour of light, and thus really does change time. Clock precision is not an issue here. Challenge 778 e

In summary, gravity is indeed the uneven running of clocks at different heights. Note that an observer at the lower position and another observer at the higher position *agree* on the result: both find that the upper clock goes faster. In other words, when gravity is present, space-time is *not* described by the Minkowski geometry of special relativity, but by some more general geometry. To put it mathematically, whenever gravity is present, the 4-distance ds^2 between events is different from the expression without gravity:

$$ds^2 \neq c^2dt^2 - dx^2 - dy^2 - dz^2 \,. \tag{267}$$

We will give the correct expression shortly.

Is this view of gravity as height-dependent time really reasonable? No. It turns out that it is not yet strange enough! Since the speed of light is the same for all observers, we can say more. If time changes with height, length must also do so! More precisely, if clocks run differently at different heights, the length of metre bars must also change with height. Can you confirm this for the case of horizontal bars at different heights? Challenge 779 ny

If length changes with height, the circumference of a circle around the Earth *cannot* be given by $2\pi r$. An analogous discrepancy is also found by an ant measuring the radius and circumference of a circle traced on the surface of a basketball. Indeed, gravity implies that humans are in a situation analogous to that of ants on a basketball, the only difference being that the circumstances are translated from two to three dimensions. We conclude that wherever gravity plays a role, space is *curved*.

What tides tell us about gravity

During his free fall, Kittinger was able to specify an inertial frame for himself. Indeed, he felt completely at rest. Does this mean that it is impossible to distinguish acceleration from gravitation? No: distinction *is* possible. We only have to compare *two* (or more) falling observers.

Kittinger could not have found a frame which is also inertial for a colleague falling

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 273 Tidal effects: the only effect bodies feel when falling

Challenge 780 e

on the opposite side of the Earth. Such a common frame does not exist. In general, it is impossible to find a *single* inertial reference frame describing different observers freely falling near a mass. In fact, it is impossible to find a common inertial frame even for *nearby* observers in a gravitational field. Two nearby observers observe that during their fall, their relative distance changes. (Why?) The same happens to orbiting observers.

Challenge 781 s

In a closed room in orbit around the Earth, a person or a mass at the centre of the room would not feel any force, and in particular no gravity. But if several particles are located in the room, they will behave differently depending on their exact positions in the room. Only if two particles were on exactly the same orbit would they keep the same relative position. If one particle is in a lower or higher orbit than the other, they will depart from each other over time. Even more interestingly, if a particle in orbit is displaced sideways, it will oscillate around the central position. (Can you confirm this?)

Challenge 782 ny

Gravitation leads to changes of relative distance. These changes evince another effect, shown in Figure 273: an extended body in free fall is slightly *squeezed*. This effect also tells us that it is an essential feature of gravity that free fall is *different* from point to point. That rings a bell. The squeezing of a body is the same effect as that which causes the tides. Indeed, the bulging oceans can be seen as the squeezed Earth in its fall towards the Moon. Using this result of universal gravity we can now affirm: the essence of gravity is the observation of tidal effects.

Page 158

Ref. 402

In other words, gravity is simple only *locally*. Only locally does it look like acceleration. Only locally does a falling observer like Kittinger feel at rest. In fact, only a point-like observer does so! As soon as we take spatial extension into account, we find tidal effects. *Gravity is the presence of tidal effects.* The absence of tidal effects implies the absence of gravity. Tidal effects are the everyday consequence of height-dependent time. Isn't this a beautiful conclusion?

In principle, Kittinger could have *felt* gravitation during his free fall, even with his eyes closed, had he paid attention to himself. Had he measured the distance change between his two hands, he would have found a tiny decrease which could have told him that he was falling. This tiny decrease would have forced Kittinger to a strange conclusion. Two inertially moving hands should move along two parallel lines, always keeping the same distance. Since the distance changes, he must conclude that in the space around him lines

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

starting out in parallel do not remain so. Kittinger would have concluded that the space around him was similar to the surface of the Earth, where two lines starting out north, parallel to each other, also change distance, until they meet at the North Pole. In other words, Kittinger would have concluded that he was in a *curved* space.

By studying the change in distance between his hands, Kittinger could even have concluded that the curvature of space changes with height. Physical space differs from a sphere, which has constant curvature. Physical space is more involved. The effect is extremely small, and cannot be felt by human senses. Kittinger had no chance to detect anything. Detection requires special high-sensitivity apparatus. However, the conclusion remains valid. Space-time is *not* described by Minkowski geometry when gravity is present. Tidal effects imply space-time curvature. Gravity is the curvature of space-time.

Bent space and mattresses

> Wenn ein Käfer über die Oberfläche einer Kugel krabbelt, merkt er wahrscheinlich nicht, daß der Weg, den er zurücklegt, gekrümmt ist. Ich dagegen hatte das Glück, es zu merken.*
>
> Albert Einstein's answer to his son Eduard's question about the reason for his fame

On the 7th of November 1919, Albert Einstein became world-famous. On that day, an article in the *Times* newspaper in London announced the results of a double expedition to South America under the heading 'Revolution in science / new theory of the universe / Newtonian ideas overthrown'. The expedition had shown unequivocally – though not for the first time – that the theory of universal gravity, essentially given by $a = GM/r^2$, was wrong, and that instead space was *curved*. A worldwide mania started. Einstein was presented as the greatest of all geniuses. 'Space warped' was the most common headline. Einstein's papers on general relativity were reprinted in full in popular magazines. People could read the field equations of general relativity, in tensor form and with Greek indices, in *Time* magazine. Nothing like this has happened to any other physicist before or since. What was the reason for this excitement?

The expedition to the southern hemisphere had performed an experiment proposed by Einstein himself. Apart from seeking to verify the change of time with height, Einstein had also thought about a number of experiments to detect the curvature of space. In the one that eventually made him famous, Einstein proposed to take a picture of the stars near the Sun, as is possible during a solar eclipse, and compare it with a picture of the same stars at night, when the Sun is far away. Einstein predicted a change in position of 1.75′ (1.75 seconds of arc) for star images at the border of the Sun, a value *twice* as large as that predicted by universal gravity. The prediction, corresponding to about 1/40 mm on the photographs, was confirmed in 1919, and thus universal gravity was ruled out.

Ref. 403

Page 161

Does this result *imply* that space is curved? Not by itself. In fact, other explanations could be given for the result of the eclipse experiment, such as a potential differing from the inverse square form. However, the eclipse results are not the only data. We already know about the change of time with height. Experiments show that two observers at

* 'When an insect walks over the surface of a sphere it probably does not notice that the path it walks is curved. I, on the other hand, had the luck to notice it.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 274 The mattress model of space: the path of a light beam and of a satellite near a spherical mass

different heights measure the same value for the speed of light c near themselves. But these experiments also show that if an observer measures the speed of light at the position of the *other* observer, he gets a value differing from c, since his clock runs differently. There is only one possible solution to this dilemma: metre bars, like clocks, also change with height, and in such a way as to yield the same speed of light everywhere.

Challenge 783 ny

If the speed of light is constant but clocks and metre bars change with height, the conclusion must be that *space is curved near masses*. Many physicists in the twentieth century checked whether metre bars really behave differently in places where gravity is present. And indeed, curvature has been detected around several planets, around all the hundreds of stars where it could be measured, and around dozens of galaxies. Many indirect effects of curvature around masses, to be described in detail below, have also been observed. All results confirm the curvature of space and space-time around masses, and in addition confirm the curvature values predicted by general relativity. In other words, metre bars near masses do indeed change their size from place to place, and even from orientation to orientation. Figure 274 gives an impression of the situation.

Ref. 404

Challenge 784 s

But beware: the right-hand figure, although found in many textbooks, can be misleading. It can easily be mistaken for a reproduction of a *potential* around a body. Indeed, it is impossible to draw a graph showing curvature and potential separately. (Why?) We will see that for small curvatures, it is even possible to explain the change in metre bar length using a potential only. Thus the figure does not really cheat, at least in the case of weak gravity. But for large and changing values of gravity, a potential cannot be defined, and thus there is indeed no way to avoid using curved space to describe gravity. In summary, if we imagine space as a sort of generalized mattress in which masses produce deformations, we have a reasonable model of space-time. As masses move, the deformation follows them.

The acceleration of a test particle only depends on the curvature of the mattress. It does not depend on the mass of the test particle. So the mattress model explains why all bodies fall in the same way. (In the old days, this was also called the equality of the inertial and gravitational mass.)

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Space thus behaves like a frictionless mattress that pervades everything. We live inside the mattress, but we do not feel it in everyday life. Massive objects pull the foam of the mattress towards them, thus deforming the shape of the mattress. More force, more energy or more mass imply a larger deformation. (Does the mattress remind you of the aether? Do not worry: physics eliminated the concept of aether because it is indistinguishable from vacuum.)

Page 757

If gravity means curved space, then any accelerated observer, such as a man in a departing car, must also observe that space is curved. However, in everyday life we do not notice any such effect, because for accelerations and sizes of of everyday life the curvature values are too small to be noticed. Could you devise a sensitive experiment to check the prediction?

Challenge 785 ny

Curved space-time

Figure 274 shows the curvature of space only, but in fact space-time is curved. We will shortly find out how to describe both the shape of space and the shape of space-time, and how to measure their curvature.

Let us have a first attempt to describe nature with the idea of curved space-time. In the case of Figure 274, the best description of events is with the use of the time t shown by a clock located at spatial infinity; that avoids problems with the uneven running of clocks at different distances from the central mass. For the radial coordinate r, the most practical choice to avoid problems with the curvature of space is to use the circumference of a circle around the central body, divided by 2π. The curved shape of space-time is best described by the behaviour of the space-time distance $\mathrm{d}s$, or by the wristwatch time $\mathrm{d}\tau = \mathrm{d}s/c$, between two neighbouring points with coordinates (t, r) and $(t + \mathrm{d}t, r + \mathrm{d}r)$.

Page 422

As we saw above, gravity means that in spherical coordinates we have

Page 502

$$\mathrm{d}\tau^2 = \frac{\mathrm{d}s^2}{c^2} \neq \mathrm{d}t^2 - \mathrm{d}r^2/c^2 - r^2\mathrm{d}\varphi^2/c^2 \,. \tag{268}$$

The inequality expresses the fact that space-time is *curved*. Indeed, the experiments on time change with height confirm that the space-time interval around a spherical mass is given by

$$\mathrm{d}\tau^2 = \frac{\mathrm{d}s^2}{c^2} = \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{rc^2}\right)\mathrm{d}t^2 - \frac{\mathrm{d}r^2}{c^2 - \frac{2GM}{r}} - \frac{r^2}{c^2}\mathrm{d}\varphi^2 \,. \tag{269}$$

This expression is called the *Schwarzschild metric* after one of its discoverers.* The metric (269) describes the curved shape of space-time around a spherical non-rotating mass. It is well approximated by the Earth or the Sun. (Why can their rotation be neglected?) Expression (269) also shows that gravity's strength around a body of mass M and radius

Challenge 786 s

* Karl Schwarzschild (1873–1916), important German astronomer; he was one of the first people to understand general relativity. He published his formula in December 1915, only a few months after Einstein had published his field equations. He died prematurely, at the age of 42, much to Einstein's distress. We will deduce the form of the metric later on, directly from the field equations of general relativity. The other discoverer of the metric, unknown to Einstein, was the Dutch physicist J. Droste.

Ref. 405

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

R is measured by a dimensionless number h defined as

$$h = \frac{2G}{c^2}\frac{M}{R} \,. \tag{270}$$

This ratio expresses the gravitational strain with which lengths and the vacuum are deformed from the flat situation of special relativity, and thus also determines how much clocks slow down when gravity is present. (The ratio also reveals how far one is from any possible horizon.) On the surface of the Earth the ratio h has the small value of $1.4 \cdot 10^{-9}$; on the surface of the Sun is has the somewhat larger value of $4.2 \cdot 10^{-6}$. The precision of modern clocks allows one to detect such small effects quite easily. The various consequences and uses of the deformation of space-time will be discussed shortly.

We note that if a mass is highly concentrated, in particular when its radius becomes *equal* to its so-called *Schwarzschild radius*

$$R_S = \frac{2GM}{c^2} \,, \tag{271}$$

the Schwarzschild metric behaves strangely: at that location, *time disappears* (note that t is time at infinity). At the Schwarzschild radius, the wristwatch time (as shown by a clock at infinity) stops – and a horizon appears. What happens precisely will be explored below. This situation is not common: the Schwarzschild radius for a mass like the Earth is 8.8 mm, and for the Sun is 3.0 km; you might want to check that the object size for every system in everyday life is larger than its Schwarzschild radius. Bodies which reach this limit are called *black holes*; we will study them in detail shortly. In fact, general relativity states that *no* system in nature is smaller than its Schwarzschild size, in other words that the ratio h defined by expression (270) is never above unity.

Page 606
Challenge 787 e
Ref. 406

In summary, the results mentioned so far make it clear that *mass generates curvature*. The mass–energy equivalence we know from special relativity then tells us that as a consequence, space should also be curved by the presence of any type of energy–momentum. Every type of energy curves space-time. For example, light should also curve space-time. However, even the highest-energy beams we can create correspond to extremely small masses, and thus to unmeasurably small curvatures. Even heat curves space-time; but in most systems, heat is only about a fraction of 10^{-12} of total mass; its curvature effect is thus unmeasurable and negligible. Nevertheless it is still possible to show experimentally that energy curves space. In almost all atoms a sizeable fraction of the mass is due to the electrostatic energy among the positively charged protons. In 1968 Kreuzer confirmed that energy curves space with a clever experiment using a floating mass.

Ref. 407

It is straightforward to imagine that the uneven running of clock is the temporal equivalent of spatial curvature. Taking the two together, we conclude that when gravity is present, *space-time* is curved.

Challenge 788 ny

Let us sum up our chain of thoughts. Energy is equivalent to mass; mass produces gravity; gravity is equivalent to acceleration; acceleration is position-dependent time. Since light speed is constant, we deduce that *energy–momentum tells space-time to curve.* This statement is the first half of general relativity.

We will soon find out how to measure curvature, how to calculate it from energy–

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

momentum and what is found when measurement and calculation are compared. We will also find out that different observers measure different curvature values. The set of transformations relating one viewpoint to another in general relativity, the *diffeomorphism symmetry*, will tell us how to relate the measurements of different observers.

Since matter moves, we can say even more. Not only is space-time curved near masses, it also bends back when a mass has passed by. In other words, general relativity states that space, as well as space-time, is *elastic*. However, it is rather stiff: quite a lot stiffer than steel. To curve a piece of space by 1 % requires an energy density enormously larger than to curve a simple train rail by 1 %. This and other interesting consequences of the elasticity of space-time will occupy us for a while.

Ref. 408

Challenge 789 ny

The speed of light and the gravitational constant

> “Si morior, moror.*”

We continue on the way towards precision in our understanding of gravitation. All our theoretical and empirical knowledge about gravity can be summed up in just two general statements. The first principle states:

▷ *The speed v of a physical system is bounded above:*

$$v \leqslant c \tag{272}$$

for all observers, where c is the speed of light.

The theory following from this first principle, *special* relativity, is extended to *general* relativity by adding a second principle, characterizing gravitation. There are several equivalent ways to state this principle. Here is one.

▷ *For all observers, the force F on a system is limited by*

$$F \leqslant \frac{c^4}{4G} \,, \tag{273}$$

where G is the universal constant of gravitation.

In short, there is a maximum force in nature. Gravitation leads to attraction of masses. However, this force of attraction is limited. An equivalent statement is:

Challenge 790 e

▷ *For all observers, the size L of a system of mass M is limited by*

$$\frac{L}{M} \geqslant \frac{4G}{c^2} \,. \tag{274}$$

* ‘If I rest, I die.’ This is the motto of the bird of paradise.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

In other words, a massive system cannot be more concentrated than a non-rotating black hole of the same mass. Another way to express the principle of gravitation is the following:

▷ *For all systems, the emitted power P is limited by*

$$P \leqslant \frac{c^5}{4G} \,. \tag{275}$$

In short, there is a maximum power in nature.

The three limits given above are all equivalent to each other; and no exception is known or indeed possible. The limits include universal gravity in the non-relativistic case. They tell us *what* gravity is, namely curvature, and *how* exactly it behaves. The limits allow us to determine the curvature in all situations, at all space-time events. As we have seen above, the speed limit together with any one of the last three principles imply all of general relativity.*

Page 476

For example, can you show that the formula describing gravitational red-shift complies with the general limit (274) on length-to-mass ratios?

Challenge 791 ny

We note that any formula that contains the speed of light c is based on special relativity, and if it contains the constant of gravitation G, it relates to universal gravity. If a formula contains *both* c and G, it is a statement of general relativity. The present chapter frequently underlines this connection.

Our mountain ascent so far has taught us that a precise description of motion requires the specification of all allowed viewpoints, their characteristics, their differences, and the transformations between them. From now on, *all* viewpoints are allowed, without exception: anybody must be able to talk to anybody else. It makes no difference whether an observer feels gravity, is in free fall, is accelerated or is in inertial motion. Furthermore, people who exchange left and right, people who exchange up and down or people who say that the Sun turns around the Earth must be able to talk to each other and to us. This gives a much larger set of viewpoint transformations than in the case of special relativity; it makes general relativity both difficult and fascinating. And since all viewpoints are allowed, the resulting description of motion is *complete*.**

Why does a stone thrown into the air fall back to Earth? – Geodesics

> A genius is somebody who makes all possible mistakes in the shortest possible time.
>
> Anonymous

In our discussion of special relativity, we saw that inertial or free-floating motion is the motion which connecting two events that requires the *longest* proper time. In the absence of gravity, the motion fulfilling this requirement is *straight* (rectilinear) motion. On the other hand, we are also used to thinking of light rays as being straight. Indeed, we are all

Page 455

Page 61

* This didactic approach is unconventional. It is possible that is has been pioneered by the present author. The British physicist Gary Gibbons also developed similar ideas independently.

Ref. 378

** Or it would be, were it not for a small deviation called quantum theory.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 275 All paths of flying stones, independently of their speed and angle, have the same curvature in space-time (photograph © Marco Fulle)

accustomed to check the straightness of an edge by looking along it. Whenever we draw the axes of a physical coordinate system, we imagine either drawing paths of light rays or drawing the motion of freely moving bodies.

In the absence of gravity, object paths and light paths coincide. However, in the presence of gravity, objects do not move along light paths, as every thrown stone shows. Light does not define spatial straightness any more. In the presence of gravity, both light and matter paths are bent, though by *different* amounts. But the original statement remains valid: even when gravity is present, bodies follow paths of longest possible proper time. For matter, such paths are called *timelike geodesics*. For light, such paths are called *lightlike* or *null geodesics*.

We note that in space-time, geodesics are the curves with *maximal* length. This is in contrast with the case of pure space, such as the surface of a sphere, where geodesics are the curves of *minimal* length. In simple words, *stones fall because they follow geodesics*. Let us perform a few checks of this statement.

Since stones move by maximizing proper time for inertial observers, they also must do so for freely falling observers, like Kittinger. In fact, they must do so for all observers. The equivalence of falling paths and geodesics is at least coherent.

If falling is seen as a consequence of the Earth's surface approaching – as we will argue later on – we can deduce directly that falling implies a proper time that is as long as possible. Free fall indeed is motion along geodesics.

Challenge 792 ny

We saw above that gravitation follows from the existence of a maximum force. The result can be visualized in another way. If the gravitational attraction between a central body and a satellite were *stronger* than it is, black holes would be smaller than they are; in that case the maximum force limit and the maximum speed could be exceeded by getting close to such a black hole. If, on the other hand, gravitation were *weaker* than it is, there would be observers for which the two bodies would not interact, thus for which they would not form a physical system. In summary, a maximum force of $c^4/4G$ implies universal gravity. There is no difference between stating that all bodies attract through gravitation and stating that there is a maximum force with the value $c^4/4G$. But at the same time, the maximum force principle implies that objects move on geodesics. Can you show this?

Challenge 793 ny

Let us turn to an experimental check. If falling is a consequence of curvature, then the paths of *all* stones thrown or falling near the Earth must have the *same* curvature in space-time. Take a stone thrown horizontally, a stone thrown vertically, a stone thrown

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

rapidly, or a stone thrown slowly: it takes only two lines of argument to show that *in space-time* all their paths are approximated to high precision by circle segments, as shown in Figure 275. All paths have the *same* curvature radius r, given by

Challenge 794 ny

$$r = \frac{c^2}{g} \approx 9.2 \cdot 10^{15}\,\mathrm{m}\,. \tag{276}$$

The large value of the radius, corresponding to a low curvature, explains why we do not notice it in everyday life. The parabolic shape typical of the path of a stone in everyday life is just the projection of the more fundamental path in 4-dimensional space-time into 3-dimensional space. The important point is that the value of the curvature does *not* depend on the details of the throw. In fact, this simple result could have suggested the ideas of general relativity to people a full century before Einstein; what was missing was the recognition of the importance of the speed of light as limit speed. In any case, this simple calculation confirms that falling and curvature are connected. As expected, and as mentioned already above, the curvature diminishes at larger heights, until it vanishes at infinite distance from the Earth. Now, given that the curvature of all paths for free fall is the same, and given that all such paths are paths of least action, it is straightforward that they are also geodesics.

If we describe fall as a consequence of the curvature of space-time, we must show that the description with geodesics reproduces all its features. In particular, we must be able to explain that stones thrown with small speed fall back, and stones thrown with high speed escape. Can you deduce this from space curvature?

Challenge 795 ny

In summary, the motion of any particle falling freely 'in a gravitational field' is described by the same variational principle as the motion of a free particle in special relativity: the path maximizes the proper time $\int \mathrm{d}\tau$. We rephrase this by saying that any particle in free fall from point A to point B minimizes the action S given by

$$S = -mc^2 \int_A^B \mathrm{d}\tau\,. \tag{277}$$

That is all we need to know about the free fall of objects. As a consequence, any *deviation from free fall keeps you young*. The larger the deviation, the younger you stay.

As we will see below, the minimum action description of free fall has been tested extremely precisely, and no difference from experiment has ever been observed. We will also find out that for free fall, the predictions of general relativity and of universal gravity differ substantially both for particles near the speed of light and for central bodies of high density. So far, all experiments have shown that whenever the two predictions differ, general relativity is right, and universal gravity and other alternative descriptions are wrong.

Page 627
Ref. 409

All bodies fall along geodesics. This tells us something important. The fall of bodies does not depend on their mass. The geodesics are like 'rails' in space-time that tell bodies how to fall. In other words, space-time can indeed be imagined as a single, giant, deformed entity. Space-time is not 'nothing'; it is an entity of our thinking. The shape of this entity tells objects how to move. Space-time is thus indeed like an intangible mattress; this deformed mattress guides falling objects along its networks of geodesics.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Moreover, *bound* energy falls in the same way as mass, as is proven by comparing the fall of objects made of different materials. They have different percentages of bound energy. (Why?) For example, on the Moon, where there is no air, cosmonauts dropped steel balls and feathers and found that they fell together, alongside each other. The independence on material composition has been checked and confirmed over and over again.

Challenge 796 s

Ref. 410

Can light fall?

How does radiation fall? Light, like any radiation, is energy without rest mass. It moves like a stream of extremely fast and light objects. Therefore deviations from universal gravity become most apparent for light. How does light fall? Light cannot change speed. When light falls vertically, it only changes colour, as we have seen above. But light can also change direction. Long before the ideas of relativity became current, in 1801, the Prussian astronomer Johann Soldner understood that universal gravity implies that light is *deflected* when passing near a mass. He also calculated how the deflection angle depends on the mass of the body and the distance of passage. However, nobody in the nineteenth century was able to check the result experimentally.

Page 499

Ref. 411

Page 161

Obviously, light has energy, and energy has weight; the deflection of light by itself is thus *not* a proof of the curvature of space. General relativity also predicts a deflection angle for light passing masses, but of *twice* the classical Soldner value, because the curvature of space around large masses adds to the effect of universal gravity. The deflection of light thus only confirms the curvature of space if the *value* agrees with the one predicted by general relativity. This is the case: observations do coincide with predictions. More details will be given shortly.

Page 533

Mass is thus not necessary to feel gravity; energy is sufficient. This result of the mass–energy equivalence must become second nature when studying general relativity. In particular, light is not light-weight, but heavy. Can you argue that the curvature of light near the Earth must be the same as that of stones, given by expression (276)?

Challenge 797 ny

In summary, all experiments show that not only mass, but also energy falls along geodesics, whatever its type (bound or free), and whatever the interaction (be it electromagnetic or nuclear). Moreover, the motion of radiation confirms that space-time is curved.

Since experiments show that all particles fall in the same way, independently of their mass, charge or any other property, we can conclude that the system of all possible trajectories forms an independent structure. This structure is what we call *space-time*.

We thus find that *space-time tells matter, energy and radiation how to fall.* This statement is the second half of general relativity. It complements the first half, which states that energy tells space-time how to curve. To complete the description of macroscopic motion, we only need to add numbers to these statements, so that they become testable. As usual, we can proceed in two ways: we can deduce the equations of motion directly, or we can first deduce the Lagrangian and then deduce the equations of motion from it. But before we do that, let's have some fun.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 276 A puzzle: what is the simplest way to get the ball attached to the rubber band into the cup?

Curiosities and fun challenges about gravitation

> Wenn Sie die Antwort nicht gar zu ernst nehmen und sie nur als eine Art Spaß ansehen, so kann ich Ihnen das so erklären: Früher hat man geglaubt, wenn alle Dinge aus der Welt verschwinden, so bleiben noch Raum und Zeit übrig. Nach der Relativitätstheorie verschwinden aber auch Zeit und Raum mit den Dingen.*
>
> Albert Einstein in 1921 in New York

Take a plastic bottle and make some holes in it near the bottom. Fill the bottle with water, closing the holes with your fingers. If you let the bottle go, no water will leave the bottle during the fall. Can you explain how this experiment confirms the equivalence of rest and free fall? Challenge 798 s

* *

On his seventy-sixth birthday, Einstein received a birthday present specially made for him, shown in Figure 276. A rather deep cup is mounted on the top of a broom stick. The cup contains a weak piece of elastic rubber attached to its bottom, to which a ball is attached at the other end. In the starting position, the ball hangs outside the cup. The rubber is too weak to pull the ball into the cup against gravity. What is the most elegant

* 'If you do not take the answer too seriously and regard it only for amusement, I can explain it to you in the following way: in the past it was thought that if all things were to disappear from the world, space and time would remain. But following relativity theory, space and time would disappear together with the things.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 799 s way to get the ball into the cup?

* *

Gravity has the same properties in the whole universe – except in the US patent office. In 2005, it awarded a patent, Nr. 6 960 975, for an antigravity device that works by distorting space-time in such a way that gravity is 'compensated' (see patft.uspto.gov). Do you know
Challenge 800 s a simpler device?

* *

The radius of curvature of space-time at the Earth's surface is $9.2 \cdot 10^{15}$ m. Can you con-
Challenge 801 e firm this value?

* *

Challenge 802 ny A piece of wood floats on water. Does it stick out more or less in a lift accelerating upwards?

* *

Page 431 We saw in special relativity that if two twins are identically accelerated in the same direction, with one twin some distance ahead of the other, then the twin ahead ages more than the twin behind. Does this happen in a gravitational field as well? And what happens
Challenge 803 ny when the field varies with height, as on Earth?

* *

A maximum force and a maximum power also imply a maximum flow of mass. Can you
Challenge 804 ny show that no mass flow can exceed $1.1 \cdot 10^{35}$ kg/s?

* *

The experiments of Figure 271 and 272 differ in one point: one happens in flat space, the other in curved space. One seems to be connected with energy conservation, the other
Challenge 805 ny not. Do these differences invalidate the equivalence of the observations?

* *

Challenge 806 s How can cosmonauts weigh themselves to check whether they are eating enough?

* *

Is a cosmonaut in orbit really floating freely? No. It turns out that space stations and satellites are accelerated by several small effects. The important ones are the pressure of the light from the Sun, the friction of the thin air, and the effects of solar wind. (Micrometeorites can usually be neglected.) These three effects all lead to accelerations of the order of 10^{-6} m/s^2 to 10^{-8} m/s^2, depending on the height of the orbit. Can you estimate how long it would take an apple floating in space to hit the wall of a space station, starting
Challenge 807 s from the middle? By the way, what is the magnitude of the tidal accelerations in this situation?

* *

Page 95 There is no negative mass in nature, as discussed in the beginning of our walk (even

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

antimatter has *positive* mass). This means that gravitation cannot be shielded, in contrast to electromagnetic interactions. Since gravitation cannot be shielded, there is no way to make a perfectly isolated system. But such systems form the basis of thermodynamics! Page 1204 We will study the fascinating implications of this later on: for example, we will discover an *upper limit* for the entropy of physical systems.

* *

Can curved space be used to travel faster than light? Imagine a space-time in which two points could be connected either by a path leading through a flat portion, or by a second path leading through a partially curved portion. Could that curved portion be used to travel between the points faster than through the flat one? Mathematically, this is possible; however, such a curved space would need to have a *negative* energy density. Such a situation is incompatible with the definition of energy and with the non-existence Ref. 412 of negative mass. The statement that this does not happen in nature is also called the *weak* Challenge 808 ny *energy condition*. Is it implied by the limit on length-to-mass ratios?

* *

The statement of a length-to-mass limit $L/M \geqslant 4G/c^2$ invites experiments to try to overcome it. Can you explain what happens when an observer moves so rapidly past a mass Challenge 809 ny that the body's length contraction reaches the limit?

* *

There is an important mathematical property of $\mathbb{R}^3$ which singles out three dimensional space from all other possibilities. A closed (one-dimensional) curve can form knots *only* in $\mathbb{R}^3$: in any higher dimension it can always be unknotted. (The existence of knots also explains why three is the smallest dimension that allows chaotic particle motion.) However, general relativity does not say *why* space-time has three plus one dimensions. It is simply based on the fact. This deep and difficult question will be settled only in the last part of our mountain ascent.

* *

Henri Poincaré, who died in 1912, shortly before the general theory of relativity was finished, thought for a while that curved space was not a necessity, but only a possibility. He imagined that one could continue using Euclidean space provided light was permitted Challenge 810 ny to follow curved paths. Can you explain why such a theory is impossible?

* *

Can two hydrogen atoms circle each other, in their mutual gravitational field? What Challenge 811 s would the size of this 'molecule' be?

* *

Challenge 812 s Can two light pulses circle each other, in their mutual gravitational field?

* *

The various motions of the Earth mentioned in the section on Galilean physics, such as Page 132 its rotation around its axis or around the Sun, lead to various types of time in physics

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

and astronomy. The time defined by the best atomic clocks is called *terrestrial dynamical time*. By inserting leap seconds every now and then to compensate for the bad definition of the second (an Earth rotation does not take 86 400, but 86 400.002 seconds) and, in minor ways, for the slowing of Earth's rotation, one gets the *universal time coordinate* or UTC. Then there is the time derived from this one by taking into account all leap seconds. One then has the – different – time which would be shown by a non-rotating clock in the centre of the Earth. Finally, there is *barycentric dynamical time*, which is the time that would be shown by a clock in the centre of mass of the solar system. Only using this latter time can satellites be reliably steered through the solar system. In summary, relativity says goodbye to Greenwich Mean Time, as does British law, in one of the rare cases were the law follows science. (Only the BBC continues to use it.)

Page 917
Ref. 413

* *

Space agencies thus *have* to use general relativity if they want to get artificial satellites to Mars, Venus, or comets. Without its use, orbits would not be calculated correctly, and satellites would miss their targets and usually even the whole planet. In fact, space agencies play on the safe side: they use a generalization of general relativity, namely the so-called *parametrized post-Newtonian formalism*, which includes a continuous check on whether general relativity is correct. Within measurement errors, no deviation has been found so far.*

* *

General relativity is also used by space agencies around the world to calculate the exact positions of satellites and to tune radios to the frequency of radio emitters on them. In addition, general relativity is essential for the so-called *global positioning system*, or GPS. This modern navigation tool** consists of 24 satellites equipped with clocks that fly around the world. Why does the system need general relativity to operate? Since all the satellites, as well as any person on the surface of the Earth, travel in circles, we have $\mathrm{d}r = 0$, and we can rewrite the Schwarzschild metric (269) as

Ref. 414

$$\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\tau}{\mathrm{d}t}\right)^2 = 1 - \frac{2GM}{rc^2} - \frac{r^2}{c^2}\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\varphi}{\mathrm{d}t}\right)^2 = 1 - \frac{2GM}{rc^2} - \frac{v^2}{c^2}\,. \tag{279}$$

* To give an idea of what this means, the *unparametrized* post-Newtonian formalism, based on general relativity, writes the equation of motion of a body of mass m near a large mass M as a deviation from the inverse square expression for the acceleration a:

$$a = \frac{GM}{r^2} + f_2\frac{GM}{r^2}\frac{v^2}{c^2} + f_4\frac{GM}{r^2}\frac{v^4}{c^4} + f_5\frac{Gm}{r^2}\frac{v^5}{c^5} + \cdots \tag{278}$$

Here the numerical factors f_n are calculated from general relativity and are of order one. The first two odd terms are missing because of the (approximate) reversibility of general relativistic motion: gravity wave emission, which is irreversible, accounts for the small term f_5; note that it contains the small mass m instead of the large mass M. All factors f_n up to f_7 have now been calculated. However, in the solar system, only the term f_2 has ever been detected. This situation might change with future high-precision satellite experiments. Higher-order effects, up to f_5, have been measured in the binary pulsars, as discussed below.

Page 531

In a *parametrized* post-Newtonian formalism, all factors f_n, including the uneven ones, are fitted through the data coming in; so far all these fits agree with the values predicted by general relativity.

** For more information, see the www.gpsworld.com website.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 813 e For the relation between satellite time and Earth time we then get

$$\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}t_{\mathrm{sat}}}{\mathrm{d}t_{\mathrm{Earth}}}\right)^2 = \frac{1-\frac{2GM}{r_{\mathrm{sat}}c^2}-\frac{v_{\mathrm{sat}}^2}{c^2}}{1-\frac{2GM}{r_{\mathrm{Earth}}c^2}-\frac{v_{\mathrm{Earth}}^2}{c^2}} \,. \tag{280}$$

Challenge 814 s Ref. 415 Can you deduce how many microseconds a satellite clock gains every day, given that the GPS satellites orbit the Earth once every twelve hours? Since only three microseconds would give a position error of one kilometre after a single day, the clocks in the satellites must be adjusted to run slow by the calculated amount. The necessary adjustments are monitored, and so far have confirmed general relativity every single day, within experimental errors, since the system began operation.

* *

General relativity is the base of the sport of *geocaching*, the world-wide treasure hunt with help of GPS receivers. See the www.terracaching.com and www.geocaching.com websites for more details.

* *

Ref. 416 Challenge 815 d The gravitational constant G does not seem to change with time. The latest experiments limit its rate of change to less than 1 part in 10^{12} per year. Can you imagine how this can be checked?

* *

Challenge 816 s Could our experience that we live in only three spatial dimensions be due to a limitation of our senses? How?

* *

Challenge 817 ny Can you estimate the effect of the tides on the colour of the light emitted by an atom?

* *

Ref. 417 Challenge 818 ny The strongest possible gravitational field is that of a small black hole. The strongest gravitational field ever observed is somewhat less though. In 1998, Zhang and Lamb used the X-ray data from a double star system to determine that space-time near the 10 km sized neutron star is curved by up to 30 % of the maximum possible value. What is the corresponding gravitational acceleration, assuming that the neutron star has the same mass as the Sun?

* *

Ref. 418 Challenge 819 e Light deflection changes the angular size δ of a mass M with radius r when observed at distance d. The effect leads to the pretty expression

$$\delta = \arcsin\left(\frac{r\sqrt{1-R_{\mathrm{S}}/d}}{d\sqrt{1-R_{\mathrm{S}}/r}}\right) \quad \text{where} \quad R_{\mathrm{S}} = \frac{2GM}{c^2} \,. \tag{281}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 820 ny
Page 614

What percentage of the surface of the Sun can an observer at infinity see? We will examine this issue in more detail shortly.

What is weight?

There is no way for a *single* (and point-like) observer to distinguish the effects of gravity from those of acceleration. This property of nature allows one to make a strange statement: things *fall* because the surface of the Earth accelerates towards them. Therefore, the *weight* of an object results from the surface of the Earth accelerating upwards and pushing against the object. That is the principle of equivalence applied to everyday life. For the same reason, objects in free fall have no weight.

Let us check the numbers. Obviously, an accelerating surface of the Earth produces a weight for each body resting on it. This weight is proportional to the inertial mass. In other words, the inertial mass of a body is identical to the gravitational mass. This is indeed observed in experiments, and to the highest precision achievable. Roland von Eötvös* performed many such high-precision experiments throughout his life, without finding any discrepancy. In these experiments, he used the fact that the inertial mass determines centrifugal effects and the gravitational mass determines free fall. (Can you imagine how he tested the equality?) Recent experiments showed that the two masses agree to one part in 10^{-12}.

Ref. 419
Challenge 821 ny
Ref. 419

However, the mass equality is not a surprise. Remembering the definition of mass ratio as negative inverse acceleration ratio, independently of the origin of the acceleration, we are reminded that mass measurements cannot be used to distinguish between inertial and gravitational mass. As we have seen, the two masses are equal by definition in Galilean physics, and the whole discussion is a red herring. Weight is an intrinsic effect of mass.

Page 92
Page 163

The equality of acceleration and gravity allows us to imagine the following. Imagine stepping into a lift in order to move down a few stories. You push the button. The lift is pushed upwards by the accelerating surface of the Earth somewhat less than is the building; the building overtakes the lift, which therefore remains behind. Moreover, because of the weaker push, at the beginning everybody inside the lift feels a bit lighter. When the contact with the building is restored, the lift is accelerated to catch up with the accelerating surface of the Earth. Therefore we all feel as if we were in a strongly accelerating car, pushed in the direction opposite to the acceleration: for a short while, we feel heavier, until the lift arrives at its destination.

Why do apples fall?

> “Vires acquirit eundo.”
>
> Vergilius**

* Roland von Eötvös (b. 1848 Budapest, d. 1919 Budapest), Hungarian physicist. He performed many high-precision gravity experiments; among other discoveries, he discovered the effect named after him. The university of Budapest is named after him.

** ‘Going it acquires strength.’ Publius Vergilius Maro (b. 70 BCE Andes, d. 19 BCE Brundisium), from the *Aeneid* 4, 175.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

An accelerating car will soon catch up with an object thrown forward from it. For the same reason, the surface of the Earth soon catches up with a stone thrown upwards, because it is continually accelerating upwards. If you enjoy this way of seeing things, imagine an apple falling from a tree. At the moment when it detaches, it stops being accelerated upwards by the branch. The apple can now enjoy the calmness of real rest. Because of our limited human perception, we call this state of rest free fall. Unfortunately, the accelerating surface of the Earth approaches mercilessly and, depending on the time for which the apple stayed at rest, the Earth hits it with a greater or lesser velocity, leading to more or less severe shape deformation.

Falling apples also teach us not to be disturbed any more by the statement that gravity is the uneven running of clocks with height. In fact, this statement is *equivalent* to saying that the surface of the Earth is accelerating upwards, as the discussion above shows.

Challenge 822 ny

Can this reasoning be continued indefinitely? We can go on for quite a while. It is fun to show how the Earth can be of constant radius even though its surface is accelerating upwards everywhere. We can thus play with the equivalence of acceleration and gravity. However, this equivalence is only useful in situations involving only one accelerating body. The equivalence between acceleration and gravity ends as soon as *two* falling objects are studied. Any study of several bodies inevitably leads to the conclusion that gravity is not acceleration; *gravity is curved space-time*.

Many aspects of gravity and curvature can be understood with no or only a little mathematics. The next section will highlight some of the differences between universal gravity and general relativity, showing that only the latter description agrees with experiment. After that, a few concepts relating to the measurement of curvature are introduced and applied to the motion of objects and space-time. If the reasoning gets too involved for a first reading, skip ahead. In any case, the section on the stars, cosmology and black holes again uses little mathematics.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 18

MOTION IN GENERAL RELATIVITY – BENT LIGHT AND WOBBLING VACUUM

> Einstein explained his theory to me every day, and on my arrival I was fully convinced that the understood it.
>
> Chaim Weizmann, first president of Israel.

Ref. 420

Before we tackle the details of general relativity, we will explore how the motion of objects and light *differs* from that predicted by universal gravity, and how these differences can be measured.

WEAK FIELDS

Gravity is strong near horizons. This happens when the mass M and the distance scale R obey

$$\frac{2GM}{Rc^2} \approx 1\,. \tag{282}$$

Therefore, gravity is strong mainly in three situations: near black holes, near the horizon of the universe, and at extremely high particle energies. The first two cases are explored later on, while the last will be explored in the final part of our mountain ascent. In contrast, in most regions of the universe there are *no* nearby horizons; in these cases, gravity is a *weak* effect. Despite the violence of avalanches or of falling asteroids, in everyday life gravity is much weaker than the maximum force. On the Earth the ratio just mentioned is only about 10^{-9}. In this and all cases of everyday life, gravitation can still be approximated by a field, despite what was said above. These weak field situations are interesting because they are simple to understand; they mainly require for their explanation the different running of clocks at different heights. Weak field situations allow us to mention space-time curvature only in passing, and allow us to continue to think of gravity as a source of acceleration. However, the change of time with height already induces many new and interesting effects. The only thing we need is a consistent relativistic treatment.

The Thirring effects

In 1918, the Austrian physicist Hans Thirring published two simple and beautiful predictions of motions, one of them with his collaborator Josef Lense. Neither motion appears in universal gravity, but they both appear in general relativity. Figure 277 shows these

Ref. 421

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 277 The Thirring and the Thirring–Lense effects

predictions.

In the first example, nowadays called the *Thirring effect*, centrifugal accelerations as well as Coriolis accelerations for masses in the interior of a rotating mass shell are predicted. Thirring showed that if an enclosing mass shell rotates, masses inside it are attracted towards the shell. The effect is very small; however, this prediction is in stark contrast to that of universal gravity, where a spherical mass shell – rotating or not – has no effect on masses in its interior. Can you explain this effect using the figure and the mattress analogy? Challenge 823 ny

The second effect, the *Thirring–Lense effect*,* is more famous. General relativity predicts that an oscillating Foucault pendulum, or a satellite circling the Earth in a polar orbit, does not stay precisely in a fixed plane relative to the rest of the universe, but that the rotation of the Earth drags the plane along a tiny bit. This *frame-dragging*, as the effect is also called, appears because the Earth in vacuum behaves like a rotating ball in a foamy mattress. When a ball or a shell rotates inside the foam, it partly drags the foam along with it. Similarly, the Earth drags some vacuum with it, and thus turns the plane of the pendulum. For the same reason, the Earth's rotation turns the plane of an orbiting satellite.

The Thirring–Lense or frame-dragging effect is extremely small. It was measured for the first time in 1998 by an Italian group led by Ignazio Ciufolini, and then again by the same group in the years up to 2004. They followed the motion of two special artificial

* Even though the order of the authors is Lense and Thirring, it is customary (but not universal) to stress the idea of Hans Thirring by placing him first.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 278 The LAGEOS satellites: metal spheres with a diameter of 60 cm, a mass of 407 kg, and covered with 426 retroreflectors (NASA)

satellites – shown in Figure 278 – consisting only of a body of steel and some Cat's-eyes. The group measured the satellite's motion around the Earth with extremely high precision, making use of reflected laser pulses. This method allowed this low-budget experiment to beat by many years the efforts of much larger but much more sluggish groups.* The results confirm the predictions of general relativity with an error of about 25 %.

Ref. 422

Frame dragging effects have also been measured in binary star systems. This is possible if one of the stars is a pulsar, because such stars send out regular radio pulses, e.g. every millisecond, with extremely high precision. By measuring the exact times when the pulses arrive on Earth, one can deduce the way these stars move and confirm that such subtle effects as frame dragging do take place.

Ref. 423

Gravitomagnetism**

Frame-dragging and the Thirring–Lense effect can be seen as special cases of gravitomagnetism. (We will show the connection below.) This approach to gravity, already studied in the nineteenth century by Holzmüller and by Tisserand, has become popular again in recent years, especially for its didactic advantages. As mentioned above, talking about a gravitational *field* is always an approximation. In the case of weak gravity, such as occurs in everyday life, the approximation is very good. Many relativistic effects can be described in terms of the gravitational field, without using the concept of space curvature or the metric tensor. Instead of describing the complete space-time mattress, the gravitational-field model only describes the deviation of the mattress from the flat state, by pretending that the deviation is a separate entity, called the gravitational field. But what is the relativistically correct way to describe the gravitational field?

Ref. 424

We can compare the situation to electromagnetism. In a relativistic description of electrodynamics, the electromagnetic field has an electric and a magnetic component. The electric field is responsible for the inverse-square Coulomb force. In the same way, in a relativistic description of (weak) gravity,*** the gravitational field has an gravitoelectric and a gravitomagnetic component. The gravitoelectric field is responsible for the inverse square acceleration of gravity; what we call the gravitational field in everyday life is the

Page 692

* One is the so-called Gravity Probe B satellite experiment, which should significantly increase the measurement precision; the satellite was put in orbit in 2005, after 30 years of planning.

** This section can be skipped at first reading.

*** The approximation requires low velocities, weak fields, and localized and stationary mass–energy distributions.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 279 The reality of gravitomagnetism

gravitoelectric part of the full relativistic gravitational field.

In nature, all components of energy–momentum tensor produce gravity effects. In other words, it is not only mass and energy that produce a field, but also mass or energy *currents*. This latter case is called gravitomagnetism (or frame dragging). The name is due to the analogy with electrodynamics, where it is not only charge density that produces a field (the electric field), but also charge current (the magnetic field).

In the case of electromagnetism, the distinction between magnetic and electric field depends on the observer; each of the two can (partly) be transformed into the other. Ref. 425 Gravitation is exactly analogous. Electromagnetism provides a good indication as to how the two types of gravitational fields behave; this intuition can be directly transferred to gravity. In electrodynamics, the motion $\boldsymbol{x}(t)$ of a charged particle is described by the Page 677 Lorentz equation

$$m\ddot{\boldsymbol{x}} = q\boldsymbol{E} - q\dot{\boldsymbol{x}} \times \boldsymbol{b} \,. \tag{283}$$

In other words, the change of *speed* is due to electric fields $\boldsymbol{E}$, whereas magnetic fields $\boldsymbol{B}$ give a velocity-dependent change of the *direction* of velocity, without changing the speed itself. Both changes depend on the value of the charge q. In the case of gravity this expression becomes

$$m\ddot{\boldsymbol{x}} = m\boldsymbol{G} - m\dot{\boldsymbol{x}} \times \boldsymbol{H} \,. \tag{284}$$

The role of charge is taken by mass. In this expression we already know the field $\boldsymbol{G}$, given by

$$\boldsymbol{G} = \nabla\varphi = \nabla\frac{GM}{r} = -\frac{GM\boldsymbol{x}}{r^3} \,. \tag{285}$$

As usual, the quantity φ is the (scalar) potential. The field $\boldsymbol{G}$ is the usual gravitational field of universal gravity, produced by every mass, and in this context is called the *gravitoelectric field*; it has the dimension of an acceleration. Masses are the sources of the gravitoelectric field. The gravitoelectric field obeys $\Delta\boldsymbol{G} = -4\pi G\rho$, where ρ is the mass density. A *static* field $\boldsymbol{G}$ has no vortices; it obeys $\Delta \times \boldsymbol{G} = 0$.

It is not hard to show that if gravito*electric* fields exist, gravito*magnetic* fields must exist Ref. 426 as well; the latter appear whenever one changes from an observer at rest to a moving one. Page 692 (We will use the same argument in electrodynamics.) A particle falling perpendicularly

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

towards an infinitely long rod illustrates the point, as shown in Figure 279. An observer at rest with respect to the rod can describe the whole situation with gravitoelectric forces alone. A second observer, moving along the rod with constant speed, observes that the momentum of the particle *along the rod* also increases. This observer will thus not only measure a gravitoelectric field; he also measures a gravitomagnetic field. Indeed, a mass moving with velocity $\boldsymbol{v}$ produces a gravitomagnetic (3-) acceleration on a test mass m given by

Challenge 824 ny

$$m\boldsymbol{a} = -m\boldsymbol{v} \times \boldsymbol{H} \tag{286}$$

where, *almost* as in electrodynamics, the static *gravitomagnetic field* $\boldsymbol{H}$ obeys

$$\boldsymbol{H} = \nabla \times \boldsymbol{A} = 16\pi N \rho \boldsymbol{v} \tag{287}$$

where ρ is mass density of the source of the field and N is a proportionality constant. The quantity $\boldsymbol{A}$ is called the *gravitomagnetic vector potential*. In nature, there are no sources for the gravitomagnetic field; it thus obeys $\nabla \boldsymbol{H} = 0$. The gravitomagnetic field has dimension of inverse time, like an angular velocity.

Challenge 825 ny

When the situation in Figure 279 is evaluated, we find that the proportionality constant N is given by

$$N = \frac{G}{c^2} = 7.4 \cdot 10^{-28}\,\mathrm{m/kg}\,, \tag{288}$$

an extremely small value. We thus find that as in the electrodynamic case, the gravitomagnetic field is weaker than the gravitoelectric field by a factor of c^2. It is thus hard to observe. In addition, a second aspect renders the observation of gravitomagnetism even more difficult. In contrast to electromagnetism, in the case of gravity there is no way to observe *pure* gravitomagnetic fields (why?); they are always mixed with the usual, gravitoelectric ones. For these reasons, gravitomagnetic effects were measured for the first time only in the 1990s. We see that universal gravity is the approximation of general relativity that arises when all gravitomagnetic effects are neglected.

Challenge 826 s

In summary, *if a mass moves, it also produces a gravitomagnetic field*. How can one imagine gravitomagnetism? Let's have a look at its effects. The experiment of Figure 279 showed that a moving rod has the effect to slightly accelerate a test mass in the same direction. In our metaphor of the vacuum as a mattress, it looks as if a moving rod drags the vacuum along with it, as well as any test mass that happens to be in that region. Gravitomagnetism can thus be seen as vacuum dragging. Because of a widespread reluctance to think of the vacuum as a mattress, the expression *frame dragging* is used instead.

In this description, *all frame dragging effects are gravitomagnetic effects*. In particular, a gravitomagnetic field also appears when a large mass *rotates*, as in the Thirring–Lense effect of Figure 277. For an angular momentum $\boldsymbol{J}$ the gravitomagnetic field $\boldsymbol{H}$ is a dipole field; it is given by

$$\boldsymbol{H} = \nabla \times \boldsymbol{h} = \nabla \times \left(-2 \frac{\boldsymbol{J} \times \boldsymbol{x}}{r^3} \right) \tag{289}$$

exactly as in the electrodynamic case. The gravitomagnetic field around a spinning mass has three main effects.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

First of all, as in electromagnetism, a spinning test particle with angular momentum $\boldsymbol{S}$ feels a *torque* if it is near a large spinning mass with angular momentum $\boldsymbol{J}$. This torque $\boldsymbol{T}$ is given by

$$\boldsymbol{T} = \frac{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{S}}{\mathrm{d}t} = \tfrac{1}{2}\,\boldsymbol{S} \times \boldsymbol{H} \,. \tag{290}$$

The torque leads to the precession of gyroscopes. For the Earth, this effect is extremely small: at the North Pole, the precession has a conic angle of 0.6 milli-arcseconds and a rotation rate of the order of 10^{-10} times that of the Earth.

Since for a torque one has $\boldsymbol{T} = \dot{\boldsymbol{\Omega}} \times \boldsymbol{S}$, the dipole field of a large rotating mass with angular momentum $\boldsymbol{J}$ yields a second effect. An orbiting mass will experience precession of its orbital plane. Seen from infinity one gets, for an orbit with semimajor axis a and
Challenge 827 ny eccentricity e,

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\Omega}} = -\frac{\boldsymbol{H}}{2} = -\frac{G}{c^2}\frac{\boldsymbol{J}}{|\boldsymbol{x}|^3} + \frac{G}{c^2}\frac{3(\boldsymbol{J}\boldsymbol{x})\boldsymbol{x}}{|\boldsymbol{x}|^5} = \frac{G}{c^2}\frac{2\boldsymbol{J}}{a^3(1-e^2)^{3/2}} \tag{291}$$

which is the prediction of Lense and Thirring.* The effect is extremely small, giving a change of only $8''$ per orbit for a satellite near the surface of the Earth. Despite this smallness and a number of larger effects disturbing it, Ciufolini's team have managed to
Ref. 422 confirm the result.

As a third effect of gravitomagnetism, a rotating mass leads to the precession of the periastron. This is a similar effect to the one produced by space curvature on orbiting masses even if the central body does not rotate. The rotation just reduces the precession due to space-time curvature. This effect has been fully confirmed for the famous binary pulsar PSR 1913+16, discovered in 1974, as well as for the 'real' double pulsar PSR J0737-3039, discovered in 2003. This latter system shows a periastron precession of 16.9°/a, the largest
Ref. 427 value observed so far.

The split into gravitoelectric and gravitomagnetic effects is thus a useful approximation to the description of gravity. It also helps to answer questions such as: How can gravity keep the Earth orbiting around the Sun, if gravity needs 8 minutes to get from
Challenge 829 ny the Sun to us? To find the answer, thinking about the electromagnetic analogy can help. In addition, the split of the gravitational field into gravitoelectric and gravitomagnetic components allows a simple description of gravitational waves.

Gravitational waves

One of the most fantastic predictions of physics is the existence of gravitational waves. Gravity waves** prove that empty space itself has the ability to move and vibrate. The basic idea is simple. Since space is elastic, like a large mattress in which we live, space should be able to oscillate in the form of propagating waves, like a mattress or any other elastic medium.

Challenge 828 ny * A homogeneous spinning sphere has an angular momentum given by $J = \frac{2}{5}M\omega R^2$.

** To be strict, the term 'gravity wave' has a special meaning: *gravity waves* are the surface waves of the sea, where gravity is the restoring force. However, in general relativity, the term is used interchangeably with 'gravitational wave'.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 280 A Gedanken experiment showing the necessity of gravity waves

TABLE 52 The predicted spectrum of gravitational waves

FREQUENCY	WAVELENGTH	NAME	EXPECTED APPEARANCE
$< 10^{-4}$ Hz	> 3 Tm	extremely low frequencies	slow binary star systems, supermassive black holes
10^{-4} Hz–10^{-1} Hz	3 Tm–3 Gm	very low frequencies	fast binary star systems, massive black holes, white dwarf vibrations
10^{-1} Hz–10^{2} Hz	3 Gm–3 Mm	low frequencies	binary pulsars, medium and light black holes
10^{2} Hz–10^{5} Hz	3 Mm–3 km	medium frequencies	supernovae, pulsar vibrations
10^{5} Hz–10^{8} Hz	3 km–3 m	high frequencies	unknown; maybe future human-made sources
$> 10^{8}$ Hz	< 3 m		maybe unknown cosmological sources

Ref. 428

Starting from the existence of a maximum energy speed, Jørgen Kalckar and Ole Ulfbeck have given a simple argument for the necessity of gravitational. They studied two equal masses falling towards each other under the effect of gravitational attraction, and imagined a spring between them. Such a spring will make the masses bounce towards each other again and again. The central spring stores the kinetic energy from the falling masses. The energy value can be measured by determining the length by which the spring is compressed. When the spring expands again and hurls the masses back into space, the gravitational attraction will gradually slow down the masses, until they again fall towards each other, thus starting the same cycle again.

However, the energy stored in the spring must get smaller with each cycle. Whenever a sphere detaches from the spring, it is decelerated by the gravitational pull of the other sphere. Now, the value of this deceleration depends on the distance to the other mass; but since there is a maximal propagation velocity, the effective deceleration is given by the distance the other mass *had* when its gravity effect started out towards the second mass. For two masses departing from each other, the effective distance is thus somewhat smaller than the actual distance. In short, while departing, the real deceleration is *larger* than the one calculated without taking the time delay into account.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Similarly, when one mass falls back towards the other, it is accelerated by the other mass according to the distance it had when the gravity effect started moving towards it. Therefore, while approaching, the acceleration is *smaller* than the one calculated without time delay.

Therefore, the masses arrive with a *smaller* energy than they departed with. At every bounce, the spring is compressed a little less. The difference between these two energies is lost by each mass: it is taken away by space-time, in other words, it is radiated away as gravitational radiation. The same thing happens with mattresses. Remember that a mass deforms the space around it as a metal ball on a mattress deforms the surface around it. (However, in contrast to actual mattresses, there is no friction between the ball and the mattress.) If two metal balls repeatedly bang against each other and then depart again, until they come back together, they will send out surface waves on the mattress. Over time, this effect will reduce the distance that the two balls depart from each other after each bang. As we will see shortly, a similar effect has already been measured, where the two masses, instead of being repelled by a spring, were orbiting each other.

A simple mathematical description of gravity waves follows from the split into gravitomagnetic and gravitoelectric effects. It does not take much effort to extend gravitomagnetostatics and gravitoelectrostatics to *gravitodynamics*. Just as electrodynamics can be deduced from Coulomb's attraction when one switches to other inertial observers, gravitodynamics can be deduced from universal gravity. One gets the four equations

Ref. 429

Challenge 830 ny

$$\nabla \boldsymbol{G} = -4\pi G\rho \quad , \quad \nabla \times \boldsymbol{G} = -\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{H}}{\partial t}$$
$$\nabla \boldsymbol{H} = 0 \quad , \quad \nabla \times \boldsymbol{H} = -16\pi G\rho \boldsymbol{v} + \frac{N}{G}\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{G}}{\partial t} \,. \tag{292}$$

We have met two of these equations already. The two other equations are expanded versions of what we have encountered, taking time-dependence into account. Except for a factor of 16 instead of 4 in the last equation, the equations for gravitodynamics are the same as Maxwell's equations for electrodynamics.* These equations have a simple property: in vacuum, one can deduce from them a *wave equation* for the gravitoelectric and the gravitomagnetic fields $\boldsymbol{G}$ and $\boldsymbol{H}$. (It is not hard: try!) In other words, *gravity can behave like a wave: gravity can radiate*. All this follows from the expression of universal gravity when applied to moving observers, with the requirement that neither observers nor energy can move faster than c. Both the above argument involving the spring and the present mathematical argument use the same assumptions and arrive at the same conclusion.

Challenge 831 ny

* The additional factor reflects the fact that the ratio between angular momentum and energy (the 'spin') of gravity waves is different from that of electromagnetic waves. Gravity waves have spin 2, whereas electromagnetic waves have spin 1. Note that since gravity is universal, there can exist only a *single* kind of spin 2 radiation particle in nature. This is in strong contrast to the spin 1 case, of which there are several examples in nature.

By the way, the spin of radiation is a *classical* property. The *spin of a wave* is the ratio $E/L\omega$, where E is the energy, L the angular momentum, and ω is the angular frequency. For electromagnetic waves, this ratio is equal to 1; for gravitational waves, it is 2.

Ref. 430 Note that due to the approximation at the basis of the equations of gravitodynamics, the equations are *neither* gauge-invariant nor generally covariant.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 281 Effects on a circular or spherical body due to a plane gravitational wave moving in a direction perpendicular to the page

Challenge 832 e A few manipulations show that the speed of these waves is given by

$$c = \sqrt{\frac{G}{N}} \,. \tag{293}$$

Page 730 This result corresponds to the electromagnetic expression

$$c = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_0 \mu_0}} \,. \tag{294}$$

The same letter has been used for the two speeds, as they are identical. Both influences travel with the speed common to all energy with vanishing rest mass. We note that this is, strictly speaking, a prediction: the speed of gravitational waves has not yet been measured. A claim from 2003 to have done so is disputed. Ref. 431

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Ref. 433 How should one imagine these waves? We sloppily said above that a gravitational wave corresponds to a surface wave of a mattress; now we have to do better and imagine that we live *inside* the mattress. Gravitational waves are thus moving and oscillating deformations of the mattress, i.e., of space. Like mattress waves, it turns out that gravity waves are *transverse*. Thus they can be polarized. (Surface waves on mattresses cannot, because in two dimensions there is no polarization.) Gravity waves can be polarized in two independent ways. The effects of a gravitational wave are shown in Figure 281, for both linear and circular polarization.* We note that the waves are invariant under a rotation by π and that the two linear polarizations differ by an angle $\pi/4$; this shows that the particles corresponding to the waves, the gravitons, are of spin 2. (In general, the classical radiation field for a spin S particle is invariant under a rotation by $2\pi/S$. In addition, the two orthogonal linear polarizations of a spin S particle form an angle $\pi/2S$. For the photon, for example, the spin is 1; indeed, its invariant rotation angle is 2π and the angle formed by the two polarizations is $\pi/2$.)

If we image empty space as a mattress that *fills* space, gravitational waves are wobbling deformations of the mattress. More precisely, Figure 281 shows that a wave of circular polarization has the same properties as a corkscrew advancing through the mattress. We will discover later on why the analogy between a corkscrew and a gravity wave with circular polarization works so well. Indeed, in the third last part of our adventure we will find a specific model of the space-time mattress material that automatically incorporates corkscrew waves (instead of the spin 1 waves shown by ordinary latex mattresses).

How does one produce gravitational waves? Obviously, masses must be accelerated. But how exactly? The conservation of energy forbids mass monopoles from varying in strength. We also know from universal gravity that a spherical mass whose radius oscillates would not emit gravitational waves. In addition, the conservation of momentum

* A (small amplitude) plane gravity wave travelling in the z-direction is described by a metric g given by

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 + h_{xx} & h_{xy} & 0 \\ 0 & h_{xy} & -1 + h_{xx} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{295}$$

where its two components, whose amplitude ratio determine the polarization, are given by

$$h_{ab} = B_{ab} \sin(kz - \omega t + \varphi_{ab}) \tag{296}$$

as in all plane harmonic waves. The amplitudes B_{ab}, the frequency ω and the phase φ are determined by the specific physical system. The general dispersion relation for the wave number k resulting from the wave equation is

$$\frac{\omega}{k} = c \tag{297}$$

and shows that the waves move with the speed of light.

In another gauge, a plane wave can be written as

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} c^2(1 + 2\varphi) & A_1 & A_2 & A_3 \\ A_1 & -1 + 2\varphi & h_{xy} & 0 \\ A_2 & h_{xy} & -1 + h_{xx} & 0 \\ A_3 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{298}$$

where φ and $\boldsymbol{A}$ are the potentials such that $\boldsymbol{G} = \nabla\varphi - \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{A}}{c\partial t}$ and $\boldsymbol{H} = \nabla \times \boldsymbol{A}$.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 833 ny forbids mass dipoles from changing.

As a result, only *changing quadrupoles* can emit waves.* For example, two masses in orbit around each other will emit gravitational waves. Also, any rotating object that is not cylindrically symmetric around its rotation axis will do so. As a result, rotating an arm leads to gravitational wave emission. Most of these statements also apply to masses Challenge 834 ny in mattresses. Can you point out the differences?

Einstein found that the amplitude h of waves at a distance r from a source is given, to Ref. 432 a good approximation, by the second derivative of the retarded quadrupole moment Q:

$$h_{ab} = \frac{2G}{c^4}\frac{1}{r}\mathrm{d}_{tt}Q^{\mathrm{ret}}_{ab} = \frac{2G}{c^4}\frac{1}{r}\mathrm{d}_{tt}Q_{ab}(t - r/c) \,. \tag{299}$$

This expression shows that the amplitude of gravity waves *decreases only with* $1/r$, in contrast to naive expectations. However, this feature is the same as for electromagnetic waves. In addition, the small value of the prefactor, $1.6 \cdot 10^{-44}\,\mathrm{Wm/s}$, shows that truly gigantic systems are needed to produce quadrupole moment changes that yield any detectable length variations in bodies. To be convinced, just insert a few numbers, keep- Challenge 835 ny ing in mind that the best present detectors are able to measure length changes down to $h = \delta l/l = 10^{-19}$. The production of detectable gravitational waves by humans is probably impossible.

Gravitational waves, like all other waves, transport energy.** If we apply the general formula for the emitted power P to the case of two masses m_1 and m_2 in circular orbits Ref. 393 around each other at distance l and get

$$P = -\frac{\mathrm{d}E}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{G}{45c^5}\dddot{Q}^{\mathrm{ret}}_{ab}\dddot{Q}^{\mathrm{ret}}_{ab} = \frac{32}{5}\frac{G}{c^5}\left(\frac{m_1 m_2}{m_1 + m_2}\right)^2 l^4\omega^6 \tag{300}$$

which, using Kepler's relation $4\pi^2 r^3/T^2 = G(m_1 + m_2)$, becomes

$$P = \frac{32}{5}\frac{G^4}{c^5}\frac{(m_1 m_2)^2(m_1 + m_2)}{l^5} \,. \tag{301}$$

Ref. 393 For elliptical orbits, the rate increases with the ellipticity, as explained by Goenner. Inserting the values for the case of the Earth and the Sun, we get a power of about 200 W, and a value of 400 W for the Jupiter–Sun system. These values are so small that their effect cannot be detected at all.

For all orbiting systems, the frequency of the waves is twice the orbital frequency, as Challenge 836 ny you might want to check. These low frequencies make it even more difficult to detect them.

As a result, the only observation of effects of gravitational waves to date is in binary

* A *quadrupole* is a symmetrical arrangement, on the *four* sides of a square, of four alternating poles. In gravitation, a monopole is a point-like or two spherical masses, and, since masses cannot be negative, a quadrupole is formed by *two* monopoles. A flattened sphere, such as the Earth, can be approximated by the sum of a monopole and a quadrupole. The same is valid for an elongated sphere.

Page 714 ** Gravitomagnetism and gravitoelectricity allow one to define a gravitational Poynting vector. It is as easy Ref. 426 to define and use as in the case of electrodynamics.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 282 Comparison between measured time delay for the periastron of the binary pulsar PSR 1913+16 and the prediction due to energy loss by gravitational radiation

pulsars. Pulsars are small but extremely dense stars; even with a mass equal to that of the Sun, their diameter is only about 10 km. Therefore they can orbit each other at small distances and high speeds. Indeed, in the most famous binary pulsar system, PSR 1913+16, the two stars orbit each other in an amazing 7.8 h, even though their semimajor axis is about 700 Mm, just less than twice the Earth–Moon distance. Since their orbital speed is up to 400 km/s, the system is noticeably relativistic.

Pulsars have a useful property: because of their rotation, they emit extremely regular radio pulses (hence their name), often in millisecond periods. Therefore it is easy to follow their orbit by measuring the change of pulse arrival time. In a famous experiment, a team of astrophysicists led by Joseph Taylor* measured the speed decrease of the binary pulsar system just mentioned. Eliminating all other effects and collecting data for 20 years, they found a decrease in the orbital frequency, shown in Figure 282. The slowdown is due to gravity wave emission. The results exactly fit the prediction by general relativity, *without any adjustable parameter*. (You might want to check that the effect must be quadratic in time.) This is the only case so far in which general relativity has been tested up to $(v/c)^5$ precision. To get an idea of the precision, consider that this experiment detected a reduction of the orbital diameter of 3.1 mm per orbit, or 3.5 m per year! The measurements were possible only because the two stars in this system are neutron stars with small size, large velocities and purely gravitational interactions. The pulsar rotation period around its axis, about 59 ms, is known to eleven digits of precision, the orbital time of 7.8 h is known to ten digits and the eccentricity of the orbit to six digits.

Ref. 434
Ref. 435
Challenge 837 ny
Page 516
Ref. 434
Ref. 393

The *direct* detection of gravitational waves is one of the aims of experimental general relativity. The race has been on since the 1990s. The basic idea is simple, as shown in

* In 1993 he shared the Nobel Prize in Physics for his life's work.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 283 Detection of gravitational waves: an illustration of the merger of two black holes (top left) and the VIRGO detector in Cascina, Italy, with one of its huge mirror suspensions, the mirror suspension details, and two drawings of the laser interferometer (© INFN)

Figure 283: take four bodies, usually four mirrors, for which the line connecting one pair is perpendicular to the line connecting the other pair. Then measure the distance changes of each pair. If a gravitational wave comes by, one pair will increase in distance and the other will decrease, at the *same* time.

Since detectable gravitational waves cannot be produced by humans, wave detection first of all requires the patience to wait for a strong enough wave to come by. The merger of two black holes could be the source of such a strong gravitational wave, as also shown

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

in Figure 283. Secondly, a system able to detect length changes of the order of 10^{-22} or better is needed – in other words, a lot of money. Any detection is guaranteed to make the news on television.* Essential for a successful detection are the techniques to eliminate noise in the detection signal. The worlds's best noise reduction experts are all working on gravitational wave detectors.

It turns out that even for a body around a black hole, only about 6 % of the rest mass can be radiated away as gravitational waves; furthermore, most of the energy is radiated during the final fall into the black hole, so that only quite violent processes, such as black hole collisions, are good candidates for detectable gravity wave sources.

Challenge 839 r Ref. 431 Gravitational waves are a fascinating area of study. They still provide many topics to explore. For example: can you find a method to measure their speed? A well-publicized but disputed claim appeared in 2003. Indeed, any correct measurement that does not simply use two spaced detectors of the type of Figure 283 would be a scientific sensation.

Challenge 840 ny For the time being, another question on gravitational waves remains open: If all change is due to motion of particles, as the Greeks maintained, how do gravity waves fit into the picture? If gravitational waves were made of particles, space-time would also have to be. We have to wait until the beginning of the final part of our ascent to say more.

Bending of light and radio waves

As we know from above, gravity also influences the motion of light. A distant observer measures a changing value for the light speed v near a mass. (Measured at his own location, the speed of light is of course always c.) It turns out that a distant observer measures a *lower* speed, so that for him, gravity has the same effects as a dense optical medium. It takes only a little bit of imagination to see that this effect will thus *increase* the bending of light near masses already deduced in 1801 by Soldner for universal gravity.

Ref. 437 The following is a simple way to calculate the effect. As usual, we use the coordinate system of flat space-time at infinity. The idea is to do all calculations to first order, as the value of the bending is very small. The angle of deflection α, to first order, is simply

$$\alpha = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} \mathrm{d}y \,, \tag{302}$$

Challenge 841 ny where v is the speed of light measured by a distant observer. (Can you confirm this?) The next step is to use the Schwarzschild metric

$$\mathrm{d}\tau^2 = \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{rc^2}\right)\mathrm{d}t^2 - \frac{\mathrm{d}r^2}{c^2 - \frac{2GM}{r}} - \frac{r^2}{c^2}\mathrm{d}\varphi^2 \tag{303}$$

Challenge 842 ny and transform it into (x, y) coordinates to first order. That gives

$$\mathrm{d}\tau^2 = \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{rc^2}\right)\mathrm{d}t^2 - \left(1 + \frac{2GM}{rc^2}\right)\frac{1}{c^2}(\mathrm{d}x^2 + \mathrm{d}y^2) \tag{304}$$

Ref. 436 Challenge 838 ny * The topic of gravity waves is full of interesting sidelines. For example, can gravity waves be used to power a rocket? Yes, maintain Bonnor and Piper. You might ponder the possibility yourself.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 284 Calculating the bending of light by a mass

which again to first order leads to

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial x} = \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{rc^2}\right) c \,. \tag{305}$$

This confirms what we know already, namely that distant observers see light *slowed down* when passing near a mass. Thus we can also speak of a height-dependent index of refraction. In other words, constant *local* light speed leads to a *global* slowdown.

Challenge 843 ny

Inserting the last result in (302) and using a clever substitution, we get a deviation angle α given by

$$\alpha = \frac{4GM}{c^2}\frac{1}{b} \tag{306}$$

where the distance b is the so-called *impact parameter* of the approaching light beam. The resulting deviation angle α is *twice* the result we found for universal gravity. For a beam just above the surface of the Sun, the result is the famous value of $1.75''$ which was confirmed by the measurement expedition of 1919. (How did they measure the deviation angle?) This was the experiment that made Einstein famous, as it showed that universal gravity is wrong. In fact, Einstein was lucky. Two earlier expeditions organized to measure the value had failed. In 1912, it was impossible to take data because of rain, and in 1914 in Crimea, scientists were arrested (by mistake) as spies, because the world war had just begun. But in 1911, Einstein had already published an *incorrect* calculation, giving only the Soldner value with half the correct size; only in 1915, when he completed general relativity, did he find the correct result. Therefore Einstein became famous only because of the failure of the two expeditions that took place before he published his correct calculation.

Page 161
Challenge 844 ny
Ref. 438
Page 161

For high-precision experiments around the Sun, it is more effective to measure the bending of radio waves, as they encounter fewer problems when they propagate through

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

the solar corona. So far, over a dozen independent experiments have done so, using radio sources in the sky which lie on the path of the Sun. They have confirmed general relativity's prediction within a few per cent.

Ref. 414, Ref. 392
Ref. 393

So far, bending of radiation has also been observed near Jupiter, near certain stars, near several galaxies and near galaxy clusters. For the Earth, the angle is at most 3 nrad, too small to be measured yet, even though this may be feasible in the near future. There is a chance to detect this value if, as Andrew Gould proposes, the data of the satellite Hipparcos, which was taking precision pictures of the night sky for many years, are analysed properly in the future.

Page 595

Of course, the bending of light also confirms that in a triangle, the sum of the angles does not add up to π (two right angles), as is predicted later for curved space. (What is the sign of the curvature?)

Page 543
Challenge 845 ny

Time delay

The above calculation of the bending of light near masses shows that for a distant observer, light is slowed down near a mass. Constant *local* light speed leads to a *global* light speed slowdown. If light were not slowed down near a mass, it would have to go faster than c for an observer near the mass!* In 1964, Irwin Shapiro had the idea to measure this effect. He proposed two methods. The first was to send radar pulses to Venus, and measure the time taken for the reflection to get back to Earth. If the signals pass near the Sun, they will be delayed. The second was to use an artificial satellite communicating with Earth.

Ref. 439

The first measurement was published in 1968, and directly confirmed the prediction of general relativity within experimental errors. All subsequent tests of the same type, such as the one shown in Figure 285, have also confirmed the prediction within experimental errors, which nowadays are of the order of one part in a thousand. The delay has also been measured in binary pulsars, as there are a few such systems in the sky for which the line of sight lies almost precisely in the orbital plane.

Ref. 440
Ref. 441

The simple calculations presented here suggest a challenge: Is it also possible to describe *full* general relativity – thus gravitation in *strong* fields – as a change of the speed of light with position and time induced by mass and energy?

Challenge 847 ny

Effects on orbits

Astronomy allows precise measurements of motions. So, Einstein first of all tried to apply his results to the motion of planets. He looked for deviations of their motions from the predictions of universal gravity. Einstein found such a deviation: the precession of the perihelion of Mercury. The effect is shown in Figure 286. Einstein said later that the moment he found out that his calculation for the precession of Mercury matched observations was one of the happiest moments of his life.

The calculation is not difficult. In universal gravity, orbits are calculated by setting

* A nice exercise is to show that the bending of a slow particle gives the Soldner value, whereas with increasing speed, the value of the bending approaches twice that value. In all these considerations, the rotation of the mass has been neglected. As the effect of frame dragging shows, rotation also changes the deviation angle; however, in all cases studied so far, the influence is below the detection threshold.

Challenge 846 e

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 285 Time delay in radio signals – one of the experiments by Irwin Shapiro



FIGURE 286 The orbit around a central body in general relativity

$a_{\text{grav}} = a_{\text{centri}}$, in other words, by setting $GM/r^2 = \omega^2 r$ and fixing energy and angular momentum. The mass of the orbiting satellite does not appear explicitly.

In general relativity, the mass of the orbiting satellite is made to disappear by rescaling energy and angular momentum as $e = E/mc^2$ and $j = J/m$. Next, the space curvature needs to be included. We use the Schwarzschild metric (303) mentioned above to deduce that the initial condition for the energy e, together with its conservation, leads to a relation between proper time τ and time t at infinity:

Ref. 392, Ref. 393
Page 506
Challenge 848 e

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}t}{\mathrm{d}\tau} = \frac{e}{1 - 2GM/rc^2} \,, \tag{307}$$

whereas the initial condition on the angular momentum j and its conservation imply that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\varphi}{\mathrm{d}\tau} = \frac{j}{r^2} \,. \tag{308}$$

These relations are valid for any particle, whatever its mass m. Inserting all this into the Schwarzschild metric, we find that the motion of a particle follows

$$\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}r}{c\mathrm{d}\tau}\right)^2 + V^2(j, r) = e^2 \tag{309}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

where the effective potential V is given by

$$V^2(J,r) = (1 - \frac{2GM}{rc^2})(1 + \frac{j^2}{r^2c^2}) \,. \tag{310}$$

Challenge 849 ny
Challenge 850 e
The expression differs slightly from the one in universal gravity, as you might want to check. We now need to solve for $r(\varphi)$. For *circular* orbits we get *two* possibilities

$$r_\pm = \frac{6GM/c^2}{1 \pm \sqrt{1 - 12(\frac{GM}{cj})^2}} \tag{311}$$

where the minus sign gives a stable and the plus sign an unstable orbit. If $cj/GM < 2\sqrt{3}$, no stable orbit exists; the object will impact the surface or, for a black hole, be swallowed. There is a stable circular orbit *only* if the angular momentum j is larger than $2\sqrt{3}GM/c$. We thus find that in general relativity, in contrast to universal gravity, there is a *smallest* stable circular orbit. The radius of this smallest stable circular orbit is $6GM/c^2 = 3R_S$.

What is the situation for *elliptical* orbits? Setting $u = 1/r$ in (309) and differentiating, the equation for $u(\varphi)$ becomes

$$u' + u = \frac{GM}{j^2} + \frac{3GM}{c^2}u^2 \,. \tag{312}$$

Challenge 851 e
Without the nonlinear correction due to general relativity on the far right, the solutions are the famous *conic sections*

$$u_0(\varphi) = \frac{GM}{j^2}(1 + \varepsilon\cos\varphi) \,, \tag{313}$$

i.e., ellipses, parabolas or hyperbolas. The type of conic section depends on the value of the parameter ε, the so-called *eccentricity*. We know the shapes of these curves from
Page 155
universal gravity. Now, general relativity introduces the nonlinear term on the right-hand side of equation (312). Thus the solutions are not conic sections any more; however, as
Challenge 852 e
the correction is small, a good approximation is given by

$$u_1(\varphi) = \frac{GM}{j^2}\left(1 + \varepsilon\cos(\varphi - \frac{3G^2M^2}{j^2c^2}\varphi)\right) \,. \tag{314}$$

The hyperbolas and parabolas of universal gravity are thus slightly deformed. Instead of elliptical orbits we get the famous rosetta path shown in Figure 286. Such a path is above all characterized by a periastron shift. The *periastron*, or *perihelion* in the case of the Sun, is the nearest point to the central body reached by an orbiting body. The periastron turns
Challenge 853 e
around the central body by an angle

$$\alpha \approx 6\pi\frac{GM}{a(1-\varepsilon^2)c^2} \tag{315}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 287 The geodesic effect

for every orbit, where a is the *semimajor axis*. For Mercury, the value is 43″ per century. Around 1900, this was the only known effect that was unexplained by universal gravity; when Einstein's calculation led him to exactly that value, he was overflowing with joy for many days.

To be sure about the equality between calculation and experiment, all other effects leading to rosetta paths must be eliminated. For some time, it was thought that the quadrupole moment of the Sun could be an alternative source of this effect; later measurements ruled out this possibility.

In the meantime, the perihelion shift has been measured also for the orbits of Icarus, Venus and Mars around the Sun, as well as for several binary star systems. In binary pul-
Ref. 441 sars, the periastron shift can be as large as several degrees per year. In all cases, expression (315) describes the motion within experimental errors.

We note that even the rosetta orbit itself is not really stable, due to the emission of gravitational waves. But in the solar system, the power lost this way is completely negli-
Page 530 gible even over thousands of millions of years, as we saw above, so that the rosetta path remains a good description of observations.

The geodesic effect

When a pointed body orbits a central mass m at distance r, the direction of the tip will not be the same after a full orbit. This effect exists only in general relativity. The angle α describing the direction change is given by

$$\alpha = 2\pi\left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{3Gm}{rc^2}}\right) \approx \frac{3\pi Gm}{rc^2} \,. \tag{316}$$

The angle change is called the *geodesic effect* – 'geodetic' in other languages. It is a further consequence of the split into gravitoelectric and gravitomagnetic fields, as you may want
Challenge 854 e to show. Obviously, it does not exist in universal gravity.

In cases where the pointing of the orbiting body is realized by an intrinsic rotation, such as a spinning satellite, the geodesic effect produces a *precession* of the axis. Thus the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 288 The lunar retroreflectors deposited by Apollo 11 (top left), Lunokhod (top centre and right), Apollo 14 (middle left) and Apollo 15 (middle right) together with their locations on the Moon and a telescope performing a distance measurement (© NASA, Observatoire de la Côte d'Azur)

effect is comparable to spin–orbit coupling in atomic theory. (The Thirring–Lense effect mentioned above is analogous to spin–spin coupling.)

Ref. 442 The geodesic effect, or geodesic precession, was predicted by Willem de Sitter in 1916; in particular, he proposed detecting that the Earth–Moon system would change its pointing direction in its fall around the Sun. The effect is tiny; for the axis of the Moon the precession angle is about 0.019 arcsec per year. The effect was first detected in 1987 by an Ref. 443 Italian team for the Earth–Moon system, through a combination of radio-interferometry and lunar ranging, making use of the Cat's-eyes, shown in Figure 288, deposited by Lunokhod and Apollo on the Moon. Experiments to detect the geodesic effect in artificial satellites are also under way.

At first sight, geodesic precession is similar to the Thomas precession found in special Page 437 relativity. In both cases, a transport along a closed line results in the loss of the original

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

direction. However, a careful investigation shows that Thomas precession can be *added* to geodesic precession by applying some additional, non-gravitational interaction, so the analogy is shaky.

This completes our discussion of weak gravity effects. We now turn to strong gravity, where curvature cannot be neglected and where the fun is even more intense.

Curiosities and fun challenges about weak fields

Challenge 855 ny Is there a static, oscillating gravitational field?

* *

If one explores the options for the speed of gravitational waves, there is an interesting connection. If the speed of gravitational waves were *smaller* than the speed of light, moving bodies that move almost as rapidly as the speed of light, like cosmic ray particles, would be slowed down by emitting *Vavilov–Čerenkov radiation*, until they reach the lower speed. This is not observed.

Page 410

If on the other hand, the speed of gravitational waves were *larger* than that of light, the waves would not obey causality or the second principle of thermodynamics. In short, gravitational waves, if they exist, must propagate with the speed of light. (A speed very near to the speed of light might also be possible.)

* *

Challenge 856 ny Are narrow beams of gravitational waves, analogous to beams of light, possible?

* *

Challenge 857 ny Would two parallel beams of gravitational waves attract each other?

How is curvature measured?

We have seen that in the precise description of gravity, motion depends on space-time curvature. In order to quantify this idea, we first of all need to describe curvature itself as accurately as possible. To clarify the issue, we will start the discussion in two dimensions, and then move to three and four dimensions.

Obviously, a flat sheet of paper has no curvature. If we roll it into a cone or a cylinder, it gets what is called *extrinsic curvature*; however, the sheet of paper still looks flat for any two-dimensional animal living on it – as approximated by an ant walking over it. In other words, the *intrinsic curvature* of the sheet of paper is zero even if the sheet as a whole is extrinsically curved. (Can a one-dimensional space have intrinsic curvature? Is a torus intrinsically curved?)

Challenge 858 s

Intrinsic curvature is thus the stronger concept, measuring the curvature which can be observed even by an ant. (All intrinsically curved surfaces are also extrinsically curved.) The surface of the Earth, the surface of an island, or the slopes of a mountain* are intrinsically curved. Whenever we talk about curvature in general relativity, we always mean

Challenge 859 e * Unless the mountain has the shape of a perfect cone. Can you confirm this?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 289 Positive, vanishing and negative curvature in two dimensions

intrinsic curvature, since any observer in nature is by definition in the same situation as an ant on a surface: their experience, their actions and plans always only concern their closest neighbourhood in space and time.

But how can an ant determine whether it lives on an intrinsically curved surface?* One way is shown in Figure 289. The ant can check whether either the circumference of a circle or its area bears a Euclidean relation to the measured radius. She can even use the difference between the measured and the Euclidean values as a measure for the local intrinsic curvature, if she takes the limit for vanishingly small circles and if she normalizes the values correctly. In other words, the ant can imagine to cut out a little disc around the point she is on, to iron it flat and to check whether the disc would tear or produce folds. Any two-dimensional surface is intrinsically curved whenever ironing is not able to make a flat street map out of it. The 'density' of folds or tears is related to the curvature.

This means that we can recognize intrinsic curvature also by checking whether two parallel lines stay parallel, approach each other, or depart from each other. In the first case, such as lines on a paper cylinder, the surface is said to have *vanishing* intrinsic curvature; a surface with approaching parallels, such as the Earth, is said to have *positive* curvature, and a surface with diverging parallels, such as a saddle, is said to have *negative* curvature. In short, positive curvature means that we are more restricted in our movements, negative that we are less restricted. A *constant* curvature even implies being locked in a finite space. You might want to check this with Figure 289.

The third way to measure curvature uses triangles. On curved surfaces the sum of angles in a triangle is either larger or smaller than π (two right angles).

Ref. 444 Let us see how we can quantify curvature. First a question of vocabulary: a sphere with radius a is said, by definition, to have an intrinsic curvature $K = 1/a^2$. Therefore a plane has zero curvature. You might check that for a circle on a sphere, the measured Challenge 860 e radius r, circumference C, and area A are related by

$$C = 2\pi r\left(1 - \frac{K}{6}r^2 + \ldots\right) \quad \text{and} \quad A = \pi r^2\left(1 - \frac{K}{12}r^2 + \ldots\right) \tag{317}$$

* Note that the answer to this question also tells us how to distinguish real curvature from curved coordinate systems on a flat space. This question is often asked by those approaching general relativity for the first time.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 290 The maximum and minimum curvature of a curved surface

where the dots imply higher-order terms. This allows one to define the intrinsic curvature K, also called the *Gaussian* curvature, for a general point on a two-dimensional surface in either of the following two equivalent ways:

$$K = 6 \lim_{r\to 0}(1 - \frac{C}{2\pi r})\frac{1}{r^2} \quad \text{or} \quad K = 12 \lim_{r\to 0}(1 - \frac{A}{\pi r^2})\frac{1}{r^2} \,. \tag{318}$$

These expressions allow an ant to measure the intrinsic curvature at each point for any smooth surface.* From now on in this text, *curvature* will always mean *intrinsic* curvature. Note that the curvature can be different from place to place, and that it can be positive, as for an egg, or negative, as for the part of a torus nearest to the hole. A saddle is another example of the latter case, but, unlike the torus, its curvature changes along all directions. In fact, it is not possible at all to fit a two-dimensional surface of *constant* negative curvature inside three-dimensional space; one needs at least four dimensions, as you can find out if you try to imagine the situation.

Challenge 862 e

For any surface, at *every* point, the direction of maximum curvature and the direction of minimum curvature are *perpendicular* to each other. This relationship, shown in Figure 290, was discovered by Leonhard Euler in the eighteenth century. You might want to check this with a tea cup, with a sculpture by Henry Moore, or with any other curved object from your surroundings, such as a Volkswagen Beetle. The Gaussian curvature K defined in (318) is in fact the product of the two corresponding inverse curvature radii. Thus, even though line curvature is not an intrinsic property, this special product is. Gaussian curvature is a measure of the intrinsic curvature. Intrinsic measures of curvature are needed if one is forced to stay inside the surface or space one is exploring. Physicists are thus particularly interested in Gaussian curvature and its higher-dimensional analogues.

Challenge 863 e

For *three*-dimensional 'surfaces', the issue is a bit more involved. First of all, we have difficulties imagining the situation. But we can still accept that the curvature of a small disc around a point will depend on its orientation. Let us first look at the simplest case. If the curvature at a point is the same in all directions, the point is called *isotropic*. We can

* If the n-dimensional volume of a sphere is written as $V_n = C_n r^n$ and its $(n-1)$-dimensional 'surface' as $O_n = nC_n r^{n-1}$, one can generalize the expressions for curvature to

Ref. 445

$$K = 3(n+2) \lim_{r\to 0}(1 - \frac{V_n}{C_n r^n})\frac{1}{r^2} \quad \text{or} \quad K = 3n \lim_{r\to 0}(1 - \frac{O_n}{nC_n r^{n-1}})\frac{1}{r^2} \,, \tag{319}$$

Challenge 861 ny

as shown by Vermeil. A famous riddle is to determine the number C_n.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

imagine a small sphere around that point. In this special case, in three dimensions, the relation between the measured radius r and the measured surface area A and volume V of the sphere lead to

Challenge 864 ny

$$A = 4\pi r^2(1 - \frac{K}{3}r^2 + \ldots) \quad \text{and} \quad V = \frac{4\pi}{3}r^3(1 - \frac{K}{5}r^2 + \ldots) \,, \tag{320}$$

where K is the curvature for an isotropic point. This leads to

$$K = 3\lim_{r\to 0}(1 - \frac{A}{4\pi r^2})\frac{1}{r^2} = 6\lim_{r\to 0}\frac{r - \sqrt{A/4\pi}}{r^3} = 6\lim_{r\to 0}\frac{r_{\text{excess}}}{r^3} \,, \tag{321}$$

defining the *excess radius* as $r_{\text{excess}} = r - \sqrt{A/4\pi}$. We thus find that for a three-dimensional space, *the average curvature is six times the excess radius of a small sphere divided by the cube of the radius*. A positive curvature is equivalent to a positive excess radius, and similarly for vanishing and negative cases.

Of course, a curvature value defined in this way is only an average over all possible directions. The precise definition of curvature involves a disc. For points that are not isotropic, the value yielded by a disc will *differ* from the value calculated by using a sphere, as it will depend on the *orientation* of the disc. In fact, there is a relationship between all possible disc curvatures at a given point; taken together, they must form a tensor. (Why?) For a full description of curvature, we thus have to specify, as for any tensor in three dimensions, the main curvature values in three orthogonal directions.*

Challenge 865 ny

What are the curvature values in the space around us? Already in 1827, the mathematician and physicist Carl-Friedrich Gauß** is said to have checked whether the three angles formed by three mountain peaks near his place of residence added up to π. Nowadays we know that the deviation δ from the angle π on the surface of a body of mass M and radius r is given by

$$\delta = \pi - (\alpha + \beta + \gamma) \approx A_{\text{triangle}}K = A_{\text{triangle}}\frac{GM}{r^3c^2} \,. \tag{322}$$

* These three disc values are not independent however, since together, they must yield the just-mentioned average volume curvature K. In total, there are thus *three* independent scalars describing the curvature in three dimensions (at each point). With the metric tensor g_{ab} and the Ricci tensor R_{ab} to be introduced below, one possibility is to take for the three independent numbers the values $R = -2K$, $R_{ab}R^{ab}$ and $\det R/\det g$.

** Carl-Friedrich Gauß (b. 1777 Braunschweig, d. 1855 Göttingen), German mathematician. Together with the Leonhard Euler, the most important mathematician of all times. A famous enfant prodige, when he was 19 years old, he constructed the regular heptadecagon with compass and ruler (see www.mathworld.wolfram.com/Heptadecagon.html). He was so proud of this result that he put a drawing of the figure on his tomb. Gauss produced many results in number theory, topology, statistics, algebra, complex numbers and differential geometry which are part of modern mathematics and bear his name. Among his many accomplishments, he produced a theory of curvature and developed non-Euclidean geometry. He also worked on electromagnetism and astronomy.

Gauss was a difficult character, worked always for himself, and did not found a school. He published little, as his motto was: pauca sed matura. As a consequence, when another mathematician published a new result, he regularly produced a notebook in which he had noted the very same result already years before. His notebooks are now available online at www.sub.uni-goettingen.de.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 291 Positive, vanishing and negative curvature (in two dimensions) and geodesic behaviour

This expression is typical for hyperbolic geometries. For the case of mathematical negative curvature K, the first equality was deduced by Johann Lambert (1728–1777). However, it was Einstein who discovered that the negative curvature K is related to the mass and gravitation of a body. For the case of the Earth and typical mountain distances, the angle δ is of the order of 10^{-14} rad. Gauss had no chance to detect any deviation, and in fact he detected none. Even today, studies with lasers and high-precision apparatus have detected no deviation yet – on Earth. The right-hand factor, which measures the curvature of space-time on the surface of the Earth, is simply too small. But Gauss did not know, as we do today, that gravity and curvature go hand in hand.

Curvature and space-time

> Notre tête est ronde pour permettre à la pensée de changer de direction.*
>
> Francis Picabia

In nature, with *four* space-time dimensions, specifying curvature requires a more involved approach. First of all, the use of space-time coordinates automatically introduces the speed of light c as limit speed, which is a central requirement in general relativity. Furthermore, the number of dimensions being four, we expect a value for an average curvature at a point, defined by comparing the 4-volume of a 4-sphere in space-time with the one deduced from the measured radius; then we expect a set of 'almost average' curvatures defined by 3-volumes of 3-spheres in various orientations, plus a set of 'low-level' curvatures defined by usual 2-areas of usual 2-discs in even more orientations. Obviously, we need to bring some order to bear on this set, and we need to avoid the double counting we encountered in the case of three dimensions.

Fortunately, physics can help to make the mathematics easier. We start by defining what we mean by curvature of space-time. Then we will define curvatures for discs of various orientations. To achieve this, we interpret the definition of curvature in another way, which allows us to generalize it to time as well. Figure 291 illustrates the fact that the curvature K also describes how geodesics *diverge*. Geodesics are the straightest paths on a surface, i.e., those paths that a tiny car or tricycle would follow if it drove on the surface keeping the steering wheel straight.

Challenge 866 e If a space is curved, the separation s will increase along the geodesics as

* 'Our head is round in order to allow our thougths to change direction.' Francis Picabia (b. 1879 Paris, d. 1953 Paris) French dadaist and surrealist painter.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^2 s}{\mathrm{d}l^2} = -Ks + \text{higher orders} \tag{323}$$

where l measures the length along the geodesic, and K is the curvature, in other words, the inverse squared curvature radius. In space-time, this relation is extended by substituting proper time (times the speed of light) for proper length. Thus separation and curvature are related by

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^2 s}{\mathrm{d}\tau^2} = -Kc^2 s + \text{higher orders} \,. \tag{324}$$

But this is the definition of an acceleration. In other words, what in the purely spatial case is described by *curvature*, in the case of space-time becomes the *relative acceleration* of two particles freely falling from nearby points. Indeed, we have encountered these accelerations already: they describe tidal effects. In short, space-time curvature and tidal effects are precisely the same.

Page 158

Obviously, the magnitude of tidal effects, and thus of curvature, will depend on the orientation – more precisely on the orientation of the space-time plane formed by the two particle velocities. The definition also shows that K is a tensor, so that later on we will have to add indices to it. (How many?) The fun is that we can avoid indices for a while by looking at a special combination of spatial curvatures. If we take three planes in space, all orthogonal to each other and intersecting at a given point, the *sum* of the three so-called *sectional* curvature values does *not* depend on the observer. (This corresponds to the tensor trace.) Can you confirm this, by using the definition of the curvature just given?

Challenge 867 ny

Ref. 446

Challenge 868 ny

The sum of the three sectional curvatures defined for mutually orthogonal planes $K_{(12)}$, $K_{(23)}$ and $K_{(31)}$, is related to the excess radius defined above. Can you find out how?

Challenge 869 ny

If a surface has *constant* (intrinsic) curvature, i.e., the same curvature at all locations, geometrical objects can be moved around without deforming them. Can you picture this?

Challenge 870 e

In summary, curvature is not such a difficult concept. It describes the *deformation* of space-time. If we imagine space (-time) as a big blob of rubber in which we live, the curvature at a point describes how this blob is squeezed at that point. Since we live *inside* the rubber, we need to use 'insider' methods, such as excess radii and sectional curvatures, to describe the deformation. Relativity often seems difficult to learn because people do not like to think about the vacuum in this way, and even less to explain it in this way. (For a hundred years it was an article of faith for every physicist to say that the vacuum was empty.) Picturing vacuum as a substance can help us in many ways to understand general relativity.

Ref. 447

Curvature and motion in general relativity

As mentioned above, one half of general relativity is the statement that any object moves along paths of *maximum* proper time, i.e., along geodesics. The *other* half is contained in a single expression: for *every* observer, the sum of all three *proper* sectional *spatial*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

curvatures at a point is given by

$$K_{(12)} + K_{(23)} + K_{(31)} = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4} W^{(0)} \tag{325}$$

where $W^{(0)}$ is the *proper* energy density at the point. The lower indices indicate the mixed curvatures defined by the three orthogonal directions 1, 2 and 3. This is all of general relativity in one paragraph.

Challenge 871 e An equivalent expression is easily found using the excess radius defined above, by introducing the mass $M = VW^{(0)}/c^2$. For the surface area A of the volume V containing the mass, we get

$$r_{\text{excess}} = r - \sqrt{A/4\pi} = \frac{G}{3c^2} M \,. \tag{326}$$

In short, general relativity affirms that for every observer, *the excess radius of a small sphere is given by the mass inside the sphere.*[*]

Note that the above expression implies that the average space curvature at a point in empty space *vanishes*. As we will see shortly, this means that near a spherical mass the negative of the curvature *towards* the mass is equal to twice the curvature *around* the mass; the total sum is thus zero.

Curvature will also differ from point to point. In particular, the expression implies that if energy *moves*, curvature will move with it. In short, both space curvature and, as we will see shortly, space-time curvature *change* over space and time.

Challenge 872 ny We note in passing that curvature has an annoying effect: the relative velocity of *distant* observers is undefined. Can you provide the argument? In curved space, relative velocity is defined only for *nearby* objects – in fact only for objects at no distance at all. Only in flat space are relative velocities of distant objects well defined.

The quantities appearing in expression (325) are *independent* of the observer. But often people want to use observer-dependent quantities. The relation then gets more involved; the single equation (325) must be expanded to ten equations, called *Einstein's field equations*. They will be introduced below. But before we do that, we will check that general relativity makes sense. We will skip the check that it contains special relativity as a limiting case, and go directly to the main test.

Universal gravity

> The only reason which keeps me here is gravity.
> Anonymous

For small velocities and low curvature values, the temporal curvatures $K_{(0j)}$ turn out to have a special property. In this case, they can be defined as the second spatial derivatives Challenge 873 e of a single scalar function φ. In other words, we can write

Ref. 448 [*] Another, equivalent formulation is that for small radii the area A is given by

$$A = 4\pi r^2 (1 + \frac{1}{9} r^2 R) \tag{327}$$

where R is the Ricci scalar, to be introduced later on.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

$$K_{(0j)} = \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial (x^j)^2} \,. \tag{328}$$

In everyday situations, the function φ turns out to be the gravitational potential. Indeed, universal gravity is the limiting case of general relativity for small speeds and small spatial curvature. These two limits imply, making use of $W^{(0)} = \rho c^2$ and $c \to \infty$, that

$$K_{(ij)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad K_{(01)} + K_{(02)} + K_{(03)} = 4\pi G\rho \,. \tag{329}$$

In other words, for small speeds, space is flat and the potential obeys Poisson's equation. Universal gravity is thus indeed the low speed and low curvature limit of general relativity.

Challenge 874 ny Can you show that relation (325) between curvature and energy density indeed means that time near a mass depends on the height, as mentioned before?

The Schwarzschild metric

Ref. 446 What is the curvature of space-time near a spherical mass?

– CS – more to be inserted – CS –

Challenge 875 ny The curvature of the Schwarzschild metric is given by

$$\begin{aligned} K_{r\varphi} = K_{r\theta} &= -\frac{G}{c^2}\frac{M}{r^3} \quad \text{and} \quad K_{\theta\varphi} = 2\frac{G}{c^2}\frac{M}{r^3} \\ K_{t\varphi} = K_{t\theta} &= \frac{G}{c^2}\frac{M}{r^3} \quad \text{and} \quad K_{tr} = -2\frac{G}{c^2}\frac{M}{r^3} \end{aligned} \tag{330}$$

Ref. 446 Page 158 everywhere. The dependence on $1/r^3$ follows from the general dependence of all tidal effects; we have already calculated them in the chapter on universal gravity. The factors G/c^2 are due to the maximum force of gravity; only the numerical prefactors need to be calculated from general relativity. The average curvature obviously vanishes, as it does Challenge 876 ny for all vacuum. As expected, the values of the curvatures near the surface of the Earth are exceedingly small.

Curiosities and fun challenges about curvature

A fly has landed on the outside of a cylindrical glass, 1 cm below its rim. A drop of honey is located halfway around the glass, also on the outside, 2 cm below the rim. What is the Challenge 877 e shortest distance from the fly to the drop? What is the shortest distance if the drop is on the *inside* of the glass?

* *

Challenge 878 e Where are the points of highest and lowest Gaussian curvature on an egg?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

ALL OBSERVERS – HEAVIER MATHEMATICS

> Jeder Straßenjunge in unserem mathematischen Göttingen versteht mehr von vierdimensionaler Geometrie als Einstein. Aber trotzdem hat Einstein die Sache gemacht, und nicht die großen Mathematiker.
>
> David Hilbert*

Now that we have a feeling for curvature, we want to describe it in a way that allows *any* observer to talk to any *other* observer. Unfortunately, this means using formulae with tensors. These formulae look daunting. The challenge is to see in each of the expressions the essential point (e.g. by forgetting all indices for a while) and not to be distracted by those small letters sprinkled all over them.

The curvature of space-time

> Il faut suivre sa pente, surtout si elle monte.**
>
> André Gide

We mentioned above that a 4-dimensional space-time is described by 2-curvature, 3-curvature and 4-curvature. Many texts on general relativity start with 3-curvature. These curvatures describing the distinction between the 3-volume calculated from a radius and the actual 3-volume. They are described by the *Ricci tensor*.*** With an argument we encountered already for the case of geodesic deviation, it turns out that the Ricci tensor describes how the shape of a spherical cloud of freely falling particles is deformed on its path.

– CS – to be expanded – CS –

In short, the Ricci tensor is the general-relativistic version of $\Delta\varphi$, or better, of $\Box\varphi$.

The most global, but least detailed, definition of curvature is the one describing the distinction between the 4-volume calculated from a measured radius and the actual 4-volume. This is the *average curvature* at a space-time point and is represented by the so-called *Ricci scalar* R, defined as

$$R = -2K = -\frac{2}{r^2_{\text{curvature}}} \,. \tag{331}$$

It turns out that the Ricci scalar can be derived from the Ricci tensor by a so-called *contraction*, which is a precise averaging procedure. For tensors of rank two, contraction is

* 'Every street urchin in our mathematical Göttingen knows more about four-dimensional geometry than Einstein. Nevertheless, it was Einstein who did the work, not the great mathematicians.'

* This section might be skipped at first reading.

** 'One has to follow one's inclination, especially if it climbs upwards.'

*** Gregorio Ricci-Cubastro (b. 1853 Lugo , d. 1925 Bologna), Italian mathematician. He is the father of absolute differential calculus, once also called 'Ricci calculus'. Tullio Levi-Civita was his pupil.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

the same as taking the trace:

$$R = R^{\lambda}{}_{\lambda} = g^{\lambda\mu} R_{\lambda\mu} \,. \tag{332}$$

The Ricci scalar describes the curvature averaged over space *and* time. In the image of a falling spherical cloud, the Ricci scalar describes the volume change of the cloud. The Ricci scalar always vanishes in vacuum. This result allows one, on the surface of the Earth, to relate the spatial curvature to the change of time with height.

Challenge 879 ny

Now comes an idea discovered by Einstein after two years of hard work. The important quantity for the description of curvature in nature is not the Ricci tensor R_{ab}, but a tensor built from it. This *Einstein tensor* G_{ab} is defined mathematically (for vanishing cosmological constant) as

$$G_{ab} = R_{ab} - \frac{1}{2} g_{ab} R \,. \tag{333}$$

It is not difficult to understand its meaning. The value G_{00} is the sum of sectional curvatures in the planes *orthogonal* to the 0 direction and thus the sum of all spatial sectional curvatures:

$$G_{00} = K_{(12)} + K_{(23)} + K_{(31)} \,. \tag{334}$$

Similarly, for each dimension i the diagonal element G_{ii} is the sum (taking into consideration the minus signs of the metric) of sectional curvatures in the planes *orthogonal* to the i direction. For example, we have

$$G_{11} = K_{(02)} + K_{(03)} - K_{(23)} \,. \tag{335}$$

The distinction between the Ricci tensor and the Einstein tensor thus lies in the way in which the sectional curvatures are combined: discs *containing* the coordinate in question in one case, discs *orthogonal* to the coordinate in the other case. Both describe the curvature of space-time equally well, and fixing one means fixing the other. (What are the trace and the determinant of the Einstein tensor?)

Challenge 880 d

The Einstein tensor is symmetric, which means that it has *ten* independent components. Most importantly, its divergence vanishes; it therefore describes a conserved quantity. This was the essential property which allowed Einstein to relate it to mass and energy in mathematical language.

The description of momentum, mass and energy

Obviously, for a complete description of gravity, also motions of momentum and energy also need to be quantified in such a way that any observer can talk to any other. We have seen that momentum and energy always appear together in relativistic descriptions; the next step is thus to find out how their motions can be quantified for general observers.

First of all, the quantity describing energy, let us call it T, must be defined using the energy–momentum vector $\boldsymbol{p} = m\boldsymbol{u} = (\gamma mc, \gamma m\boldsymbol{v})$ of special relativity. Furthermore, T does not describe a single particle, but the way energy–momentum is distributed over space and time. As a consequence, it is most practical to use T to describe a *density* of energy and momentum. T will thus be a *field*, and depend on time and space, a fact

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

usually indicated by the notation $T = T(t, x)$.

Since the energy–momentum density T describes a density over space and time, it defines, at every space-time point and for every infinitesimal surface $\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{A}$ around that point, the flow of energy–momentum $\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{p}$ through that surface. In other words, T is defined by the relation

$$\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{p} = T\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{A}\,. \tag{336}$$

The surface is assumed to be characterized by its normal vector $\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{A}$. Since the energy–momentum density is a proportionality factor between two vectors, T is a *tensor*. Of course, we are talking about 4-flows and 4-surfaces here. Therefore the energy–momentum density tensor can be split in the following way:

$$T = \left(\begin{array}{c|ccc} w & S_1 & S_2 & S_3 \\ \hline S_1 & t_{11} & t_{12} & t_{13} \\ S_2 & t_{21} & t_{22} & t_{23} \\ S_3 & t_{31} & t_{32} & t_{33} \end{array}\right) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \text{energy density} & \text{energy flow or momentum density} \\ \hline \text{energy flow or momentum density} & \text{momentum flow density} \end{array}\right) \tag{337}$$

where $w = T_{00}$ is a 3-scalar, $\boldsymbol{S}$ a 3-vector and t a 3-tensor. The total quantity T is called the *energy–momentum* (*density*) *tensor*. It has two essential properties: it is symmetric and its divergence vanishes.

The vanishing divergence of the tensor T, often written as

$$\partial_a T^{ab} = 0 \quad \text{or abbreviated} \quad T^{ab}{}_{,a} = 0\,, \tag{338}$$

expresses the fact that the tensor describes a *conserved* quantity. In every volume, energy can change only via flow through its boundary surface. Can you confirm that the description of energy–momentum with this tensor satisfies the requirement that any two observers, differing in position, orientation, speed *and* acceleration, can communicate their results to each other?

Challenge 881 ny

The energy–momentum density tensor gives a full description of the distribution of energy, momentum and mass over space and time. As an example, let us determine the energy–momentum density for a moving liquid. For a liquid of density ρ, a pressure p and a 4-velocity $\boldsymbol{u}$, we have

$$T^{ab} = (\rho_0 + p)u^a u^b - p g^{ab} \tag{339}$$

where ρ_0 is the density measured in the comoving frame, the so-called *proper* density.* Obviously, ρ, ρ_0 and p depend on space and time.

* In the *comoving* frame we thus have

$$T^{ab} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_0 c^2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & p & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & p & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & p \end{pmatrix}. \tag{340}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Of course, for a particular material fluid, we need to know how pressure p and density ρ are related. A full material characterization thus requires the knowledge of the relation

$$p = p(\rho) \,. \tag{341}$$

This relation is a material property and thus *cannot* be determined from relativity. It has to be derived from the constituents of matter or radiation and their interactions. The simplest possible case is *dust*, i.e., matter made of point particles* with no interactions at all. Its energy–momentum tensor is given by

$$T^{ab} = \rho_0 u^a u^b \,. \tag{342}$$

Challenge 882 ny Can you explain the difference from the liquid case?

The divergence of the energy–momentum tensor vanishes for all times and positions, Challenge 883 ny as you may want to check. This property is the same as for the Einstein tensor presented above. But before we elaborate on this issue, a short remark. We did not take into account *gravitational energy*. It turns out that gravitational energy cannot be defined in general. Gravity is *not* an interaction and does *not* have an associated energy.**

Hilbert's action – how things fall?

When Einstein discussed his work with David Hilbert, Hilbert found a way to do in a few weeks what had taken years for Einstein. Hilbert understood that general relativity *in empty space* could be described by an action integral, like all other physical systems.

Thus Hilbert set out to find the measure of change, as this is what an action describes, for motion due to gravity. Obviously, the measure must be observer-invariant; in particular, it must be invariant under all possible changes of viewpoints.

Motion due to gravity is determined by curvature. Any curvature measure independent of the observer must be a combination of the Ricci scalar R and the cosmological constant Λ. It thus makes sense to expect that the change of space-time is described by an action S given by

$$S = \frac{c^4}{16\pi G} \int (R + 2\Lambda) \, \mathrm{d}V \,. \tag{343}$$

The volume element $\mathrm{d}V$ must be specified to use this expression in calculations. The cosmological constant Λ (added some years after Hilbert's work) appears as a mathematical possibility to describe the most general action that is diffeomorphism-invariant. We will see below that its value in nature, though small, seems to be different from zero.

The Hilbert action of a chunk of space-time is thus the integral of the Ricci scalar plus

* Even though general relativity expressly forbids the existence of point particles, the approximation is useful in cases when the particle distances are large compared to their own size.

** In certain special circumstances, such as weak fields, slow motion, or an asymptotically flat space-time, we *can* define the integral of the G^{00} component of the Einstein tensor as negative gravitational energy. Gravitational energy is thus only defined *approximately*, and only for our everyday environment. Nevertheless, this approximation leads to the famous speculation that the total energy of the universe is zero. Do you agree? Page 598 Challenge 884 ny

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

twice the cosmological constant over that chunk. The principle of least action states that space-time moves in such a way that this integral changes as little as possible.

– CS – to be finished – CS –

In summary, the question 'how do things move?' is answered by general relativity in the same way as by special relativity: *things follow the path of maximal ageing*.

Challenge 885 ny Can you show that the Hilbert action follows from the maximum force?

The symmetries of general relativity

The main symmetry of the Lagrangian of general relativity is called *diffeomorphism invariance*.

– CS – to be written – CS –

The field equations for empty space-time also show *scale symmetry*. This is the invariance of the equations after multiplication of all coordinates by a common numerical factor. In 1993, Torre and Anderson showed that diffeomorphism symmetry and trivial

Ref. 449 scale symmetry are the *only* symmetries of the vacuum field equations.

Apart from diffeomorphism symmetry, full general relativity, including mass–energy, has an additional symmetry which is not yet fully elucidated. This symmetry connects the various possible initial conditions of the field equations; the symmetry is extremely

Ref. 450 complex and is still a topic of research. These fascinating investigations should give new insights into the classical description of the big bang.

Einstein's field equations

> [Einstein's general theory of relativity] cloaked the ghastly appearance of atheism.
>
> A witch hunter from Boston, around 1935

> Do you believe in god? Prepaid reply 50 words.
>
> Subsequent telegram by another to his hero Albert Einstein

> I believe in Spinoza's god, who reveals himself in the orderly harmony of what exists, not in a god who concerns himself with fates and actions of human beings.
>
> Albert Einstein's answer

Einstein's famous field equations were the basis of many religious worries. They contain

Page 476 the full description of general relativity. As explained above, they follow from the maxi-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

mum force – or equivalently, from Hilbert's action – and are given by

$$G_{ab} = -\kappa\, T_{ab}$$

or

$$R_{ab} - \frac{1}{2} g_{ab} R - \Lambda g_{ab} = -\kappa\, T^{ab} \,. \tag{344}$$

The constant κ, called the *gravitational coupling constant*, has been measured to be

$$\kappa = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4} = 2.1 \cdot 10^{-43}\,/\mathrm{N} \tag{345}$$

and its small value – 2π divided by the maximum force $c^4/4G$ – reflects the weakness of gravity in everyday life, or better, the difficulty of bending space-time. The constant Λ, the so-called *cosmological constant*, corresponds to a vacuum energy volume density, or pressure Λ/κ. Its low value is quite hard to measure. The currently favoured value is

Page 587

$$\Lambda \approx 10^{-52}\,/\mathrm{m}^2 \quad \text{or} \quad \Lambda/\kappa \approx 0.5\,\mathrm{nJ/m^3} = 0.5\,\mathrm{nPa} \,. \tag{346}$$

Ref. 451 Current measurements and simulations suggest that this parameter, even though it is numerically near to the inverse square of the present radius of the universe, is a constant of nature that does not vary with time.

In summary, the field equations state that the curvature at a point is equal to the flow of energy–momentum through that point, taking into account the vacuum energy density. In other words, *energy–momentum tells space-time how to curve.**

The field equations of general relativity can be simplified for the case in which speeds are small. In that case $T_{00} = \rho c^2$ and all other components of T vanish. Using the defini-

* Einstein arrived at his field equations using a number of intellectual guidelines that are called *principles* in the literature. Today, many of them are not seen as central any more. Nevertheless, we give a short overview.

- *Principle of general relativity*: all observers are equivalent; this principle, even though often stated, is probably empty of any physical content.

- *Principle of general covariance*: the equations of physics must be stated in tensorial form; even though Ref. 452 it is known today that all equations can be written with tensors, even universal gravity, in many cases they require unphysical 'absolute' elements, i.e., quantities which affect others but are not affected themselves. Page 855 This unphysical idea is in contrast with the idea of *inter*action, as explained above.

- *Principle of minimal coupling*: the field equations of gravity are found from those of special relativity by taking the simplest possible generalization. Of course, now that the equations are known and tested experimentally, this principle is only of historical interest.

- *Equivalence principle*: acceleration is locally indistinguishable from gravitation; we used it to argue that space-time is semi-Riemannian, and that gravity is its curvature.

- *Mach's principle*: inertia is due to the interaction with the rest of the universe; this principle is correct, even though it is often maintained that it is not fulfilled in general relativity. In any case, it is not the essence Page 601 of general relativity.

- *Identity of gravitational and inertial mass*: this is included in the definition of mass from the outset, but restated ad nauseam in general relativity texts; it is implicitly used in the definition of the Riemann tensor.

- *Correspondence principle*: a new, more general theory, such as general relativity, must reduce to previous theories, in this case universal gravity or special relativity, when restricted to the domains in which those are valid.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 886 ny

tion of the constant κ and setting $\varphi = (c^2/2)h_{00}$ in $g_{ab} = \eta_{ab} + h_{ab}$, we find

$$\nabla^2\varphi = 4\pi\rho \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\mathrm{d}^2x}{\mathrm{d}t^2} = -\nabla\varphi \tag{347}$$

which we know well, since it can be restated as follows: a body of mass m near a body of mass M is accelerated by

$$a = G\frac{M}{r^2}, \tag{348}$$

a value which is independent of the mass m of the falling body. And indeed, as noted already by Galileo, all bodies fall with the same acceleration, independently of their size, their mass, their colour, etc. In general relativity also, gravitation is completely democratic.* The independence of free fall from the mass of the falling body follows from the description of space-time as a bent mattress. Objects moving on a mattress also move in the same way, independently of the mass value.

To get a feeling for the complete field equations, we will take a short walk through their main properties. First of all, all motion due to space-time curvature is *reversible*,

Challenge 887 e

differentiable and thus *deterministic*. Note that only the complete motion, of space-time *and* matter *and* energy, has these properties. For particle motion only, motion is in fact *irreversible*, since some gravitational radiation is usually emitted.

By contracting the field equations we find, for vanishing cosmological constant, the following expression for the Ricci scalar:

$$R = -\kappa T\,. \tag{353}$$

This result also implies the relation between the excess radius and the mass inside a

Challenge 888 ny

sphere.

The field equations are *nonlinear* in the metric g, meaning that sums of solutions usually are *not* solutions. That makes the search for solutions rather difficult. For a complete solution of the field equations, initial and boundary conditions should be specified. The

Ref. 453

ways to do this form a specialized part of mathematical physics; it is not explored here.

* Here is another way to show that general relativity fits with universal gravity. From the definition of the Riemann tensor we know that relative acceleration b_a and speed of nearby particles are related by

$$\nabla_e b_a = R_{ceda}v^c v^d\,. \tag{349}$$

From the symmetries of R we know there is a φ such that $b_a = -\nabla_a\varphi$. That means that

$$\nabla_e b^a = \nabla_e\nabla^a\varphi = R^a_{ced}v^c v^d \tag{350}$$

which implies that

$$\Delta\varphi = \nabla_a\nabla^a\varphi = R^a_{cad}v^c v^d = R_{cd}v^c v^d = \kappa(T_{cd}v^c v^d - T/2) \tag{351}$$

Introducing $T_{ab} = \rho v_a v_b$ we get

$$\Delta\varphi = 4\pi G\rho \tag{352}$$

as we wanted to show.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Albert Einstein used to say that general relativity only provides the understanding of one side of the field equations (344), but not of the other. Can you see which side he meant?

Challenge 889 ny

What can we do of interest with these equations? In fact, to be honest, not much that we have not done already. Very few processes require the use of the full equations. Many textbooks on relativity even stop after writing them down! However, studying them is worthwhile. For example, one can show that the Schwarzschild solution is the *only* spherically symmetric solution. Similarly, in 1923, Birkhoff showed that every rotationally symmetric vacuum solution is static. This is the case even if masses themselves move, as for example during the collapse of a star.

Maybe the most beautiful applications of the field equations are the various *films* made of relativistic processes. The worldwide web hosts several of these; they allow one to see what happens when two black holes collide, what happens when an observer falls into a black hole, etc. To generate these films, the field equations usually need to be solved directly, without approximations.*

– CS – more to be added – CS –

Another area of application concerns *gravitational waves*. The full field equations show that waves are not harmonic, but nonlinear. Sine waves exist only approximately, for small amplitudes. Even more interestingly, if two waves collide, in many cases *singularities* are predicted to appear. This whole theme is still a research topic and might provide new insights for the quantization of general relativity in the coming years.

We end this section with a side note. Usually, the field equations are read in one sense only, as stating that energy–momentum produces curvature. One can also read them in the other way, calculating the energy–momentum needed to produces a given curvature. When one does this, one discovers that not all curved space-times are possible, as some would lead to *negative* energy (or mass) densities. Such solutions would contradict the mentioned limit on length-to-mass ratios for physical systems.

More on the force limit

When the cosmological constant is taken into the picture, the maximum force principle requires a second look. In the case of a non-vanishing cosmological constant, the force limit makes sense only if the constant Λ is positive; this is the case for the currently measured value, which is $\Lambda \approx 10^{-52}/\mathrm{m}^2$. Indeed, the radius–mass relation of black holes

Ref. 454

Ref. 392, Ref. 393

$$2GM = Rc^2\left(1 - \frac{\Lambda}{3}R^2\right) \tag{354}$$

implies that a radius-*independent* maximum force is valid only for positive or zero cosmological constant. For a negative cosmological constant the force limit would only be valid for infinitely small black holes. In the following, we take a pragmatic approach and note that a maximum force limit can be seen to imply a vanishing or positive cosmological constant. Obviously, the force limit does not specify the *value* of the constant; to

* See for example the www.photon.at/~werner/black-earth website.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

achieve this, a second principle needs to be added. A straightforward formulation, using
Page 496 the additional principle of a minimum force in nature, was proposed above.

One might ask also whether rotating or charged black holes change the argument that leads from maximum force to the derivation of general relativity. However, the derivation using the Raychaudhuri equation does not change. In fact, the only change of the argument appears with the inclusion of torsion, which changes the Raychaudhuri equation itself. As long as torsion plays no role, the derivation given above remains valid. The inclusion of torsion is still an open research issue.

Another question is how maximum force relates to scalar–tensor theories of gravity, such as the proposal by Brans and Dicke or its generalizations. If a particular scalar-tensor theory obeys the general horizon equation (244) then it must also imply a maximum force. The general horizon equation must be obeyed both for *static* and for *dynamic* horizons. If that were the case, the specific scalar–tensor theory would be equivalent to general relativity, as it would allow one, using the argument of Jacobson, to deduce the usual field equations. This case can appear if the scalar field behaves like matter, i.e., if it has mass–energy like matter and curves space-time like matter. On the other hand, if in the particular scalar–tensor theory the general horizon equation (244) is not obeyed for *all moving* horizons – which is the general case, as scalar–tensor theories have more defining constants than general relativity – then the maximum force does not appear and the theory is not equivalent to general relativity. This connection also shows that an experimental test of the horizon equation for *static* horizons only is not sufficient to confirm general relativity; such a test rules out only some, but not all, scalar–tensor theories.

Deducing universal gravity

For the maximum force limit to be considered a basic physical principle, all properties of gravitation, including the full theory of general relativity, must be deduced from it. To make this argument easier to follow, we will split it into several steps. First of all, we show that the force limit implies that in everyday life the inverse square law of universal gravity holds. Then we show that it implies the main ideas of general relativity. Finally, we show that the full theory of general relativity follows.

In other words, from this point onwards the force limit is assumed to be valid. We explore its consequences and compare them with the known properties of nature. The maximum force limit can also be visualized in another way. If the gravitational attraction between a central body and a satellite were *stronger* than it is, black holes would be smaller than they are; in that case the maximum force limit and the maximum speed could be exceeded. If, on the other hand, gravitation were *weaker* than it is, a fast and accelerating observer would not be able to determine that the two bodies interact. In summary, a maximum force of $c^4/4G$ implies universal gravity. There is no difference between stating that all bodies attract through gravitation and stating that there is a maximum force with the value $c^4/4G$.

Deducing linearized general relativity

The next logical step is to show that a maximum force also implies general relativity. The naive approach is to repeat, step by step, the standard approach to general relativity.

Space-time curvature is a consequence of the fact that the speed of light is the maxi-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Ref. 392, Ref. 393 mum speed for *all* observers, even if they are located in a gravitational field. The gravitational red shift shows that in gravitational fields, clocks change their rate with height; that change, together with the constancy of the speed of light, implies space-time curvature. Gravity thus implies space-time curvature. The value of the curvature in the case of weak gravitational fields is completely fixed by the inverse square law of gravity. Since universal gravity follows from the maximum force, we deduce that maximum force implies space-time curvature.

Apart from curvature, we must also check the other basic ideas of general relativity. The *principle of general relativity* states that all observers are equivalent; since the maximum force principle applies to all observers, the principle of general relativity is contained in it. The *equivalence principle* states that, locally, gravitation can be transformed away by changing to a suitable observer. This is also the case for the maximum force principle, which is claimed for all observers, thus also for observers that locally eliminate gravitation. *Mach's principle*, whose precise formulation varies, states that only relative quantities should play a role in the description of nature. Since the maximum force is a relative quantity – in particular, the relation of mass and curvature remains – Mach's principle is also satisfied.

Free bodies in flat space move with constant speed. By the equivalence principle, this statement generalizes to the statement that freely falling bodies move along geodesics. The maximum force principle keeps intact the statement that *space-time tells matter how to move*.

The curvature of space-time for weak gravitational fields is fixed by the inverse square law of gravity. Space curvature is thus present in the right amount around each mass.
Ref. 455 As Richard Feynman explains, by extending this result to all possible observers, we can deduce all low-curvature effects of gravitation. In particular, this implies the existence of linear (low-amplitude) gravitational waves and of the Thirring–Lense effect. Linearized general relativity thus follows from the maximum force principle.

How to calculate the shape of geodesics

The other half of general relativity states that bodies fall along geodesics. All orbits are geodesics, thus curves with the longest proper time. It is thus useful to be able to calculate these trajectories.* To start, one needs to know the *shape of space-time*, the notion of 'shape' being generalized from its familiar two-dimensional meaning. For a being living on the surface, it is usually described by the metric g_{ab}, which defines the distances between neighbouring points through

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = \mathrm{d}x_a \, \mathrm{d}x^a = g_{ab}(x) \, \mathrm{d}x^a \, \mathrm{d}x^b \,. \tag{355}$$

It is a famous exercise of calculus to show from this expression that a curve $x^a(s)$ depending on a well behaved (affine) parameter s is a timelike or spacelike (metric) *geodesic*, i.e.,
Challenge 890 ny the longest possible path between the two events,** only if

* This is a short section for the more curious; it can be skipped at first reading.

** We remember that in space in everyday life, geodesics are the shortest possible paths; however, in space-time in general relativity, geodesics are the longest possible paths. In both cases, they are the 'straightest' possible paths.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}s}\left(g_{ad}\frac{\mathrm{d}x^d}{\mathrm{d}s}\right) = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial g_{bc}}{\partial x^a}\frac{\mathrm{d}x^b}{\mathrm{d}s}\frac{\mathrm{d}x^c}{\mathrm{d}s}\,, \tag{356}$$

as long as ds is different from zero along the path.* All bodies in free fall follow such geodesics. We showed above that the geodesic property implies that a stone thrown in the air falls back, unless if it is thrown with a speed larger than the escape velocity. Expression (356) thus replaces both the expression $\mathrm{d}^2x/\mathrm{d}t^2 = -\nabla\varphi$ valid for falling bodies and the expression $\mathrm{d}^2x/\mathrm{d}t^2 = 0$ valid for freely floating bodies in special relativity.

Page 510

The path does not depend on the mass or on the material of the body. Therefore *antimatter* also falls along geodesics. In other words, antimatter and matter do not repel; they also attract each other. Interestingly, even experiments performed with normal matter can show this, if they are carefully evaluated. Can you find out how?

Ref. 456

Challenge 891 ny

For completeness, we mention that light follows *lightlike* or *null* geodesics. In other words, there is an affine parameter u such that the geodesics follow

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^2x^a}{\mathrm{d}u^2} + \Gamma^a{}_{bc}\frac{\mathrm{d}x^b}{\mathrm{d}u}\frac{\mathrm{d}x^c}{\mathrm{d}u} = 0 \tag{360}$$

with the different condition

$$g_{ab}\frac{\mathrm{d}x^a}{\mathrm{d}u}\frac{\mathrm{d}x^b}{\mathrm{d}u} = 0\,. \tag{361}$$

Given all these definitions of various types of geodesics, what are the lines drawn in Figure 274 on page 505?

Challenge 892 ny

Mass in general relativity

The diffeomorphism-invariance of general relativity makes life quite interesting. We will see that it allows us to say that we live on the *inside* of a hollow sphere, and that it does not allow us to say where energy is actually located. If energy cannot be located, what about mass? It soon becomes clear that mass, like energy, can be localized *only* if distant space-time is known to be flat. It is then possible to define a localized mass value by making precise an intuitive idea: the mass is measured by the time a probe takes to orbit

* This is often written as

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^2x^a}{\mathrm{d}s^2} + \Gamma^a_{bc}\frac{\mathrm{d}x^b}{\mathrm{d}s}\frac{\mathrm{d}x^c}{\mathrm{d}s} = 0 \tag{357}$$

where the condition

$$g_{ab}\frac{\mathrm{d}x^a}{\mathrm{d}s}\frac{\mathrm{d}x^b}{\mathrm{d}s} = 1 \tag{358}$$

must be fulfilled, thus simply requiring that all the tangent vectors are *unit* vectors, and that d$s \neq 0$ all along the path. The symbols Γ appearing above are given by

$$\Gamma^a{}_{bc} = \left\{ {a \atop bc} \right\} = \frac{1}{2}g^{ad}\left(\partial_b g_{dc} + \partial_c g_{db} - \partial_d g_{bc}\right)\,, \tag{359}$$

and are called *Christoffel symbols of the second kind* or simply the *metric connection*.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

the unknown body.*

The intuitive mass definition *requires* flat space-time at infinity; it cannot be extended to other situations. In short, mass can only be localized if total mass can be defined. And *total mass* is defined only for asymptotically flat space-time. The only other notion of mass that is precise in general relativity is the *local mass density* at a point. In contrast, it is not well understood how to define the mass contained in a region larger than a point but smaller than the entirety of space-time.

Challenge 893 ny

Now that we can go on talking about mass without (too much of) a bad conscience, we turn to the equations of motion.

Is gravity an interaction?

We tend to answer this question affirmatively, as in Galilean physics gravity was seen as an influence on the motion of bodies. In fact, we described it by a potential, implying that gravity *produces* motion. But let us be careful. A force or an interaction is what changes the motion of objects. However, we just saw that when two bodies attract each other through gravitation, both always remain in free fall. For example, the Moon circles the Earth because it continuously falls around it. Since any freely falling observer continuously remains at rest, the statement that gravity changes the motion of bodies is not correct for all observers. Indeed, we will soon discover that in a sense to be discussed shortly, the Moon and the Earth both follow 'straight' paths.

Is this correction of our idea of gravity only a question of words? Not at all. Since gravity is not an interaction, it is *not* due to a field and there is *no* potential.

Page 855

Let us check this strange result in yet another way. The most fundamental definition of 'interaction' is as the difference between the whole and the sum of its parts. In the case of gravity, an observer in free fall could claim that nothing special is going on, independently of whether the other body is present or not, and could claim that gravity is not an interaction.

However, that is going too far. An interaction transports energy between systems. We have indeed seen that gravity can be said to transport energy only approximately. Gravitation is thus an interaction only approximately. But that is not a sufficient reason to abandon this characterization. The concept of energy is not useful for gravity beyond the domain of everyday life. For the general case, namely for a general observer, gravity is thus fundamentally different from electricity or magnetism.

Another way to look at the issue is the following. Take a satellite orbiting Jupiter with energy–momentum $\boldsymbol{p} = m\boldsymbol{u}$. If we calculate the energy–momentum change along its

* This definition was formalized by Arnowitt, Deser and Misner, and since then has often been called the *ADM mass*. The idea is to use the metric g_{ij} and to take the integral

$$m = \frac{1}{16\pi} \int_{S_R} (g_{ij,i} v_j - g_{ii,j} v_j) \mathrm{d}A \tag{362}$$

where S_R is the coordinate sphere of radius R, v is the unit vector normal to the sphere and $\mathrm{d}A$ is the area element on the sphere. The limit exists if space-time is asymptotically flat and if the mass distribution is sufficiently concentrated. Mathematical physicists have also shown that for any manifold whose metric changes at infinity as

Ref. 457

$$g_{ij} = (1 + f/r + O(1/r^2))\delta_{ij} \tag{363}$$

the total mass is given by $M = 2f$.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 894 ny path s, we get

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{p}}{\mathrm{d}s} = m\frac{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{u}}{\mathrm{d}s} = m(\boldsymbol{e}_a\frac{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{u}^a}{\mathrm{d}s} + \frac{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{e}_a}{\mathrm{d}s}\boldsymbol{u}^a) = m\boldsymbol{e}_a(\frac{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{u}^a}{\mathrm{d}s} + \Gamma^a{}_{bd}\boldsymbol{u}^b\boldsymbol{u}^c) = 0 \qquad (364)$$

where $\boldsymbol{e}$ describes the unit vector along a coordinate axis. The energy–momentum Challenge 895 ny change vanishes along any geodesic, as you might check. Therefore, the energy–momentum of this motion is conserved. In other words, *no* force is acting on the satellite. One could reply that in equation (364) the second term alone is the gravitational force. But this term can be made to vanish along the entirety of any given world Ref. 458 line. In short, nothing changes between two bodies in free fall around each other: gravity Challenge 896 ny could be said not to be an interaction. The properties of energy confirm this argument. Challenge 897 s

Of course, the conclusion that gravity is not an interaction is somewhat academic, as it contradicts our experience of daily life. But we will need it for the full understanding of motion later on. The behaviour of radiation confirms the deduction. In vacuum, radiation is always moving freely. In a sense, we can say that radiation always is in free fall. Strangely, since we called free fall the same as rest, we should conclude that radiation always is at rest. This is not wrong! We have already seen that light cannot be accelerated.* We even saw that gravitational bending is not an acceleration, since light follows straight paths in space-time in this case as well. Even though light seems to slow down near masses for distant observers, it always moves at the speed of light locally. In short, even gravitation doesn't manage to move light.

There is another way to show that light is always at rest. A clock for an observer trying to reach the speed of light goes slower and slower. For light, in a sense, time stops: or, if you prefer, *light does not move*.

The essence of general relativity

If a maximum power or force appearing on horizons is the basis for general relativity, one can ask whether physical systems other than space-time can also be described in this way.

For special relativity, we found that all its main effects – such as a limit speed, Lorentz contraction or energy–mass equivalence – are also found for dislocations in solids. Do systems analogous to general relativity exist? Attempts to find such systems have only been partially successful. Several equations and ideas of general relativity are applicable to deformations of solids, since general relativity describes the deformation of the Ref. 459 space-time mattress. Kröner has studied this analogy in great detail. Other systems with horizons, and thus with observables analogous to curvature, are found in certain liquids – where vortices play the role of black holes – and in certain quantum fluids for the propRef. 460 agation of light. Exploring such systems has become a research topic in its own right. A full analogy of general relativity in a macroscopic system was discovered only a few

* Refraction, the slowdown of light inside matter, is not a counter-example. Strictly speaking, light inside matter is constantly being absorbed and re-emitted. In between these processes, light still propagates with the speed of light in vacuum. The whole process only *looks* like a slowdown in the macroscopic limit. The same applies to diffraction and to reflection. A list of apparent ways to bend light can be found on page 737; details of the quantum-mechanical processes at their basis can be found on page 1006.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

years ago. This analogy will be presented in the final part of our adventure; we will need an additional ingredient that is not visible at this point of our ascent.

Riemann gymnastics

Most books introduce curvature the hard way, namely historically,* using the Riemann curvature tensor. This is a short summary, so that you can understand that old stuff when you come across it.

We saw above that curvature is best described by a tensor. In 4 dimensions, this curvature tensor, usually called R, must be a quantity which allows us to calculate, among other things, the area for any orientation of a 2-disc in space-time. Now, in 4 dimensions, orientations of a disc are defined in terms of *two* 4-vectors; let us call them $\boldsymbol{p}$ and $\boldsymbol{q}$. And instead of a disc, we take the *parallelogram* spanned by $\boldsymbol{p}$ and $\boldsymbol{q}$. There are several possible definitions.

Challenge 898 e

The *Riemann-Christoffel curvature tensor* R is then defined as a quantity which allows us to calculate the curvature $K(\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{q})$ for the surface spanned by $\boldsymbol{p}$ and $\boldsymbol{q}$, with area A, through

$$K(\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{q}) = \frac{R\, \boldsymbol{pqpq}}{A^2(\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{q})} = \frac{R_{abcd} p^a q^b p^c q^d}{(g_{\alpha\delta} g_{\beta\gamma} - g_{\alpha\gamma} g_{\beta\delta}) p^\alpha q^\beta p^\gamma q^\delta} \tag{365}$$

where, as usual, Latin indices a, b, c, d, etc. run from 0 to 3, as do Greek indices here, and a *summation* is implied when an index name appears twice. Obviously R is a tensor, of rank 4. This tensor thus describes only the *intrinsic* curvature of a space-time. In contrast, the metric g describes the complete *shape* of the surface, not only the curvature. The curvature is thus the physical quantity of relevance locally, and physical descriptions therefore use only the *Riemann*** *tensor* R or quantities derived from it.***

But we can forget the just-mentioned definition of curvature. There is a second, more physical way to look at the Riemann tensor. We know that curvature means gravity. As we said above, gravity means that when two nearby particles move freely with the same velocity and the same direction, the distance between them changes. In other words, the

Challenge 899 e

* This is a short section for the more curious; it can be skipped at first reading.

** Bernhard Riemann (b. 1826 Breselenz, d. 1866 Selasca), important German mathematician. One among his numerous important achievements is the foundation of non-Euclidean geometry.

*** We showed above that space-time is curved by noting changes in clock rates, in metre bar lengths and in light propagation. Such experiments are the easiest way to determine the metric g. We know that space-time is described by a 4-dimensional manifold M with a metric g_{ab} that locally, at each space-time point, is a Minkowski metric. Such a manifold is called a *Riemannian manifold*. Only such a metric allows one to define a local inertial system, i.e., a local Minkowski space-time at every space-time point. In particular, we have

$$g_{ab} = 1/g^{ab} \quad \text{and} \quad g_a{}^b = g^a{}_b = \delta^a_b \,. \tag{366}$$

How are curvature and metric related? The solution to this question usually occupies a large number of pages in relativity books; just for information, the relation is

$$R^a{}_{bcd} = \frac{\partial \Gamma^a{}_{bd}}{\partial x^c} - \frac{\partial \Gamma^a{}_{bc}}{\partial x^d} + \Gamma^a{}_{ec} \Gamma^e{}_{bd} - \Gamma^a{}_{fd} \Gamma^f{}_{bc} \,. \tag{367}$$

The curvature tensor is built from the second derivatives of the metric. On the other hand, we can also determine the metric if the curvature is known. An approximate relation is given below.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

local effect of gravity is *relative acceleration* of nearby particles.

It turns out that the tensor R describes precisely this relative acceleration, i.e., what we called the *tidal effects* earlier on. Obviously, the relative acceleration $\boldsymbol{b}$ increases with the separation $\boldsymbol{d}$ and the square (why?) of the speed $\boldsymbol{u}$ of the two particles. Therefore we can also define R as a (generalized) proportionality factor among these quantities:

Challenge 900 ny

$$\boldsymbol{b} = R\,\boldsymbol{u}\,\boldsymbol{u}\,\boldsymbol{d} \quad \text{or, more clearly,} \quad b^a = R^a{}_{bcd}\, u^b\, u^c\, d^d \,. \tag{368}$$

The components of the Riemann curvature tensor have the dimensions of inverse square length. Since it contains all information about intrinsic curvature, we conclude that if R vanishes in a region, space-time in that region is flat. This connection is easily deduced from this second definition.*

Challenge 901 ny

A final way to define the tensor R is the following. For a *free-falling* observer, the metric g_{ab} is given by the metric η_{ab} from special relativity. In its neighbourhood, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_{ab} &= \eta_{ab} + \frac{1}{3} R_{acbd} x^c x^d + O(x^3) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (\partial_c \partial_d g_{ab}) x^c x^d + O(x^3) \,. \end{aligned} \tag{370}$$

The curvature term thus describes the departure of the space-time metric from that of flat space-time. The curvature tensor R is a large beast; it has $4^4 = 256$ components at each point of space-time; however, its symmetry properties reduce them to 20 independent numbers.** The actual number of importance in physical problems is still smaller, namely only 10. These are the components of the Ricci tensor, which can be defined with

---

* This second definition is also called the definition through *geodesic deviation*. It is of course not evident that it coincides with the first. For an explicit proof, see the literature. There is also a third way to picture the tensor R, a more mathematical one, namely the original way Riemann introduced it. If one parallel-transports a vector $\boldsymbol{w}$ around a parallelogram formed by two vectors $\boldsymbol{u}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$, each of length ε, the vector $\boldsymbol{w}$ is changed to $\boldsymbol{w} + \delta\boldsymbol{w}$. One then has

Ref. 461

$$\delta\boldsymbol{w} = -\varepsilon^2 R\,\boldsymbol{u}\,\boldsymbol{v}\,\boldsymbol{w} + \quad \text{higher-order terms} \quad . \tag{369}$$

More can be learned about the geodesic deviation by studying the behaviour of the famous south-pointing carriage which we have encountered before. This device, common in China before the compass was discovered, only works if the world is flat. Indeed, on a curved surface, after following a large closed path, it will show a different direction than at the start of the trip. Can you explain why?

Page 191

Challenge 902 ny

** The free-fall definition shows that the Riemann tensor is symmetric in certain indices and antisymmetric in others:

Challenge 903 ny

$$R_{abcd} = R_{cdab} \quad , \quad R_{abcd} = -R_{bacd} = -R_{abdc} \,. \tag{371}$$

These relations also imply that many components vanish. Of importance also is the relation

$$R_{abcd} + R_{adbc} + R_{acdb} = 0 \,. \tag{372}$$

Note that the order of the indices is not standardized in the literature. The list of invariants which can be constructed from R is long. We mention that $\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{abcd} R_{cd}{}^{ef} R_{abef}$, namely the product ${}^*R\,R$ of the Riemann tensor with its dual, is the invariant characterizing the Thirring–Lense effect.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

the help of the Riemann tensor by contraction, i.e., by setting

$$R_{bc} = R^{a}{}_{bac} \,. \tag{373}$$

Its components, like those of the Riemann tensor, are inverse square lengths. The values of the tensor R_{bc}, or those of R^{a}_{bcd}, are independent of the sign convention used in the Minkowski metric, in contrast to R_{abcd}.

Challenge 904 e

Challenge 905 ny

Can you confirm the relation $R_{abcd}R^{abcd} = 48m^2/r^6$ for the Schwarzschild solution?

Curiosities and fun challenges about general relativity

For a long time, people have speculated why the Pioneer 10 and 11 artificial satellites, which are now over 70 astronomical units away from the Sun, are subject to a constant deceleration of $8 \cdot 10^{-10}\ \mathrm{m/s^2}$ (towards the Sun) since they passed the orbit of Saturn. This effect is called the *Pioneer anomaly*. The origin is not clear and still a subject of research. But several investigations have shown that the reason is *not* a deviation from the inverse square dependence of gravitation, as is sometimes proposed. In other words, the effect must be electromagnetic.

Ref. 462

There are many hints that point to an asymmetry in heat radiation emission. Indeed, an front-to-back asymmetry of only 80 W is sufficient to explain the effect. (The on-board generators produce 2.5 kW.) But the source of the asymmetry has not been understood yet. Finding the asymmetry – or another explanation for the deceleration – is one of the challenges of modern space physics.

Ref. 463

Challenge 906 r

Test yourself: could the light mill effect, namely that impinging light pulls the object towards the source, be the reason for the effect?

Page 745

Challenge 907 ny



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 19

WHY CAN WE SEE THE STARS? – MOTION IN THE UNIVERSE

> Zwei Dinge erfüllen das Gemüt mit immer neuer und zunehmender Bewunderung und Ehrfurcht, je öfter und anhaltender sich das Nachdenken damit beschäftigt: der bestirnte Himmel über mir und das moralische Gesetz in mir.*
>
> Immanuel Kant (1724–1804)

On clear nights, between two and five thousand stars are visible with the naked eye. Several hundred of them have names. Indeed, in all parts of the world, the stars and the constellations they form are seen as memories of ancient events, and stories are told about them.** But the simple fact that we can *see* the stars is the basis for a story much more fantastic than all myths. It touches almost all aspects of modern physics.

Which stars do we see?

> Democritus says [about the Milky Way] that it is a region of light emanating from numerous stars small and near to each other, of which the grouping produces the brightness of the whole.
>
> Aetius, *Opinions*. Ref. 465

The stars we see on a clear night are mainly the brightest of our nearest neighbours in the surrounding region of the Milky Way. They lie at distances between four and a few thousand light years from us. Roughly speaking, in our environment there is a star about every 400 cubic light years.

Almost all visible stars are from our own galaxy. The only extragalactic object *constantly* visible to the naked eye in the northern hemisphere is the so-called Andromeda nebula, shown enlarged in Figure 292. It is a whole galaxy like our own, as Immanuel Kant had already conjectured in 1755. Several extragalactic objects are visible with the naked eye in the southern hemisphere: the Tarantula nebula, as well as the large and the small Magellanic clouds. The Magellanic clouds are neighbour galaxies to our own. Other, temporary exceptions are the rare *novae*, exploding stars which can be seen if they

* 'Two things fill the mind with ever new and increasing admiration and awe, the more often and persistently thought considers them: the starred sky above me and the moral law inside me.' Ref. 464

** About the myths around the stars and the constellations, see e.g. the text by G. Fasching, *Sternbilder und ihre Mythen*, Springer Verlag, 1993. On the internet there are also the beautiful www.astro.wisc.edu/~dolan/constellations/ and www.astro.uiuc.edu/~kaler/sow/sow.html websites.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 292 The Andromeda nebula M31, our neighbour galaxy (and the 31st member of the Messier object listing) (NASA)



FIGURE 293 How our galaxy looks in the infrared (NASA)

appear in nearby galaxies, or the still rarer *supernovae*, which can often be seen even in faraway galaxies.

In fact, the visible stars are special in other respects also. For example, telescopes show that about half of them are in fact double: they consist of two stars circling around each other, as in the case of Sirius. Measuring the orbits they follow around each other allows one to determine their masses. Can you explain how?

Challenge 908 ny

Is the universe different from our Milky Way? Yes, it is. There are several arguments to demonstrate this. First of all, our galaxy – the word *galaxy* is just the original Greek term for 'Milky Way' – is *flattened*, because of its rotation. If the galaxy rotates, there must be other masses which determine the background with respect to which this rotation takes place. In fact, there is a huge number of other galaxies – about 10^{11} – in the universe, a discovery dating only from the twentieth century.

Why did our understanding of the place of our galaxy in the universe happen so late? Well, people had the same difficulty as they had when trying to determine the shape of the Earth. They had to understand that the galaxy is not only a milky strip seen on clear nights, but an actual physical system, made of about 10^{11} stars gravitating around each other.* Like the Earth, the galaxy was found to have a three-dimensional *shape*; it

* The Milky Way, or *galaxy* in Greek, was said to have originated when Zeus, the main Greek god, tried to let his son Heracles feed at Hera's breast in order to make him immortal; the young Heracles, in a sign

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 294 The elliptical galaxy NGC 205 (the 205th member of the New Galactic Catalogue) (NASA)

is shown in Figure 293. Our galaxy is a flat and circular structure, with a diameter of 100 000 light years; in the centre, it has a spherical bulge. It rotates about once every 200 to 250 million years. (Can you guess how this is measured?) The rotation is quite slow: since the Sun was formed, it has made only about 20 to 25 full turns around the centre.

Challenge 909 ny

It is even possible to measure the *mass* of our galaxy. The trick is to use a binary pulsar on its outskirts. If it is observed for many years, one can deduce its acceleration around the galactic centre, as the pulsar reacts with a frequency shift which can be measured on Earth. Many decades of observation are needed and many spurious effects have to be eliminated. Nevertheless, such measurements are ongoing. Present estimates put the mass of our galaxy at 10^{42} kg or $5 \cdot 10^{11}$ solar masses.

Ref. 468

What do we see at night?

Astrophysics leads to a strange conclusion about matter, quite different from how we are used to thinking in classical physics: *the matter observed in the sky is found in clouds*. *Clouds* are systems in which the matter density diminishes with the distance from the centre, with no definite border and with no definite size. Most astrophysical objects are best described as clouds.

The Earth is also a cloud, if we take its atmosphere, its magnetosphere and the dust ring around it as part of it. The Sun is a cloud. It is a gas ball to start with, but is even more a cloud if we take into consideration its protuberances, its heliosphere, the solar wind it generates and its magnetosphere. The solar system is a cloud if we consider its

showing his future strength, sucked so forcefully that the milk splashed all over the sky.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 295 The colliding galaxies M51 and M51B (NASA), 65 000 al across, 31 Mal away.



FIGURE 296 The X-rays in the night sky, between 1 and 30 MeV (NASA)

comet cloud, its asteroid belt and its local interstellar gas cloud. The galaxy is a cloud if we remember its matter distribution and the cloud of cosmic radiation it is surrounded by. In fact, even people can be seen as clouds, as every person is surrounded by gases, little dust particles from skin, vapour, etc.

Ref. 466 In the universe, almost all clouds are plasma clouds. A *plasma* is an ionized gas, such as fire, lightning, the inside of neon tubes, or the Sun. At least 99.9 % of all *matter in the universe is in the form of plasma clouds*. Only a very small percentage exists in solid or liquid form, such as toasters, subways or their users.

Clouds in the universe have certain common properties. First, clouds seen in the universe, when undisturbed by collisions or other interactions from neighbouring objects,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 297 Rotating clouds emitting jets along their axis; top row: a composite image (visible and infrared) of the galaxy 0313-192, the galaxy 3C296, and the Vela pulsar; bottom row: the star in formation HH30, the star in formation DG Tauri B, and a black hole jet from the galaxy M87 (all NASA)

are *rotating*. Most clouds are therefore flattened and are in shape of discs. Secondly, in many rotating clouds, matter is falling towards the centre: most clouds are *accretion discs*. Finally, undisturbed accretion discs usually emit something along the rotation axis: they possess *jets*. This basic cloud structure has been observed for young stars, for pulsars, for galaxies, for quasars and for many other systems. Figure 297 gives some examples. (Does the Sun have a jet? Does the Milky Way have a jet? So far, none has been detected – there is still room for discovery.)

Challenge 910 r

In summary, at night we see mostly rotating, flattened plasma clouds emitting jets along their axes. A large part of astronomy and astrophysics collects information about them. An overview about the observations is given in Table 53.

Ref. 467

TABLE 53 Some observations about the universe

Aspect	Main properties	Value
Phenomena		
galaxy formation	observed by Hubble	several times
	trigger event	unknown
galactic collisions	momentum	10^{45} to 10^{47} kg m/s
star formation	cloud collapse	form stars between 0.04 and 200 solar masses
	frequency	between 0 and 1000 solar masses per year per galaxy; around 1 solar mass in the Milky Way
novae	new luminous stars,	$L < 10^{31}$ W
	ejecting bubble	$R \approx t \cdot c/100$
supernovae	new bright stars,	$L < 10^{36}$ W

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Aspect	Main properties	Value
	rate	1 to 5 per galaxy per 1000 a
hypernovae	optical bursts	$L > 10^{37}$ W
gamma-ray bursts	luminosity	L up to 10^{45} W, about one per cent of the whole visible universe's luminosity
	energy	*c.* 10^{46} J
	duration	*c.* 0.015 to 1000 s
	observed number	*c.* 2 per day
radio sources	radio emission	$10^{3}{}^{3}$ to 10^{38} W
X-ray sources	X-ray emission	$10^{2}{}^{3}$ to 10^{34} W
cosmic rays	energy	from 1 eV to 10^{22} eV
gravitational lensing	light bending	angles down to 10^{-4} ″
comets	recurrence, evaporation	typ. period 50 a, typ. visibility lifetime 2 ka, typ. lifetime 100 ka
meteorites	age	up to $4.57 \cdot 10^{9}$ a
Observed components		
intergalactic space	mass density	*c.* 10^{-26} kg/m^3
quasars	red-shift	up to $z = 6$
	luminosity	$L = 10^{40}$ W, about the same as one galaxy
galaxy superclusters	number of galaxies	*c.* 10^{8} inside our horizon
our own local supercluster	number of galaxies	about 4000
galaxy groups	size	100 Zm
	number of galaxies	between a dozen and 1000
our local group	number of galaxies	30
galaxies	size	0.5 to 2 Zm
	number	*c.* 10^{11} inside horizon
	containing	10 to 400 globular clusters
	containing	typically 10^{11} stars each
	containing	typically one supermassive and several intermediate-mass black holes
our galaxy	diameter	1.0(0.1) Zm
	mass	10^{42} kg or $5 \cdot 10^{11}$ solar masses Ref. 468
	speed	600 km/s towards Hydra-Centaurus
	containing	about 30 000 pulsars Ref. 469
	containing	100 globular clusters each with 1 million stars
globular clusters (e.g. M15)	containing	thousands of stars, one intermediate-mass black hole
	age	up to 12 Ga (oldest known objects)
nebulae, clouds	composition	dust, oxygen, hydrogen

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Aspect	Main properties	Value
our local interstellar cloud	size	20 light years
	composition	atomic hydrogen at 7500 K
star systems	types	orbiting double stars, over 70 stars orbited by brown dwarfs, several planetary systems
our solar system	size	2 light years (Oort cloud)
our solar system	speed	368 km/s from Aquarius towards Leo
stars	mass	up to 130 solar masses (except when stars fuse) Ref. 470
giants and supergiants	large size	up to 1 Tm
main sequence stars		
brown dwarfs	low mass	below 0.072 solar masses
	low temperature	below 2800 K Ref. 471
L dwarfs	low temperature	1200 to 2800 K
T dwarfs	low temperature	900 to 1100 K
white dwarfs	small radius	$r \approx 5000\,\mathrm{km}$
	high temperature	cools from 100 000 to 5000 K
neutron stars	nuclear mass density	$\rho \approx 10^{17}\,\mathrm{kg/m^3}$
	small size	$r \approx 10\,\mathrm{km}$
jet sources		
central compact objects		
emitters of X-ray bursts	X-ray emission	
pulsars	periodic radio emission	
	mass	up to around 25 solar masses
magnetars	high magnetic fields	up to 10^{11} T and higher Ref. 472
(soft gamma repeaters, anomalous X-ray pulsars)		
	mass	above 25 solar masses Ref. 473
black holes	horizon radius	$r = 2GM/c^2$, observed mass range from 1 to 100 million solar masses
General properties		
cosmic horizon	distance	$c.\,10^{26}\,\mathrm{m} = 100\,\mathrm{Ym}$
expansion	Hubble's constant	$71(4)\,\mathrm{km\,s^{-1}\,Mpc^{-1}}$ or $2.3(2) \cdot 10^{-18}\,\mathrm{s^{-1}}$
'age' of the universe		13.7(2) Ga
vacuum	energy density	$0.5\,\mathrm{nJ/m^3}$ or $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.73$ for $k = 0$
		no evidence for time-dependence
large-scale shape	space curvature	$k \approx \Omega_K = 0$ Page 581
	topology	simple in our galactic environment, unknown at large scales

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Aspect	Main properties	Value
dimensions	number	3 for space, 1 for time, at low and moderate energies
matter	density	2 to 11 $\cdot 10^{-27}$ kg/m^3 or 1 to 6 hydrogen atoms per cubic metre
		$\Omega_M = 0.25$
baryons	density	$\Omega_b = 0.04$, one sixth of the previous (included in Ω_M)
dark matter	density	$\Omega_{DM} = 0.21$ (included in Ω_M), unknown
dark energy	density	$\Omega_{DM} = 0.75$, unknown
photons	number density	4 to 5 $\cdot 10^8$ /m^3 = 1.7 to 2.1 $\cdot 10^{-31}$ kg/m^3
	energy density	$\Omega_R = 4.6 \cdot 10^{-5}$
neutrinos	energy density	Ω_ν unknown
average temperature	photons	2.725(2) K
	neutrinos	not measured, predicted value is 2 K
perturbations	photon anisotropy	$\Delta T/T = 1 \cdot 10^{-5}$
	density amplitude	$A = 0.8(1)$
	spectral index	$n = 0.97(3)$
	tensor-to-scalar ratio	$r < 0.53$ with 95% confidence
ionization optical depth		$\tau = 0.15(7)$
decoupling		$z = 1100$

But while we are speaking of what we see in the sky, we need to clarify a general issue.

What is the universe?

> I'm astounded by people who want to 'know' the universe when it's hard enough to find your way around Chinatown.
>
> Woody Allen

The term universe implies turning. The universe is what turns around us at night. For a physicist, at least three definitions are possible for the term 'universe':

— The (*visible*) *universe* is the totality of all observable mass and energy. This includes everything inside the cosmological horizon. Since the horizon is moving away from us, the amount of observable mass and energy is constantly increasing. The content of the term 'visible universe' is thus not fixed in time. (What is the origin of this increase? We will come back to this issue later on.)

— The (*believed*) *universe* is the totality of all mass and energy, *including* any that is not visible. Numerous books on general relativity state that there definitely exists matter or energy beyond the observation boundaries. We will explain the origin of this belief below.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 298 The universe is full of galaxies – this photograph shows the Perseus cluster (NASA)

— The (*full*) *universe* is the sum of matter and energy *as well as* space-time itself.

These definitions are often mixed up in physical and philosophical discussions. There is *no* generally accepted consensus on the terms, so one has to be careful. In this text, when we use the term 'universe', we imply the *last* definition only. We will discover repeatedly that without clear distinction between the definitions the complete ascent of Motion Mountain becomes impossible. (For example: Is the amount of matter and energy in the full universe the same as in the visible universe?)

Challenge 911 ny

Note that the 'size' of the visible universe, or better, the distance to its horizon, is a quantity which *can* be imagined. The value of 10^{26} m is not beyond imagination. If one took all the iron from the Earth's core and made it into a wire reaching to the edge of the visible universe, how thick would it be? The answer might surprise you. Also, the content of the universe is clearly finite. There are about as many visible *galaxies* in the universe as there are grains in a cubic metre of sand. To expand on the comparison, can you deduce how much space you would need to contain all the flour you would get if every little speck represented one star?

Challenge 912 ny

Challenge 913 ny

The colour and the motion of the stars

> Ἦ τοι μὲν πρώτιστα Χάος γένετ' ... *
>
> Hesiod, *Theogony*.

* 'Verily, at first chaos came to be ...'. The Theogony, attributed to the probably mythical Hesiodos, was finalized around 700 BCE. It can be read in English and Greek on the www.perseus.tufts.edu website. The famous quotation here is from verse 117.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 299 An atlas of our cosmic environment: illustrations at scales up to 12.5, 50, 250, 5 000, 50 000, 500 000, 5 million, 100 million, 1 000 million and 14 000 million light years (© Richard Powell, www.atlasoftheuniverse.com)

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Obviously, the universe is full of motion. To get to know the universe a bit, it is useful to measure the speed and position of as many objects in it as possible. In the twentieth century, a large number of such observations were obtained from stars and galaxies.
Challenge 914 s (Can you imagine how distance and velocity are determined?) This wealth of data can be summed up in two points.

First of all, on large scales, i.e., averaged over about five hundred million light years, the matter density in the universe is *homogeneous* and *isotropic*. Obviously, at smaller scales inhomogeneities exist, such as galaxies or cheesecakes. Our galaxy for example is
Ref. 474 neither isotropic nor homogeneous. But at large scales the differences average out. This large-scale homogeneity of matter distribution is often called the *cosmological principle*.

The second point about the universe is even more important. In the 1920s, independ-
Ref. 475 ently, Carl Wirtz, Knut Lundmark and Gustaf Stromberg showed that on the whole, galaxies move away from the Earth, and the more so, the more they were distant. There are a few exceptions for nearby galaxies, such as the Andromeda nebula itself; but in general, the speed of flight v of an object increases with distance d. In 1929, the US-American astronomer Edwin Hubble* published the first measurement of the relation between speed and distance. Despite his use of incorrect length scales he found a relation

$$v = H\, d\ , \tag{374}$$

where the proportionality constant H is today called the *Hubble constant*. A graph of the relation is given in Figure 300. The Hubble constant is known today to have a value around $71\,\mathrm{km\,s^{-1}Mpc^{-1}}$. (Hubble's own value was so far from this value that it is not cited any more.) For example, a star at a distance of 2 Mpc** is moving away from Earth with a speed between of around 142 km/s, and proportionally more for stars further away.

In fact, the discovery by Wirtz, Lundmark and Stromberg implies that *every* galaxy
Challenge 915 ny moves away from *all* the others. (Why?) In other words, the matter in the universe is *expanding*. The scale of this expansion and the enormous dimensions involved are amazing. The motion of all the thousand million galaxy groups in the sky is described by the single equation (374)! Some deviations are observed for nearby galaxies, as mentioned above, and for faraway galaxies, as we will see.

The cosmological principle and the expansion taken together imply that the universe cannot have existed before time when it was of vanishing size; the universe thus has a *finite age*. Together with the evolution equations, as explained in more detail below, the Hubble constant points to an age value of around 13 700 million years. The expansion also means that the universe has a *horizon*, i.e., a finite maximum distance for sources whose signals can arrive on Earth. Signals from sources beyond the horizon cannot reach us.

Since the universe is expanding, in the past it has been much smaller and thus much denser than it is now. It turns out that it has also been hotter. George Gamow*** predicted

* Edwin Powell Hubble (1889–1953), important US-American astronomer. After being an athlete and taking a law degree, he returned to his childhood passion of the stars; he finally proved Immanuel Kant's 1755 conjecture that the Andromeda nebula was a galaxy like our own. He thus showed that the Milky Way is only a tiny part of the universe.

Page 923 ** A *megaparsec* or Mpc is a distance of 30.8 Zm.

*** George Gamow (b. 1904 Odessa, d. 1968 St. Boulder), Russian-American physicist; he explained alpha

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 300 The relation between star distance and star velocity

Ref. 476 in 1948 that since hot objects radiate light, the sky cannot be completely black at night, but must be filled with black-body radiation emitted when it was 'in heat'. That radiation, called the *background radiation*, must have cooled down due to the expansion of the Challenge 916 ny universe. (Can you confirm this?) Despite various similar predictions by other authors, in one of the most famous cases of missed scientific communication, the radiation was found only much later, by two researchers completely unaware of all this work. A famous Ref. 477 paper in 1964 by Doroshkevich and Novikov had even stated that the antenna used by the (unaware) later discoverers was the best device to search for the radiation! In any case, only in 1965 did Arno Penzias and Robert Wilson discover the radiation. It was in one of the most beautiful discoveries of science, for which both later received the Nobel Ref. 478 Prize for physics. The radiation turns out to be described by the black-body radiation for a body with a temperature of 2.7 K; it follows the black-body dependence to a precision of about 1 part in 10^4.

But apart from expansion and cooling, the past fourteen thousand million years have also produced a few other memorable events.

Do stars shine every night?

> Don't the stars shine beautifully? I am the only person in the world who knows why they do.
> Friedrich (Fritz) Houtermans (1903–1966)

Stars seem to be there for ever. In fact, every now and then a new star appears in the sky: a *nova*. The name is Latin and means 'new'. Especially bright novae are called *supernovae*. Novae and similar phenomena remind us that stars usually live much longer than humans, but that like us, they are born, shine and die.

decay as a tunnelling effect and predicted the microwave background. He wrote the first successful popular science texts, such as *1, 2, 3, infinity* and the *Mr. Thompkins* series, which were later imitated by many others.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 301 The Hertzsprung–Russell diagram (© Richard Powell)

It turns out that one can plot all stars on the so-called *Hertzsprung–Russell diagram*. This diagram, central to every book on astronomy, is shown in Figure 301. It is a beautiful example of a standard method used by astrophysicists: collecting statistics over many examples of a type of object, one can deduce the life cycle of the object, even though their lifetime is much longer than that of a human. For example, it is possible, by clever use of the diagram, to estimate the age of stellar clusters, and thus arrive at a minimum age of the universe. The result is around thirteen thousand million years.

The finite lifetime of stars leads to restrictions on their visibility, especially for high red-shifts. Indeed, modern telescope can look at places (and times) so far in the past that they contained no stars yet. At those distances one only observes *quasars*; these light sources are not stars, but much more massive and bright systems. Their precise structure is still being studied by astrophysicists.

Since the stars shine, they were also *formed* somehow. Over millions of years, vast dust clouds in space can contract, due to the influence of gravity, and form a dense, hot and rotating structure: a new star. The fascinating details of their birth from dust clouds are a central part of astrophysics, but we will not explore them here.

Yet we do not have the full answer to our question. Why do stars shine at all? Clearly, they shine because they are hot. They are hot because of nuclear reactions in their interior.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Page 1250 We will discuss these processes in more detail in the chapter on the nucleus.

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSE

> Anima scintilla stellaris essentiae.*
> Heraclitus of Ephesus (*c.* 540 to *c.* 480 BCE)

Ref. 479

Ref. 480 The adventures the universe has experienced, or better, the adventures the matter and radiation inside it have experienced, are summarized in Table 54. The steps not yet discussed will be studied in quantum theory. This history table has applications no theoretical physicist would have imagined. The sequence is so beautiful and impressive that nowadays it is used in certain psychotherapies to point out to people the story behind their existence and to remind them of their own worth. Enjoy.

TABLE 54 A short history of the universe

TIME FROM NOW[a]	TIME FROM BIG BANG[b]	EVENT	TEMPERATURE
$\approx 14 \cdot 10^9$ a	$\approx t_{\mathrm{Pl}}$ [b]	Time, space, matter and initial conditions indeterminate	10^{32} K $\approx T_{\mathrm{Pl}}$
$13 \cdot 10^9$ a	*c.* 800 t_{Pl} $\approx 10^{-42}$ s	Distinction of space-time from matter and radiation, initial conditions determinate	10^{30} K
	10^{-35} s to 10^{-32} s	**Inflation & GUT epoch** starts; strong and electroweak interactions diverge	$5 \cdot 10^{26}$ K
	10^{-12} s	Antiquarks annihilate; electromagnetic and weak interaction separate	10^{15} K
	$2 \cdot 10^{-6}$ s	Quarks get confined into hadrons; universe is a plasma	10^{13} K
		Positrons annihilate	
	0.3 s	Universe becomes transparent for neutrinos	10^{10} K
	a few seconds	**Nucleosynthesis**: D, ^{4}He, ^{3}He and ^{7}Li *nuclei* form; radiation still dominates	10^9 K
	2500 a	**Matter domination** starts; density perturbations magnify	75 000 K
$z = 1100$	380 000 a	**Recombination**: during these latter stages of the big bang, H, He and Li *atoms* form, and the universe becomes 'transparent' for light, as matter and radiation decouple, i.e., as they acquire different temperatures; the 'night' sky starts to get darker and darker	3000 K
		Sky is almost black except for black-body radiation	$T_\gamma = T_0(1+z)$
$z = 10$ to 30		**Galaxy formation**	
$z = 6$		Oldest object seen so far	

* 'The soul is a spark of the substance of the stars.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Time from now[a]	Time from big bang[b]	Event	Temperature
$z = 5$		Galaxy clusters form	
$z = 3$	10^6 a	First generation of stars (population II) is formed, starting hydrogen fusion; helium fusion produces carbon, silicon and oxygen	
	$2 \cdot 10^9$ a	First stars explode as supernovae[c]; iron is produced	
$z = 1$	$3 \cdot 10^9$ a	Second generation of stars (population I) appears, and subsequent supernova explosions of the ageing stars form the trace elements (Fe, Se, etc.) we are made of and blow them into the galaxy	
$4.7 \cdot 10^9$ a		Primitive cloud, made from such explosion remnants, collapses; Sun forms	
$4.6 \cdot 10^9$ a		**Earth** and other planet **formation**: Azoicum starts	
$4.3 \cdot 10^9$ a		Craters form on the planets	
$4.0 \cdot 10^9$ a		Moon forms from material ejected during the collision of a large asteroid with the still-liquid Earth	
$4.0 \cdot 10^9$ a		**Archean** eon (Archaeozoicum) starts: bombardment from space stops; Earth's crust solidifies; oldest minerals form; water condenses	
$3.5 \cdot 10^9$ a		Unicellular (microscopic) life appears; stromatolites form	
$2.5 \cdot 10^9$ a		**Proterozoic** eon ('age of first life') starts: atmosphere becomes rich in oxygen thanks to the activity of microorganisms Ref. 481	
$1 \cdot 10^9$ a		Macroscopic, multicellular life appears	
$800 \cdot 10^6$ a		Earth is completely covered with ice for the first time (reason still unknown) Ref. 482	
600 to $540 \cdot 10^6$ a		Earth is completely covered with ice for the last time	
$540(5) \cdot 10^6$ a		**Paleozoic** era (Palaeozoicum, 'age of old life') starts, after a gigantic ice age: animals appear, oldest fossils (with 540(5) start of Cambrian, 495(5) Ordovician, 440(5) Silurian, 417(5) Devonian, 354(5) Carboniferous and 292(5) Permian periods)	
$450 \cdot 10^6$ a		Land plants appear	
$370 \cdot 10^6$ a		Wooden trees appear	
$250(5) \cdot 10^6$ a		**Mesozoic** era (Mesozoicum, 'age of middle life', formerly called Secondary) starts: most insects and other life forms are exterminated; mammals appear (with 250(5) start of Triassic, 205(4) Jurassic and 142(3) Cretaceous periods)	
$150 \cdot 10^6$ a		Continent Pangaea splits into Laurasia and Gondwana	

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Time from now[a]	Time from big bang[b]	Event	Temperature
		The star cluster of the Pleiades forms	
$150 \cdot 10^6$ a		Birds appear	
$142(3) \cdot 10^6$ a		Golden time of dinosaurs (Cretaceous) starts	
$100 \cdot 10^6$ a		Start of formation of Alps, Andes and Rocky Mountains	
$65.5 \cdot 10^6$ a		**Cenozoic** era (Caenozoicum, 'age of new life') starts: dinosaurs become extinct after an asteroid hits the Earth in the Yucatan; primates appear (with 65.5 start of Tertiary, consisting of Paleogene period with Paleocene, 55.0 Eocene and 33.7 Oligocene epoch, and of Neogene period, with 23.8 Miocene and 5.32 Pliocene epoch; then 1.81 Quaternary period with Pleistocene (or Diluvium) and 0.01 Holocene (or Alluvium) epoch)	
$50 \cdot 10^6$ a		Large mammals appear	
$7(1) \cdot 10^6$ a		Hominids appears	
$3 \cdot 10^6$ a		Supernova explodes, with following consequences: more intense cosmic radiation, higher formation rate of clouds, Earth cools down drastically, high evolutionary pressure on the hominids and as a result, Homo appears Ref. 483	
500 000 a		Formation of youngest stars in galaxy	
500 000 a		Homo sapiens appears	
100 000 a		Beginning of last ice age	
90 000 a		Homo sapiens sapiens appears	
11 800 a		End of last ice age, start of Holocene	
6 000 a		First written texts	
2 500 a		Physics starts	
500 a		Use of coffee, pencil and modern physics starts	
200 a		Electricity use begins	
100 a		Einstein publishes	
10 to 120 a		You are a unicellular being	
present	*c.* $14 \cdot 10^9$ a	You are reading this	$T_\gamma = 2.73$ K, $T_\nu \approx 1.6$ K, $T_\mathrm{b} \approx 0$ K
future		You enjoy life; for details and reasons, see page 800	

a. The time coordinate used here is the one given by the coordinate system defined by the microwave background radiation, as explained on page 584. A year is abbreviated 'a' (Latin 'annus'). Errors in the last digits are given between parentheses.
b. This quantity is not exactly defined since the big bang is not a space-time event. More on this issue on page 1427.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

c. The history of the atoms on Earth shows that we are made from the leftovers of a supernova. We truly are made of *stardust*.

The geological time scale is the one of the International Commission on Stratigraphy; the times are measured through radioactive dating.

Despite its length and its interest, this table has its limitations. For example, what happened elsewhere in the last few thousand million years? There is still a story to be written of which next to nothing is known. For obvious reasons, investigations have been rather Earth-centred.

Research in astrophysics is directed at discovering and understanding all phenomena observed in the skies. Here we skip most of this fascinating topic, since as usual, we want to focus on motion. Interestingly, general relativity allows us to explain many of the general observations about motion in the universe.

The history of space-time

> A number of rabbits run away from a central point in various directions, all with the same speed. While running, one rabbit turns its head, and makes a startling observation. What does it see?

Challenge 917 s

The data showing that the universe is sprinkled with stars all over lead to a simple conclusion: the universe cannot be static. Gravity always changes the distances between bodies; the only exceptions are circular orbits. Gravity also changes the *average* distances between bodies: gravity always tries to collapse clouds. The biggest cloud of all, the one formed by all the matter in the universe, must therefore either be collapsing, or still be in expansion.

Ref. 484 The first to dare to draw this conclusion was Aleksander Friedmann.* In 1922 he deduced the detailed evolution of the universe in the case of homogeneous, isotropic mass distribution. His calculation is a classic example of simple but powerful reasoning. For a universe which is homogeneous and isotropic for every point, the line element is given by

Challenge 918 ny

$$ds^2 = c^2 dt^2 - a^2(t)(dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2) \tag{375}$$

and matter is described by a density ρ_M and a pressure p_M. Inserting all this into the field

* Aleksander Aleksandrowitsch Friedmann (1888–1925), Russian physicist who predicted the expansion of the universe. Following his early death from typhus, his work remained almost unknown until Georges A. Lemaître (b. 1894 Charleroi, d. 1966 Leuven), Belgian priest and cosmologist, took it up and expanded it in 1927, focusing, as his job required, on solutions with an initial singularity. Lemaître was one of the propagators of the (erroneous!) idea that the big bang was an 'event' of 'creation' and convinced his whole organization of it. The Friedmann–Lemaître solutions are often erroneously called after two other physicists, who studied them again much later, in 1935 and 1936, namely H.P. Robertson and A.G. Walker.

Page 590, page 591

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

equations, we get two equations

$$\left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\right)^2 + \frac{k}{a^2} = \frac{8\pi G}{3}\rho_{\mathrm{M}} + \frac{\Lambda}{3} \quad \text{and} \tag{376}$$

$$\ddot{a} = -\frac{4\pi G}{3}(\rho_{\mathrm{M}} + 3p_{\mathrm{M}})\, a + \frac{\Lambda}{3}\, a \tag{377}$$

which imply

$$\dot{\rho}_{\mathrm{M}} = -3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}(\rho_{\mathrm{M}} + p_{\mathrm{M}}) \,. \tag{378}$$

At the present time t_0, the pressure of matter is negligible. (In the following, the index 0 refers to the present time.) In this case, the expression $\rho_{\mathrm{M}} a^3$ is constant in time.

Equations (376) and (377) depend on only two constants of nature: the gravitational constant G, related to the maximum force or power in nature, and the cosmological constant Λ, describing the energy density of the vacuum, or, if one prefers, the smallest force in nature.

Challenge 919 ny

Before we discuss the equations, first a few points of vocabulary. It is customary to relate all mass densities to the so-called *critical mass density* ρ_{c} given by

$$\rho_{\mathrm{c}} = \frac{3H_0^2}{8\pi G} \approx (8 \pm 2) \cdot 10^{-27}\,\mathrm{kg/m^3} \tag{379}$$

corresponding to about 8, give or take 2, hydrogen atoms per cubic metre. On Earth, one would call this value an extremely good *vacuum*. Such are the differences between everyday life and the universe as a whole. In any case, the critical density characterizes a matter distribution leading to an evolution of the universe just between never-ending expansion and collapse. In fact, this density is the critical one, leading to a so-called *marginal* evolution, only in the case of *vanishing* cosmological constant. Despite this restriction, the term is now used for this expression in all other cases as well. One thus speaks of dimensionless mass densities Ω_{M} defined as

$$\Omega_{\mathrm{M}} = \rho_0/\rho_{\mathrm{c}} \,. \tag{380}$$

The cosmological constant can also be related to this critical density by setting

$$\Omega_\Lambda = \frac{\rho_\Lambda}{\rho_{\mathrm{c}}} = \frac{\Lambda c^2}{8\pi G \rho_{\mathrm{c}}} = \frac{\Lambda c^2}{3H_0^2} \,. \tag{381}$$

A third dimensionless parameter Ω_{K} describes the curvature of space. It is defined in terms of the present-day radius of the universe R_0 and the curvature constant $k = \{1, -1, 0\}$ as

$$\Omega_{\mathrm{K}} = \frac{-k}{R_0^2\, H_0^2} \tag{382}$$

and its sign is opposite to the one of the curvature k; Ω_{K} vanishes for vanishing curvature.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 302 The ranges for the Ω parameters and their consequences

Note that a positively curved universe, when homogeneous and isotropic, is necessarily closed and of finite volume. A flat or negatively curved universe with the same matter distribution can be open, i.e., of infinite volume, but does not need to be so. It could be simply or multiply connected. In these cases the topology is not completely fixed by the curvature.

The present-time Hubble parameter is defined by $H_0 = \dot{a}_0/a_0$. From equation (376) we then get the central relation

Challenge 920 ny

$$\Omega_M + \Omega_\Lambda + \Omega_K = 1 \,. \tag{383}$$

In the past, when data were lacking, physicists were divided into two camps: the *claustrophobics* believing that $\Omega_K > 0$ and the *agoraphobics* believing that $\Omega_K < 0$. More details about the measured values of these parameters will be given shortly. The diagram of Figure 302 shows the most interesting ranges of parameters together with the corresponding behaviours of the universe.

For the Hubble parameter, the most modern measurements give a value of

$$H_0 = 71 \pm 4\,\mathrm{km/sMpc} = 2.3 \pm 2 \cdot 10^{-18}\,/\mathrm{s} \tag{384}$$

which corresponds to an age of the universe of 13.7 ± 2 thousand million years. In other words, the age deduced from the history of space-time agrees with the age, given above, deduced from the history of stars.

To get a feeling of how the universe evolves, it is customary to use the so-called *decel-*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 303 The evolution of the universe's scale a for different values of its mass density

eration parameter q_0. It is defined as

$$q_0 = -\frac{\ddot{a}_0}{a_0 H_0^2} = \frac{1}{2}\Omega_M - \Omega_\Lambda \,. \tag{385}$$

The parameter q_0 is positive if the expansion is slowing down, and negative if the expansion is accelerating. These possibilities are also shown in the diagram.

An even clearer way to picture the expansion of the universe for vanishing pressure is to rewrite equation (376) using $\tau = t\,H_0$ and $x(\tau) = a(t)/a(t_0)$, yielding

$$\begin{aligned} (\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}\tau})^2 + U(x) &= \Omega_K \\ \text{with } U(x) &= -\Omega_\Lambda x - \Omega_\Lambda x^2 \end{aligned} \tag{386}$$

This looks like the evolution equation for the motion of a particle with mass 1, with total energy Ω_K in a potential $U(x)$. The resulting evolutions are easily deduced.

For vanishing Ω_Λ, the universe either expands for ever, or recollapses, depending on the value of the mass–energy density.

For non-vanishing (positive) Ω_Λ, the potential has exactly one maximum; if the particle has enough energy to get over the maximum, it will accelerate continuously. That is the situation the universe seems to be in today.

For a certain time range, the result is shown in Figure 303. There are two points to be noted: first the set of possible curves is described by *two* parameters, not one. In addition, lines cannot be drawn down to zero size. There are two main reasons: we do not yet understand the behaviour of matter at very high energy, and we do not understand the behaviour of space-time at very high energy. We return to this important issue later on.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 304 The long-term evolution of the universe's scale factor a for various parameters

The main conclusion to be drawn from Friedmann's work is that a homogeneous and isotropic universe is *not static*: it either expands or contracts. In either case, it has a *finite age*. This profound idea took many years to spread around the cosmology community; even Einstein took a long time to get accustomed to it.

Note that due to its isotropic expansion, the universe has a preferred reference frame: the frame defined by average matter. The time measured in that frame is the time listed in Table 54 and is the one we assume when we talk about the *age* of the universe.

An overview of the possibilities for the long time evolution is given in Figure 304. The evolution can have various outcomes. In the early twentieth century, people decided among them by personal preference. Albert Einstein first preferred the solution $k = 1$ and $\Lambda = a^{-2} = 4\pi G\rho_M$. It is the unstable solution found when $x(\tau)$ remains at the top of the potential $U(x)$.

In 1917, the Dutch physicist Willem de Sitter had found, much to Einstein's personal dismay, that an empty universe with $\rho_M = p_M = 0$ and $k = 1$ is also possible. This type of universe expands for large times. The de Sitter universe shows that in special cases, matter is not needed for space-time to exist.

Challenge 921 ny

Lemaître had found expanding universes for positive mass, and his results were also contested by Einstein at first. When later the first measurements confirmed the calculations, the idea of a massive and expanding universe became popular. It became the standard model in textbooks. However, in a sort of collective blindness that lasted from

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 305 The fluctuations of the cosmic background radiation (WMAP/NASA)

around 1950 to 1990, almost everybody believed that $\Lambda = 0$.* Only towards the end of the twentieth century did experimental progress allow one to make statements based on evidence rather than beliefs or personal preferences, as we will find out shortly. But first of all we will settle an old issue.

Why is the sky dark at night?

> In der Nacht hat ein Mensch nur ein Nachthemd an, und darunter kommt gleich der Charakter.**
>
> Rober Musil

First of all, the sky is not black at night. It has the same intrinsic colour as during the day, as any long-exposure photograph shows. (See, for example, Figure 98.) But that colour, like the colour of the sky during the day, is not due to the temperature of the sky, but to scattered light from the stars. If we look for the real colour of the sky, we need to look for its thermal radiation. Indeed, measurements show that even the empty sky is not completely cold or black at night. It is filled with radiation of around 200 GHz; more precise measurements show that the radiation corresponds to the thermal emission of a body at 2.73 K. This *background radiation* is the thermal radiation left over from the big bang.

Ref. 485 The universe is indeed colder than the stars. But why is this so? If the universe were homogeneous on large scales and infinitely large, it would have an infinite number of stars. Looking in any direction, we would see the surface of a star. The night sky would Challenge 923 s be as bright as the surface of the Sun! Can you convince your grandmother about this?

In a deep forest, one sees a tree in every direction. Similarly, in a 'deep' universe, we

Challenge 922 ny * In this case, for $\Omega_M \geqslant 1$, the age of the universe follows $t_0 \leqslant 2/(3H_0)$, where the limits correspond. For vanishing mass density one has $t_0 = 1/H_0$.

** 'At night, a person is dressed only with a nightgown, and directly under it there is the character.' Robert Musil (b. 1880 Klagenfurt, d. 1942 Geneva), German writer.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

would see a star in every direction. Now, the average star has a surface temperature of about 6000 K. If we lived in a deep and old universe, we would effectively live inside an oven with a temperature of around 6000 K, making it impossible to enjoy ice cream.

This paradox was most clearly formulated in 1823 by the astronomer Wilhelm Olbers.* As he extensively discussed the question, it is also called *Olbers' paradox*. Today we know that even if all matter in the universe were converted into radiation, the universe would still not be as bright as just calculated. In other words, the power and lifetime of stars are much too low to produce the oven brightness just mentioned. So something is wrong.

Ref. 486

In fact, two main effects can be invoked to avoid the contradiction. First, since the universe is finite in age, distant stars are shining for less time. We see them in a younger stage or even during their formation, when they were darker. As a result, the share of brightness of distant stars is smaller than that of nearby stars, so that the average temperature of the sky is reduced.** Secondly, we could imagine that the radiation of distant stars is red-shifted and that the volume the radiation must fill is increasing continuously, so that the average temperature of the sky is also reduced.

Calculations are necessary to decide which effect is the greater one. This issue has been studied in great detail by Paul Wesson; he explains that the first effect is larger than the second by a factor of about three. We may thus state correctly that the sky is dark at night *mostly* because the universe has a finite age. We can add that the sky would be somewhat brighter if the universe were not expanding.

Ref. 487

Ref. 485

In addition, the darkness of the sky is possible only because the speed of light is finite. Can you confirm this?

Challenge 925 ny

Finally, the darkness of the sky also tells us that the universe has a *large* (but finite) age. Indeed, the 2.7 K background radiation is that cold, despite having been emitted at 3000 K, because it is red-shifted, thanks to the Doppler effect. Under reasonable assumptions, the temperature T of this radiation changes with the scale factor $R(t)$ of the universe as

Ref. 488

$$T \sim \frac{1}{R(t)} \,. \tag{387}$$

In a young universe, we would thus not be able to see the stars, even if they existed.

From the brightness of the sky at night, measured to be about $3 \cdot 10^{-13}$ times that of an average star like the Sun, we can deduce something interesting: the density of stars in the universe must be much smaller than in our galaxy. The density of stars in the galaxy can be deduced by counting the stars we see at night. But the average star density in the galaxy would lead to much higher values for the night brightness if it were constant throughout the universe. We can thus deduce that the galaxy is much *smaller* than the

Ref. 486

* Heinrich Wilhelm Matthäus Olbers (b. 1758 Arbergen, d. 1840 Bremen), astronomer. He discovered two planetoids, Pallas and Vesta, and five comets; he developed the method of calculating parabolic orbits for comets which is still in use today. Olbers also actively supported the mathematician and astronomer Friedrich Wilhelm Bessel in his career choice. The paradox is named after Olbers, though others had made similar points before, such as the Swiss astronomer Jean Philippe Loÿs de Cheseaux in 1744 and Johannes Kepler in 1610.

Page 126

** Can you explain that the sky is not black just because it is painted black or made of black chocolate? Or more generally, that the sky is not made of and does not contain any dark and cold substance, as Olbers himself suggested, and as John Herschel refuted in 1848?

Challenge 924 ny

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

universe simply by measuring the brightness of the night sky and by counting the stars in the sky! Can you make the explicit calculation? Challenge 926 ny

In summary, the sky is black at night because space-time and matter are of finite, but old age. As a side issue, here is a quiz: is there an Olbers' paradox also for gravitation? Challenge 927 ny

Is the universe open, closed or marginal?

> - Doesn't the vastness of the universe make you feel small?
> - I can feel small without any help from the universe.
>
> Anonymous

Sometimes the history of the universe is summed up in two words: *bang!...crunch*. But will the universe indeed recollapse, or will it expand for ever? Or is it in an intermediate, marginal situation? The parameters deciding its fate are the mass density and cosmological constant.

The main news of the last decade of twentieth-century astrophysics are the experimental results allowing one to determine all these parameters. Several methods are being used. The first method is obvious: determine the speed and distance of distant stars. For large distances, this is difficult, since the stars are so faint. But it has now become possible to search the sky for supernovae, the bright exploding stars, and to determine their distance from their brightness. This is presently being done with the help of computerized searches of the sky, using the largest available telescopes. Ref. 489

A second method is the measurement of the anisotropy of the cosmic microwave background. From the observed power spectrum as a function of the angle, the curvature of space-time can be deduced.

A third method is the determination of the mass density using the gravitational lensing effect for the light of distant quasars bent around galaxies or galaxy clusters. Page 595

A fourth method is the determination of the mass density using galaxy clusters. All these measurements are expected to improve greatly in the years to come.

At present, these four completely independent sets of measurements provide the values Ref. 490

$$(\Omega_M, \Omega_\Lambda, \Omega_K) \approx (0.3, 0.7, 0.0) \tag{388}$$

where the errors are of the order of 0.1 or less. The values imply that *the universe is spatially flat, its expansion is accelerating and there will be no big crunch*. However, no definite statement on the topology is possible. We will return to this last issue shortly. Page 596

In particular, the data show that the density of matter, including all dark matter, is only about one third of the critical value.* Two thirds are given by the cosmological term. For

* The difference between the total matter density and the separately measurable baryonic matter density, only about one sixth of the former value, is also not explained yet. It might even be that the universe contains matter of a type unknown so far. This issue is called the *dark matter problem*; it is one of the important unsolved questions of cosmology.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

the cosmological constant Λ one gets the value

$$\Lambda = \Omega_\Lambda \frac{3H_0^2}{c^2} \approx 10^{-52}/\mathrm{m}^2 \,. \tag{389}$$

This value has important implications for quantum theory, since it corresponds to a vacuum energy density

$$\rho_\Lambda c^2 = \frac{\Lambda c^4}{8\pi G} \approx 0.5\,\mathrm{nJ/m^3} \approx \frac{10^{-46}\,(\mathrm{GeV})^4}{(\hbar c)^3} \,. \tag{390}$$

But the cosmological term also implies a negative vacuum pressure $p_\Lambda = -\rho_\Lambda c^2$. Inserting this result into the relation for the potential of universal gravity deduced from relativity

Page 553

$$\Delta\varphi = 4\pi G(\rho + 3p/c^2) \tag{391}$$

Ref. 491 we get

$$\Delta\varphi = 4\pi G(\rho_\mathrm{M} - 2\rho_\Lambda) \,. \tag{392}$$

Challenge 928 ny Thus the gravitational acceleration is

$$a = \frac{GM}{r^2} - \frac{\Lambda}{3}c^2 r = \frac{GM}{r^2} - \Omega_\Lambda H_0^2\, r \,, \tag{393}$$

which shows that a *positive* vacuum energy indeed leads to a *repulsive* gravitational effect. Inserting the mentioned value (389) for the cosmological constant Λ we find that the repulsive effect is small even for the distance between the Earth and the Sun. In fact, the order of magnitude of the repulsive effect is so much smaller than that of attraction that one cannot hope for a direct experimental confirmation of this deviation from universal gravity at all. Challenge 929 ny Probably astrophysical determinations will remain the only possible ones. A positive gravitational constant manifests itself through a positive component in the expansion rate, as we will see shortly.

But the situation is puzzling. The origin of this cosmological constant is *not* explained by general relativity. This mystery will be solved only with the help of quantum theory. In any case, the cosmological constant is the first local and quantum aspect of nature detected by astrophysical means.

Why is the universe transparent?

Could the universe be filled with water, which is transparent, as maintained by some popular books in order to explain rain? Ref. 492 No. Even if it were filled with air, the total mass would never have allowed the universe to reach the present size; it would have recollapsed much earlier and we would not exist. Challenge 930 ny

The universe is thus transparent because it is mostly empty. But *why* is it so empty? First of all, in the times when the size of the universe was small, all antimatter annihilated with the corresponding amount of matter. Only a tiny fraction of matter, which originally

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

was slightly more abundant than antimatter, was left over. This 10^{-9} fraction is the matter
Page 1288 we see now. As a consequence, there are 10^9 as many photons in the universe as electrons or quarks.

In addition, 380 000 years after antimatter annihilation, all available nuclei and electrons recombined, forming atoms, and their aggregates, like stars and people. No free charges interacting with photons were lurking around any more, so that from that period onwards light could travel through space as it does today, being affected only when it hits a star or dust particle.

If we remember that the average density of the universe is $10^{-26}\,\mathrm{kg/m^3}$ and that most of the matter is lumped by gravity in galaxies, we can imagine what an excellent vacuum lies in between. As a result, light can travel along large distances without noticeable hindrance.

But why is the vacuum transparent? That is a deeper question. Vacuum is transparent because it contains no electric charges and no horizons: charges or horizons are indispensable in order to absorb light. In fact, quantum theory shows that vacuum does
Page 1189 contain so-called *virtual* charges. However, virtual charges have no effects on the transmission of light.

The big bang and its consequences

> Μελέτη θανάτου. Learn to die.
> Plato, *Phaedo*, 81a.

Above all, the big bang model, which is deduced from the colour of the stars and galaxies, states that about fourteen thousand million years ago the whole universe was extremely
Page 868 small. This fact gave the big bang its name. The term was created (with a sarcastic un-
Ref. 493 dertone) in 1950 by Fred Hoyle, who by the way never believed that it applies to nature. Nevertheless, the term caught on. Since the past smallness of the universe be checked directly, we need to look for other, verifiable consequences. The central ones are the following:

— all matter moves away from all other matter;
— the mass of the universe is made up of about 75% hydrogen and 23% helium;
— there is thermal background radiation of about 2.7 K;
— the maximal age for any system in the universe is around fourteen thousand million years;
— there are background neutrinos with a temperature of about 2 K;*
— for non-vanishing cosmological constant, Newtonian gravity is slightly reduced.

All predictions except the last two have been confirmed by observations. Technology will probably not allow us to check the last two in the foreseeable future; however, there is no evidence against them.

Competing descriptions of the universe have not been so successful in matching
Ref. 493 observations. In addition, theoretical arguments state that with matter distributions such as the observed one, and some rather weak general assumptions, there is no way to avoid
Ref. 494 a period in the *finite* past in which the universe was extremely small. Therefore it is worth

* The theory states that $T_\nu/T_\gamma \approx (4/11)^{1/3}$. These neutrinos appeared about 0.3 s after the big bang.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

having a close look at the situation.

Was the big bang a big bang?

Was it a kind of explosion? This description implies that some material transforms internal energy into motion of its parts. There was no such process in the early history of the universe. In fact, a better description is that space-time is expanding, rather than matter moving. The mechanism and the origin of the expansion is *unknown* at this point of our mountain ascent. Because of the importance of spatial expansion, the whole phenomenon cannot be called an explosion at all. And obviously there neither was nor is any sound carrying medium in interstellar space, so that one cannot speak of a 'bang' in any sense of the term.

Was it big? The visible universe was rather small about fourteen thousand million years ago, much smaller than an atom. In summary, the big bang was neither big nor a bang; but the rest is correct.

Was the big bang an event?

The big bang theory is a description of what happened in the *whole* of space-time. Despite what is often written in careless newspaper articles, at every moment of the expansion space has been of non-vanishing size: space was *never* a single point. People who pretend it was are making ostensibly plausible, but false statements. The big bang theory is a description of the *expansion* of space-time, not of its beginning. Following the motion of matter back in time, general relativity cannot deduce the existence of an initial singularity. The issue of measurement errors is probably not a hindrance; however, the effect of the nonlinearities in general relativity at situations of high energy densities is not clear.

Most importantly, quantum theory shows that the big bang was *not* a true singularity, as no physical observable, neither density nor temperature, ever reaches an infinitely large (or infinitely small) value. Such values cannot exist in nature.* In any case, there is a general agreement that arguments based on *pure* general relativity alone cannot make correct statements about the big bang. Nevertheless, most statements in newspaper articles are of this sort.

Page 1436

Was the big bang a beginning?

Asking what was before the big bang is like asking what is north of the North Pole. Just as nothing is north of the North Pole, so nothing 'was' before the big bang. This analogy could be misinterpreted to imply that the big bang took its start at a single point in time, which of course is incorrect, as just explained. But the analogy is better than it looks: in fact, there is *no* precise North Pole, since quantum theory shows that there is a fundamental indeterminacy as to its position. There is also a corresponding indeterminacy for the big bang.

In fact, it does not take more than three lines to show with quantum theory that time and space are *not* defined either at or near the big bang. We will give this simple argument in the first chapter of the final part of our mountain ascent. The big bang therefore cannot

Page 1401

* Many physicists are still wary of making such strong statements on this point. The first sections of the final part of our mountain ascent give the precise arguments leading to them.

Page 1396

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

be called a 'beginning' of the universe. There never was a time when the scale factor $a(t)$ of the universe was zero.

This conceptual mistake is frequently encountered. In fact, quantum theory shows that near the big bang, events can *neither* be ordered *nor* even be defined. More bluntly, there is *no* beginning; there has never been an initial event or singularity.

Obviously the concept of time is not defined 'outside' or 'before' the existence of the universe; this fact was already clear to thinkers over a thousand years ago. It is then tempting to conclude that time must have *started*. But as we saw, that is a logical mistake as well: first of all, there is no starting event, and secondly, time does not flow, as clarified already in the beginning of our walk.

Ref. 495 Page 51

A similar mistake lies behind the idea that the universe had certain 'initial conditions.' Initial conditions *by definition* make sense only for objects or fields, i.e., for entities which can be observed from the outside, i.e., for entities which have an environment. The universe does not comply with this requirement; it thus cannot have initial conditions. Nevertheless, many people still insist on thinking about this issue; interestingly, Stephen Hawking sold millions of copies of a book explaining that a description without initial conditions is the most appealing, overlooking the fact that there is no other possibility anyway.*

Page 185 Ref. 496

In summary, the big bang is not a beginning, nor does it imply one. We will uncover the correct way to think about it in the final part of our mountain ascent.

Does the big bang imply creation?

> "[The general theory of relativity produces] universal doubt about god and his creation."
>
> A witch hunter

Creation, i.e., the appearance of something out of nothing, needs an existing concept of space and time to make sense. The concept of 'appearance' makes no sense otherwise. But whatever the description of the big bang, be it classical, as in this chapter, or quantum mechanical, as in later ones, this condition is never fulfilled. Even in the present, classical description of the big bang, which gave rise to its name, there is *no* appearance of matter, nor of energy, nor of anything else. And this situation does not change in any later, improved description, as time or space are never defined *before* the appearance of matter.

Page 862

In fact, all properties of a creation are missing: there is no 'moment' of creation, no appearance from nothing, no possible choice of any 'initial' conditions out of some set of possibilities, and as we will see in more detail later on, not even any choice of particular physical 'laws' from any set of possibilities.

In summary, the big bang does not imply nor harbour a creation process. The big bang was not an event, not a beginning and *not* a case of creation. It is impossible to continue the ascent of Motion Mountain if one cannot accept each of these three conclusions. To deny them is to continue in the domain of beliefs and prejudices, thus effectively giving up on the mountain ascent.

Challenge 931 ny

* This statement will still provoke strong reactions among physicists; it will be discussed in more detail in the section on quantum theory.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 306 The transmittance of the atmosphere (NASA)

Note that this requirement is not new. In fact, it was already contained in equation (1) at the start of our walk, as well as in all the following ones. It appears even more clearly at this point. But what then *is* the big bang? We'll find out in the last part of our ascent. We now return to the discussion of what the stars can tell us about nature.

Page 54

Why can we see the Sun?

First of all, the Sun is visible because air is transparent. It is not self-evident that air is transparent; in fact it is transparent only to *visible* light and to a few selected other frequencies. Infrared and ultraviolet radiation are mostly absorbed. The reasons lie in the behaviour of the molecules the air consists of, namely mainly nitrogen, oxygen and a few other transparent gases. Several moons and planets in the solar system have opaque atmospheres: we are indeed lucky to be able to see the stars at all.

In fact, even air is not completely transparent; air molecules *scatter* light a little bit. That is why the sky and distant mountains appear blue and sunsets red,* and stars are invisible during daylight. At many wavelengths far from the visible spectrum the atmosphere is even opaque, as Figure 306 shows. (It is also opaque for all wavelengths shorter than 200 nm, up to gamma rays. On the long wavelength range, it remains transparent up to wavelength of around 10 to 20 m, depending on solar activity, when the extinction by the ionosphere sets in.)

Secondly, we can see the Sun because the Sun, like all hot bodies, *emits* light. We describe the details of *incandescence*, as this effect is called, below.

Page 793

Thirdly, we can see the Sun because we and our environment and the Sun's environment are *colder* than the Sun. In fact, incandescent bodies can be distinguished from their background only if the background is colder. This is a consequence of the properties of incandescent light emission, usually called *black-body radiation*. The radiation is

* Air scattering makes the sky blue also at night, as can be proven by long-exposure photographs. (See, for example, Figure 98.) However, our eyes are not able to perceive this, and the low levels of light make it appear black to us.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

material-independent, so that for an environment with the same temperature as the body, nothing can be seen at all. Just have a look at the photograph on page 770 as a proof.

Finally, we can see the Sun because it is not a black hole. If it were, it would emit (almost) no light.

Obviously, each of these conditions applies to stars as well. For example, we can only see them because the night sky is black. But then, how to explain the multicoloured sky?

Why are the colours of the stars different?

Stars are visible because they emit visible light. We have encountered several important effects which determine colours: the diverse temperatures among the stars, the Doppler shift due to a relative speed with respect to the observer, and the gravitational red-shift.

Not all stars are good approximations to black bodies, so that the black-body radiation law does not always accurately describe their colour. However, most stars are reasonable approximations of black bodies. The temperature of a star depends mainly on its size, its mass, its composition and its age, as astrophysicists are happy to explain. Orion is a good example of a coloured constellation: each star has a different colour. Long-exposure photographs beautifully show this.

Page 768
Ref. 497
Page 84

The basic colour determined by temperature is changed by two effects. The first, the *Doppler red-shift* z, depends on the speed v between source and observer as

Challenge 932 ny

$$z = \frac{\Delta\lambda}{\lambda} = \frac{f_S}{f_O} - 1 = \sqrt{\frac{c+v}{c-v}} - 1 \,. \tag{394}$$

Such shifts play a significant role only for remote, and thus faint, stars visible through the telescope. With the naked eye, Doppler shifts cannot be seen. But Doppler shifts can make distant stars shine in the infrared instead of in the visible domain. Indeed, the highest Doppler shifts observed for luminous objects are larger than 5.0, corresponding to a recessional speed of more than 94 % of the speed of light. Note that in the universe, the red-shift is also related to the scale factor $R(t)$ by

Challenge 933 ny

$$z = \frac{R(t_0)}{R(t_{\text{emission}})} - 1 \,. \tag{395}$$

Light at a red-shift of 5.0 was thus emitted when the universe was one sixth of its present age.

The other colour-changing effect, the *gravitational red-shift* z_g, depends on the matter density of the source and is given by

$$z_g = \frac{\Delta\lambda}{\lambda} = \frac{f_S}{f_0} - 1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{2GM}{c^2 R}}} - 1 \,. \tag{396}$$

It is usually quite a bit smaller than the Doppler shift. Can you confirm this?

Challenge 934 ny

No other red-shift processes are known; moreover, such processes would contradict all the known properties of nature. But the colour issue leads to the next question.

Page 603

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 55 The colour of the stars

Class	Temperature	Example	Location	Colour
O	30 kK	Mintaka	δ Orionis	blue-violet
O	31(10) kK	Alnitak	ζ Orionis	blue-violet
B	22(6) kK	Bellatrix	γ Orionis	blue
B	26 kK	Saiph	κ Orionis	blue-white
B	12 kK	Rigel	β Orionis	blue-white
B	25 kK	Alnilam	ε Orionis	blue-white
B	17(5) kK	Regulus	α Leonis	blue-white
A	9.9 kK	Sirius	α Canis Majoris	blue-white
A	8.6 kK	Megrez	δ Ursae Majoris	white
A	7.6(2) kK	Altair	α Aquilae	yellow-white
F	7.4(7) kK	Canopus	α Carinae	yellow-white
F	6.6 kK	Procyon	α Canis Minoris	yellow-white
G	5.8 kK	Sun	ecliptic	yellow
K	3.5(4) kK	Aldebaran	α Tauri	orange
M	2.8(5) kK	Betelgeuse	α Orionis	red
D	<80 kK	–	–	any

Note. White dwarfs, or class-D stars, are remnants of imploded stars, with a size of only a few tens of kilometres. Not all are white; they can be yellow or red. They comprise 5% of all stars. None is visible with the naked eye. Temperature uncertainties in the last digit are given between parentheses.
The size of all other stars is an independent variable and is sometimes added as roman numerals at the end of the spectral type. (Sirius is an A1V star, Arcturus a K2III star.) Giants and supergiants exist in all classes from O to M.
To accommodate brown dwarfs, two new star classes, L and T, have been proposed.

Are there dark stars?

It could be that some stars are not seen because they are dark. This could be one explanation for the large amount of dark matter seen in the recent measurements of the background radiation. This issue is currently of great interest and hotly debated. It is known that objects more massive than Jupiter but less massive than the Sun can exist in states which emit hardly any light. They are called *brown dwarfs*. It is unclear at present how many such objects exist. Many of the so-called extrasolar 'planets' are probably brown dwarfs. The issue is not yet settled.

Page 604 Another possibility for dark stars are black holes. These are discussed in detail below.

Are all stars different? – Gravitational lenses

"Per aspera ad astra."*

* 'Through hardship to the stars.' A famous Latin motto. Often incorrectly given as 'per ardua at astra'.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 307 How one star can lead to several images

Are we sure that at night, two stars are really different? The answer is no. Recently, it was shown that two 'stars' were actually two images of the same object. This was found by comparing the flicker of the two images. It was found that the flicker of one image was exactly the same as the other, just shifted by 423 days. This result was found by the Estonian astrophysicist Jaan Pelt and his research group while observing two images of quasars in the system Q0957+561. Ref. 498

The two images are the result of *gravitational lensing*, as shown in Figure 307. Indeed, a large galaxy can be seen between the two images, much nearer to the Earth. This effect had been already considered by Einstein; however he did not believe that it was observable. The real father of gravitational lensing is Fritz Zwicky, who predicted in 1937 that the effect would be quite common and easy to observe, if lined-up galaxies instead of lined-up stars were considered, as indeed turned out to be the case. Ref. 499

Interestingly, when the time delay is known, astronomers are able to determine the size of the universe from this observation. Can you imagine how? Challenge 935 ny

In fact, if the two observed objects are lined up exactly behind each other, the more distant one is seen as *ring* around the nearer one. Such rings have indeed been observed, and the galaxy image around a central foreground galaxy at B1938+666, shown in Figure 308, is one of the most beautiful examples. In 2005, several cases of gravitational lensing by stars were also discovered. More interestingly, three events where one of the two stars has a Earth-mass planet have also been observed. The coming years will surely lead to many additional observations, helped by the sky observation programme in the southern hemisphere that checks the brightness of about 100 million stars every night.

Generally speaking, images of nearby stars are truly unique, but for the distant stars the problem is tricky. For single stars, the issue is not so important, seen overall. Reassuringly, only about 80 multiple star images have been identified so far. But when whole galaxies are seen as several images at once (and several dozens are known so far) we might start to get nervous. In the case of the galaxy cluster CL0024+1654, shown in Figure 309, seven thin, elongated, blue images of the same distant galaxy are seen around the yellow, nearer, elliptical galaxies.

But multiple images can be created not only by gravitational lenses; the *shape* of the universe could also play some tricks.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 308 The Zwicky-Einstein ring B1938+666, seen in the radio spectrum (left) and in the optical domain (right) (NASA)



FIGURE 309 Multiple blue images of a galaxy formed by the yellow cluster CL0024+1654 (NASA)

What is the shape of the universe?

There is a popular analogy which avoids some of the just-mentioned problems. The universe in its evolution is similar to the surface of an ever-expanding sphere: the surface is finite, but it has no boundary. The universe simply has an additional dimension; therefore its volume is also ever increasing, finite, but without boundary. This statement presupposes that the universe has the same topology, the same 'shape' as that of a sphere with an additional dimension.

Ref. 500 But what is the experimental evidence for this statement? There is none. Nothing is yet known about the shape of the universe. It is extremely hard to determine it, simply because of its sheer size.

What do experiments say? In the nearby region of the universe, say within a few million light years, the topology is simply connected. But for large distances, almost nothing is certain. Maybe research into gamma-ray bursts will tell us something about the topol-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

ogy, as these bursts often originate from the dawn of time.* Maybe even the study of fluctuations of the cosmic background radiation can tell us something. All this research is still in its infancy.

Since little is known, we can ask about the range of possible answers. As just mentioned, in the standard model with $k = 1$, space-time is usually assumed to be a product of linear time, with the topology R of the real line, and a sphere S^3 for space. That is the simplest possible shape, corresponding to a *simply-connected* universe. For $k = 0$, the simplest topology of space is three-dimensional real space $\mathbb{R}^3$, and for $k = -1$ it is a hyperbolic manifold $\boldsymbol{H}^3$.

Page 582 In addition, Figure 302 showed that depending on the value of the cosmological constant, space could be finite and bounded, or infinite and unbounded. In Friedmann–Lemaître calculations, simple-connectedness is usually tacitly assumed, even though it is not at all required.

It could well be that space-time is *multiply* connected, like a higher-dimensional version of a torus. It could also have even more complex topologies.** In these cases, it could even be that the actual number of galaxies is much smaller than the observed number. This situation would correspond to a kaleidoscope, where a few beads produce a large number of images. In addition, topological surprises could also be hidden *behind* the horizon.

In fact, the range of possibilities is not limited to the simply and multiply connected cases suggested by classical physics. An additional and completely unexpected twist will appear in the last part of our walk, when quantum theory is included in the investigations. Page 1435

What is behind the horizon?

> The universe is a big place; perhaps the biggest.
> Kilgore Trout, *Venus on the Half Shell*.

The horizon is a tricky entity. In fact, all cosmological models show that it moves rapidly away from us. A detailed investigation shows that for a matter-dominated universe the horizon moves away from us with a velocity Ref. 502 Challenge 936 ny

$$v_{\text{horizon}} = 3c \,. \tag{397}$$

A pretty result, isn't it? Obviously, since the horizon does not transport any signal, this is not a contradiction of relativity. But what is behind the horizon?

If the universe is *open* or *marginal*, the matter we see at night is predicted by naively applied general relativity to be a – literally – infinitely small part of all matter existing. Indeed, an open or marginal universe implies that there is an infinite amount of matter behind the horizon. Is such a statement verifiable? Challenge 937 ny

* The story is told from the mathematical point of view by Bob Osserman, *Poetry of the Universe*, 1996.

** The Friedmann–Lemaître metric is also valid for any quotient of the just-mentioned simple topologies by a group of isometries, leading to dihedral spaces and lens spaces in the case $k = 1$, to tori in the case $k = 0$, and to *any* hyperbolic manifold in the case $k = -1$. Ref. 501

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

In a *closed* universe, matter is still predicted to exist behind the horizon; however, in this case it is only a finite amount.

In short, the standard model of cosmology states that there is a lot of matter behind the horizon. Like most cosmologists, we sweep the issue under the rug and take it up only later in our walk. A precise description of the topic is provided by the hypothesis of inflation.

Why are there stars all over the place? – Inflation

What were the initial conditions of matter? Matter was distributed in a constant density over space expanding with great speed. How could this happen? The person who has explored this question most thoroughly is Alan Guth. So far, we have based our studies of the night sky, cosmology, on two observational principles: the isotropy and the homogeneity of the universe. In addition, the universe is (almost) flat. Inflation is an attempt to understand the origin of these observations. Flatness at the present instant of time is strange: the flat state is an unstable solution of the Friedmann equations. Since the universe is still flat after fourteen thousand million years, it must have been even flatter near the big bang.

Ref. 503 Guth argued that the precise flatness, the homogeneity and the isotropy could follow if in the first second of its history, the universe had gone through a short phase of exponential size increase, which he called *inflation*. This exponential size increase, by a factor of about 10^{26}, would homogenize the universe. This extremely short evolution would be driven by a still-unknown field, the *inflaton field*. Inflation also seems to describe correctly the growth of inhomogeneities in the cosmic background radiation.

However, so far, inflation poses as many questions as it solves. Twenty years after his initial proposal, Guth himself is sceptical on whether it is a conceptual step forward. The final word on the issue has not been said yet.

Why are there so few stars? – The energy and entropy content of the universe

> Die Energie der Welt ist constant. Die Entropie der Welt strebt einem Maximum zu.*
>
> Rudolph Clausius

The matter–energy density of the universe is near the critical one. Inflation, described in the previous section, is the favourite explanation for this connection. This implies that the actual number of stars is given by the behaviour of matter at extremely high temperatures, and by the energy density left over at lower temperature. The precise connection is still the topic of intense research. But this issue also raises a question about the quotation above. Was the creator of the term 'entropy', Rudolph Clausius, right when he made this famous statement? Let us have a look at what general relativity has to say about all this.

In general relativity, a *total* energy can indeed be defined, in contrast to *localized* energy, which cannot. The total energy of all matter and radiation is indeed a constant of motion.

* 'The energy of the universe is constant. Its entropy tends towards a maximum.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

It is given by the sum of the baryonic, luminous and neutrino parts:

$$E = E_b + E_\gamma + E_\nu \approx \frac{c^2 M_0}{T_0} + \ldots + \ldots \approx \frac{c^2}{G} + \ldots \,. \tag{398}$$

This value is constant only when integrated over the whole universe, not when just the inside of the horizon is taken.*

Many people also add a gravitational energy term. If one tries to do so, one is obliged to define it in such a way that it is exactly the negative of the previous term. This value for the gravitational energy leads to the popular speculation that the *total* energy of the universe might be zero. In other words, the number of stars could also be limited by this relation.

However, the discussion of *entropy* puts a strong question mark behind all these seemingly obvious statements. Many people have tried to give values for the entropy of the
Ref. 504 universe. Some have checked whether the relation

$$S = \frac{kc^3}{G\hbar}\frac{A}{4} = \frac{kG}{\hbar c} 4\pi M^2 \,, \tag{399}$$

Challenge 938 ny which is correct for black holes, also applies to the universe. This assumes that all the matter and all the radiation of the universe can be described by some average temperature. They argue that the entropy of the universe is surprisingly low, so that there must be some ordering principle behind it. Others even speculate over where the entropy of the universe comes from, and whether the horizon is the source for it.

But let us be careful. Clausius assumes, without the slightest doubt, that the universe is a closed system, and thus deduces the statement quoted above. Let us check this assumption. Entropy describes the maximum energy that can be extracted from a hot object. After the discovery of the particle structure of matter, it became clear that entropy is also given by the number of microstates that can make up a specific macrostate. But neither definition makes any sense if applied to the universe as a whole. There is no way to extract energy from it, and no way to say how many microstates of the universe would look like the macrostate.

The basic reason is the impossibility of applying the concept of *state* to the universe.
Page 34 We first defined the state as all those properties of a system which allow one to distinguish it from other systems with the same intrinsic properties, or which differ from one observer to another. You might want to check for yourself that for the universe, such state
Challenge 939 s properties do not exist at all.

We can speak of the state of space-time and we can speak of the state of matter and energy. But we cannot speak of the state of the universe, because the concept makes no sense. If there is no state of the universe, there is no entropy for it. And neither is there an energy value. This is in fact the only correct conclusion one can draw about the issue.

* Except for the case when pressure can be neglected.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Why is matter lumped?

We are able to see the stars because the universe consists mainly of empty space, in other words, because stars are small and far apart. But why is this the case? Cosmic expansion was deduced and calculated using a homogeneous mass distribution. So why did matter lump together?

It turns out that homogeneous mass distributions are *unstable*. If for any reason the density fluctuates, regions of higher density will attract more matter than regions of lower density. Gravitation will thus cause the denser regions to increase in density and the regions of lower density to be depleted. Can you confirm the instability, simply by assuming a space filled with dust and $a = GM/r^2$? In summary, even a tiny quantum fluctuation in the mass density will lead, after a certain time, to lumped matter.

Challenge 940 ny

But how did the first inhomogeneities form? That is one of the big problems of modern physics and astrophysics, and there is no accepted answer yet. Several modern experiments are measuring the variations of the cosmic background radiation spectrum with angular position and with polarization; these results, which will be available in the coming years, might provide some information on the way to settle the issue.

Ref. 505

Why are stars so small compared with the universe?

Given that the matter density is around the critical one, the size of stars, which contain most of the matter, is a result of the interaction of the elementary particles composing them. Below we will show that general relativity (alone) cannot explain any size appearing in nature. The discussion of this issue is a theme of quantum theory.

Page 620

Are stars and galaxies moving apart or is the universe expanding?

Can we distinguish between space expanding and galaxies moving apart? Yes, we can. Can you find an argument or devise an experiment to do so?

Challenge 941 ny

The expansion of the universe does not apply to the space on the Earth. The expansion is calculated for a homogeneous and isotropic mass distribution. Matter is neither homogeneous nor isotropic inside the galaxy; the approximation of the cosmological principle is not valid down here. It has even been checked experimentally, by studying atomic spectra in various places in the solar system, that there is *no* Hubble expansion taking place around us.

Ref. 506

Is there more than one universe?

The existence of 'several' universes might be an option when we study the question whether we see all the stars. But you can check that neither definition of 'universe' given above, be it 'all matter-energy' or 'all matter–energy and all space-time', allows us to answer the question positively.

Challenge 942 ny

There is no way to define a plural for universe: either the universe is everything, and then it is unique, or it is not everything, and then it is not the universe. We will discover that quantum theory does not change this conclusion, despite recurring reports to the contrary.

Page 1094

Whoever speaks of many universes is talking gibberish.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Why are the stars fixed? – Arms, stars and Mach's principle

> Si les astres étaient immobiles, le temps et l'espace n'existeraient plus.*
>
> Maurice Maeterlink.

The two arms possessed by humans have played an important role in discussions about motion, and especially in the development of relativity. Looking at the stars at night, we can make a simple observation, if we keep our arms relaxed. Standing still, our arms hang down. Then we turn rapidly. Our arms lift up. In fact they do so whenever we see the stars turning. Some people have spent a large part of their lives studying this phenomenon. Why?

Ref. 507 Stars and arms prove that motion is relative, not absolute.** This observation leads to two possible formulations of what Einstein called *Mach's principle*.

— *Inertial frames are determined by the rest of the matter in the universe.*

This idea is indeed realized in general relativity. No question about it.

— *Inertia is due to the* interaction *with the rest of the universe.*

This formulation is more controversial. Many interpret it as meaning that the *mass* of an object depends on the distribution of mass in the rest of the universe. That would mean that one needs to investigate whether mass is anisotropic when a large body is nearby. Of course, this question has been studied experimentally; one simply needs to measure whether a particle has the same mass values when accelerated in different directions. Ref. 508 Unsurprisingly, to a high degree of precision, no such anisotropy has been found. Many therefore conclude that Mach's principle is wrong. Others conclude with some pain in Ref. 509 their stomach that the whole topic is not yet settled.

But in fact it is easy to see that Mach *cannot* have meant a mass variation at all: one then would also have to conclude that mass is distance-dependent, even in Galilean physics. But this is known to be false; nobody in his right mind has ever had any doubts Challenge 943 e about it.

The whole debate is due to a misunderstanding of what is meant by 'inertia': one can interpret it as inertial *mass* or as inertial *motion* (like the moving arms under the stars). There is no evidence that Mach believed either in anisotropic mass or in distance-dependent mass; the whole discussion is an example people taking pride in not making a mistake which is incorrectly imputed to another, supposedly more stupid, person.***

Obviously, inertial effects do depend on the distribution of mass in the rest of the universe. Mach's principle is correct. Mach made some blunders in his life (he is infamous for opposing the idea of atoms until he died, against experimental evidence) but

* 'If the stars were immobile, time and space would not exist any more.' Maurice Maeterlink (1862–1949) is a famous Belgian dramatist.

** The original reasoning by Newton and many others used a bucket and the surface of the water in it; but the arguments are the same.

*** For another example, at school one usually hears that Columbus was derided because he thought the Earth to be spherical. But he was not derided at all for this reason; there were only disagreements on the *size* of the Earth, and in fact it turned out that his critics were right, and that he was wrong in his own, much too small, estimate of the radius.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

his principle is *not* one of them. Unfortunately it is to be expected that the myth about the incorrectness of Mach's principle will persist, like that of the derision of Columbus. Ref. 509

In fact, Mach's principle is valuable. As an example, take our galaxy. Experiments show that it is flattened and rotating. The Sun turns around its centre in about 250 million years. Indeed, if the Sun did not turn around the galaxy's centre, we would fall into it in about 20 million years. As the physicist Dennis Sciama pointed out, from the shape of our galaxy we can draw a powerful conclusion: there must be a lot of other matter, i.e., a lot of other stars and galaxies in the universe. Can you confirm his reasoning? Challenge 944 s

At rest in the universe

There is no preferred frame in special relativity, no absolute space. Is the same true in the actual universe? No; there *is* a preferred frame. Indeed, in the standard big-bang cosmology, the average galaxy is at rest. Even though we talk about the big bang, any average galaxy can rightly maintain that it is at rest. Each one is in free fall. An even better realization of this privileged frame of reference is provided by the background radiation.

In other words, the night sky is black because we move with almost no speed through background radiation. If the Earth had a large velocity relative to the background radiation, the sky would be bright even at night, thanks to the Doppler effect for the background radiation. In other words, the fact that the night sky is dark in all directions is a consequence of our slow motion against the background radiation.

This 'slow' motion has a speed of 368 km/s. (This is the value of the motion of the Sun; there are variations due to addition of the motion of the Earth.) The speed value is large in comparison to everyday life, but small compared to the speed of light. More detailed studies do not change this conclusion. Even the motion of the Milky Way and that of the local group against the cosmic background radiation is of the order of 600 km/s; that is still much slower than the speed of light. The reasons why the galaxy and the solar system move with these 'low' speeds across the universe have already been studied in our walk. Can you give a summary? Challenge 945 ny

By the way, is the term 'universe' correct? Does the universe rotate, as its name implies? If by universe one means the whole of experience, the question does not make sense, because rotation is only defined for bodies, i.e., for parts of the universe. However, if by universe one only means 'all matter', the answer *can* be determined by experiments. Ref. 510 It turns out that the rotation is extremely small, if there is any: measurements of the cosmic background radiation show that in the lifetime of the universe, it cannot have rotated by more than a hundredth of a millionth of a turn! In short, 'universe' is a misnomer.

Does light attract light?

Another reason why we can see stars is that their light reaches us. But why are travelling light rays not disturbed by each other's gravitation? We know that light is energy and that any energy attracts other energy through gravitation. In particular, light is electromagnetic energy, and experiments have shown that all electromagnetic energy is subject to gravitation. Could two light beams that are advancing with a small angle between them converge, because of mutual gravitational attraction? That could have measurable and possibly interesting effects on the light observed from distant stars.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The simplest way to explore the issue is to study the following question: Do parallel light beams remain parallel? Interestingly, a precise calculation shows that mutual gravitation does *not* alter the path of two parallel light beams, even though it *does* alter the path of antiparallel light beams.* The reason is that for parallel beams moving at light speed, the gravitomagnetic component exactly *cancels* the gravitoelectric component.

Ref. 511

Challenge 946 ny

Since light does not attract light moving along, light is not disturbed by its own gravity during the millions of years that it takes to reach us from distant stars. Light does not attract or disturb light moving alongside. So far, all known quantum-mechanical effects also confirm this conclusion.

Does light decay?

In the section on quantum theory we will encounter experiments showing that light is made of particles. It is plausible that these photons might *decay* into some other particle, as yet unknown, or into lower-frequency photons. If that actually happened, we would not be able to see distant stars.

But any decay would also mean that light would change its direction (why?) and thus produce blurred images for remote objects. However, no blurring is observed. In addition, the Soviet physicist Matvey Bronstein demonstrated in the 1930s that any light decay process would have a larger rate for smaller frequencies. When people checked the shift of radio waves, in particular the famous 21 cm line, and compared it with the shift of light from the same source, no difference was found for any of the galaxies tested.

Challenge 947 ny

Ref. 512

People even checked that Sommerfeld's fine-structure constant, which determines the colour of objects, does not change over time. Despite an erroneous claim in recent years, no change could be detected over thousands of millions of years.

Ref. 513

Of course, instead of decaying, light could also be *hit* by some hitherto unknown entity. But this possibility is excluded by the same arguments. These investigations also show that there is no additional red-shift mechanism in nature apart from the Doppler and gravitational red-shifts.

Challenge 948 ny

Page 593

The visibility of the stars at night has indeed shed light on numerous properties of nature. We now continue our mountain ascent with a more general issue, nearer to our quest for the fundamentals of motion.



* Antiparallel beams are parallel beams travelling in opposite directions.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 20

BLACK HOLES – FALLING FOREVER

> Qui iacet in terra non habet unde cadat.*
>
> Alanus de Insulis

Why study black holes?

Black holes are the most extreme gravitational phenomena. They realize nature's limit of length-to-mass ratios. They produce the highest force value possible in nature; as a result, they produce high space-time curvatures. Therefore, black holes cannot be studied *without* general relativity. In addition, the study of black holes is a major stepping stone towards unification and the final description of motion.

Ref. 406 'Black hole' is shorthand for 'gravitationally completely collapsed object'. For many years it was unclear whether or not they exist. But the available experimental data have now led most experts to conclude that there is a black hole at the centre of most galaxies, Ref. 514 including our own. Black holes are also suspected at the heart of quasars and of gamma ray bursters. It seems that the evolution of galaxies is strongly tied to the evolution of black holes. In addition, half a dozen smaller black holes have been identified elsewhere in our galaxy. For these and many other reasons, black holes, the most impressive, the Ref. 515 most powerful and the most relativistic systems in nature, are a fascinating subject of study.

Horizons

The escape velocity is the speed needed to launch an projectile in such a way that it never falls back down. The escape velocity depends on the mass and the size of the planet from which the launch takes place. What happens when a planet or star has an escape velocity that is larger than the speed of light c? Such objects were first imagined by the British geologist John Michell in 1784, and independently by the French mathematician Pierre Ref. 516 Laplace in 1795, long before general relativity was developed. Michell and Laplace realized something fundamental: even if an object with such a high escape velocity were a hot star, it would appear to be completely *black*. The object would not allow any light to leave it; in addition, it would block all light coming from behind it. In 1967, John Wheeler**

* 'He who lies on the ground cannot fall down from it.' The author's original name is Alain de Lille (*c.* 1128–1203).

** John Archibald Wheeler (1911–), US-American physicist, important expert on general relativity and author of several excellent textbooks, among them the beautiful John A. Wheeler, *A Journey into Gravity and Spacetime*, Scientific American Library & Freeman, 1990, in which he explains general relativity with

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 310 The light cones in the equatorial plane around a non-rotating black hole, seen from above

Ref. 406 coined the now standard term *black hole*.

It only takes a short calculation to show that light cannot escape from a body of mass Challenge 949 ny M whenever the radius is smaller than a critical value given by

$$R_S = \frac{2GM}{c^2} \tag{400}$$

called the *Schwarzschild radius*. The formula is valid both in universal gravity and in general relativity, provided that in general relativity we take the radius as meaning the circumference divided by 2π. Such a body realizes the limit value for length-to-mass ratios in nature. For this and other reasons to be given shortly, we will call R_S also the *size* of the black hole of mass M. (But note that it is only half the diameter. In addition, the term 'size' has to be taken with some grain of salt.) In principle, it is possible to imagine an object with a smaller length-to-mass ratio; but nobody has yet observed one. In fact, we will discover that there is no way to observe an object smaller than the Schwarzschild radius, just as an object moving faster than the speed of light cannot be observed. However, we can observe black holes – the limit case – just as we can observe entities moving at the speed of light.

When a test mass approaches the critical radius R_S, two things happen. First, the local proper acceleration for (imaginary) point masses increases without bound. For realistic objects of finite size, the black hole realizes the highest force possible in nature. Something that falls into a black hole cannot be pulled back out. A black hole thus swallows all matter that falls into it. It acts like a cosmic vacuum cleaner.

At the surface of a black hole, the red-shift factor for a distant observer also increases without bound. The ratio between the two quantities is called the *surface gravity* of a Challenge 950 ny black hole. It is given by

$$g_{\text{surf}} = \frac{GM}{R_S^2} = \frac{c^4}{4GM} = \frac{c^2}{2R_S} \,. \tag{401}$$

A black hole thus does not allow any light to leave it.

passion and in detail, but without any mathematics.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

A surface that realizes the force limit and an infinite red-shift makes it is impossible to send light, matter, energy or signals of any kind to the outside world. A black hole is thus surrounded by a horizon. We know that a horizon is a limit surface. In fact, a horizon is a limit in two ways. First, a horizon is a limit to communication: nothing can communicate across it. Secondly, a horizon is a surface of maximum force and power. These properties are sufficient to answer all questions about the effects of horizons. For example: What happens when a light beam is sent upwards from the horizon? And from slightly above the horizon?

Challenge 951 ny

Black holes, regarded as astronomical objects, are thus different from planets. During the formation of planets, matter lumps together; as soon as it cannot be compressed any further, an equilibrium is reached, which determines the radius of the planet. That is the same mechanism as when a stone is thrown towards the Earth: it stops falling when it *hits* the ground. A 'ground' is formed whenever matter hits other matter. In the case of a black hole, there is no ground; everything *continues* falling. That is why, in Russian, black holes used to be called *collapsars*.

This continuous falling takes place when the concentration of matter is so high that it overcomes all those interactions which make matter *impenetrable* in daily life. In 1939, Robert Oppenheimer* and Hartland Snyder showed theoretically that a black hole forms whenever a star of sufficient mass stops burning. When a star of sufficient mass stops burning, the interactions that form the 'floor' disappear, and everything continues falling without end.

Ref. 517

A *black hole is matter in permanent free fall.* Nevertheless, its radius for an outside observer remains constant! But that is not all. Furthermore, because of this permanent free fall, black holes are the only state of matter in thermodynamic equilibrium! In a sense, floors and all other every-day states of matter are metastable: these forms are not as stable as black holes.

The characterizing property of a black hole is thus its *horizon*. The first time we encountered horizons was in special relativity, in the section on accelerated observers. The horizons due to gravitation are similar in all their properties; the section on the maximum force and power gave a first impression. The only difference we have found is due to the neglect of gravitation in special relativity. As a result, horizons in nature cannot be planar, in contrast to what is suggested by the observations of the imagined point-like observers assumed to exist in special relativity.

Page 464

Both the maximum force principle and the field equations imply that the space-time around a rotationally symmetric (thus non-rotating) and electrically neutral mass is described by

Page 506

$$\mathrm{d}i^2 = \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{rc^2}\right)\mathrm{d}t^2 - \frac{\mathrm{d}r^2}{1 - \frac{2GM}{rc^2}} - r^2\mathrm{d}\varphi^2/c^2 \,. \tag{402}$$

This is the so-called *Schwarzschild metric*. As mentioned above, r is the circumference divided by 2π; t is the time measured at infinity. No *outside* observer will ever receive

* Robert Oppenheimer (1904–1967), important US-American physicist. He can be called the father of theoretical physics in the USA. He worked on quantum theory and atomic physics. He then headed the team that developed the nuclear bomb during the Second World War. He was also the most prominent (innocent) victim of one of the greatest witch-hunts ever organized in his home country. See also the www.nap.edu/readingroom/books/biomems/joppenheimer.html website.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

any signal emitted from a radius value $r = 2GM/c^2$ or smaller. Indeed, as the proper time i of an observer at radius r is related to the time t of an observer at infinity through

$$\mathrm{d}i = \sqrt{1 - \frac{2GM}{rc^2}}\,\mathrm{d}t\,, \tag{403}$$

we find that an observer at the horizon would have vanishing proper time. In other words, at the horizon the red-shift is infinite. (In fact, the surface of infinite red-shift and the horizon coincide only for non-rotating black holes. For rotating black holes, the two surfaces are distinct.) Everything happening at the horizon goes on infinitely slowly, as observed by a distant observer. In other words, for a distant observer observing what is going on at the horizon itself, nothing at all ever happens.

In the same way that observers cannot reach the speed of light, observers cannot reach a horizon. For a second observer, it can only happen that the first is moving almost as fast as light; in the same way, for a second observer, it can only happen that the first has almost reached the horizon. In addition, a traveller cannot feel how much he is near the speed of light for another, and experiences light speed as unattainable; in the same way, a traveller (into a large black hole) cannot feel how much he is near a horizon and experiences the horizon as unattainable.

In general relativity, horizons of any kind are predicted to be *black*. Since light cannot escape from them, classical horizons are completely dark surfaces. In fact, horizons are the darkest entities imaginable: nothing in nature is darker. Nonetheless, we will later discover that physical horizons are not completely black.

Orbits

Ref. 512 Since black holes curve space-time strongly, a body moving near a black hole behaves in more complicated ways than predicted by universal gravity. In universal gravity, paths are either ellipses, parabolas, or hyperbolas; all these are plane curves. It turns out that paths lie in a plane only near *non-rotating* black holes.*

Challenge 953 ny Around non-rotating black holes, also called *Schwarzschild black holes*, circular paths are impossible for radii less than $3R_S/2$ (can you show why?) and are unstable to perturbations from there up to a radius of $3R_S$. Only at larger radii are circular orbits stable. Around black holes, there are no elliptic paths; the corresponding rosetta path is shown in Figure 311. Such a path shows the famous periastron shift in all its glory.

Challenge 954 ny Note that the potential around a black hole is not appreciably different from $1/r$ for distances above about fifteen Schwarzschild radii. For a black hole of the mass of the Sun, that would be 42 km from its centre; therefore, we would not be able to note any difference for the path of the Earth around the Sun.

We have mentioned several times in our adventure that gravitation is characterized by its tidal effects. Black holes show extreme properties in this respect. If a cloud of dust

* For such paths, Kepler's rule connecting the average distance and the time of orbit

$$\frac{GMt^3}{(2\pi)^2} = r^3 \tag{404}$$

Challenge 952 ny still holds, provided the proper time and the radius measured by a distant observer are used.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 311 Motions of uncharged objects around a non-rotating black hole – for different impact parameters and initial velocities

falls into a black hole, the size of the cloud increases as it falls, until the cloud envelops the whole horizon. In fact, the result is valid for any extended body. This property of black holes will be of importance later on, when we will discuss the size of elementary particles.

For falling bodies coming from infinity, the situation near black holes is even more interesting. Of course there are no hyperbolic paths, only trajectories similar to hyperbolas for bodies passing far enough away. But for small, but not too small impact parameters, a body will make a number of turns around the black hole, before leaving again. The number of turns increases beyond all bounds with decreasing impact parameter, until a value is reached at which the body is captured into an orbit at a radius of $2R$, as shown in Figure 311. In other words, this orbit *captures* incoming bodies if they approach it below a certain critical angle. For comparison, remember that in universal gravity, capture is never possible. At still smaller impact parameters, the black hole swallows the incoming mass. In both cases, capture and deflection, a body can make several turns around the black hole, whereas in universal gravity it is impossible to make more than *half* a turn around a body.

Challenge 955 ny

The most absurd-looking orbits, though, are those corresponding to the parabolic case of universal gravity. (These are of purely academic interest, as they occur with probability zero.) In summary, relativity changes the motions due to gravity quite drastically.

Around *rotating* black holes, the orbits of point masses are even more complex than those shown in Figure 311; for bound motion, for example, the ellipses do not stay in one plane – thanks to the Thirring–Lense effect – leading to extremely involved orbits in

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 312 Motions of *light* passing near a non-rotating black hole

three dimensions filling the space around the black hole.

For *light* passing a black hole, the paths are equally interesting, as shown in Figure 312. There are no qualitative differences with the case of rapid particles. For a non-rotating black hole, the path obviously lies in a single plane. Of course, if light passes sufficiently nearby, it can be strongly bent, as well as captured. Again, light can also make one or several turns around the black hole before leaving or being captured. The limit between the two cases is the path in which light moves in a circle around a black hole, at $3R/2$. If we were located on that orbit, we would see the back of our head by looking forward!

Challenge 956 ny However, this orbit is unstable. The surface containing all orbits inside the circular one is called the *photon sphere*. The photon sphere thus divides paths leading to capture from those leading to infinity. Note that there is no *stable* orbit for light around a black hole.

Challenge 957 ny Are there any rosetta paths for light around a black hole?

For light around a *rotating* black hole, paths are much more complex. Already in the equatorial plane there are two possible circular light paths: a smaller one in the direction

Challenge 958 ny of the rotation, and a larger one in the opposite direction.

For *charged* black holes, the orbits for falling charged particles are even more complex. The electrical field lines need to be taken into account. Several fascinating effects appear which have no correspondence in usual electromagnetism, such as effects similar to electrical versions of the Meissner effect. The behaviour of such orbits is still an active area of research in general relativity.

Hair and entropy

How is a black hole characterized? It turns out that all properties of black holes follow from a few basic quantities characterizing them, namely their mass M, their angular momentum J, and their electric charge Q.* All other properties – such as size, shape, colour,

* The existence of three basic characteristics is reminiscent of particles. We will find out more about the connection between black holes and particles in the final part of our mountain ascent.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

magnetic field – are uniquely determined by these.* It is as though, to use Wheeler's colourful analogy, one could deduce every characteristic of a woman from her size, her waist and her height. Physicists also say that black holes 'have no hair,' meaning that (classical) black holes have no other degrees of freedom. This expression was also introduced by Wheeler.** This fact was proved by Israel, Carter, Robinson and Mazur; they showed that for a given mass, angular momentum and charge, there is only *one* possible black hole. (However, the uniqueness theorem is not valid any more if the black hole carries nuclear quantum numbers, such as weak or strong charges.)

Ref. 520

Ref. 521

In other words, a black hole is independent of how it has formed, and of the materials used when forming it. Black holes all have the same composition, or better, they have no composition at all (at least classically).

The mass M of a black hole is not restricted by general relativity. It may be as small as that of a microscopic particle and as large as many million solar masses. But for their angular momentum J and electric charge Q, the situation is different. A rotating black hole has a maximum possible angular momentum and a maximum possible electric (and magnetic) charge.*** The limit on the angular momentum appears because its perimeter may not move faster than light. The electric charge is also limited. The two limits are not independent: they are related by

Challenge 959 ny

$$\left(\frac{J}{cM}\right)^2 + \frac{GQ^2}{4\pi\varepsilon_0 c^4} \leqslant \left(\frac{GM}{c^2}\right)^2 \quad . \tag{405}$$

This follows from the limit on length-to-mass ratios at the basis of general relativity. Rotating black holes realizing the limit (405) are called *extremal* black holes. The limit (405) implies that the horizon radius of a general black hole is given by

Challenge 960 ny

$$r_\mathrm{h} = \frac{GM}{c^2}\left(1 + \sqrt{1 - \frac{J^2c^2}{M^4G^2} - \frac{Q^2}{4\pi\varepsilon_0 GM^2}}\right) \tag{406}$$

For example, for a black hole with the mass and half the angular momentum of the Sun, namely $2 \cdot 10^{30}$ kg and $0.45 \cdot 10^{42}\,\mathrm{kg\,m^2/s}$, the charge limit is about $1.4 \cdot 10^{20}$ C.

How does one distinguish rotating from non-rotating black holes? First of all by the *shape*. Non-rotating black holes must be spherical (any non-sphericity is radiated away as gravitational waves) and rotating black holes have a slightly flattened shape, uniquely determined by their angular momentum. Because of their rotation, their surface of infinite

Ref. 522

* Mainly for marketing reasons, non-rotating and electrically neutral black holes are often called *Schwarzschild* black holes; uncharged and rotating ones are often called *Kerr* black holes, after Roy Kerr, who discovered the corresponding solution of Einstein's field equations in 1963. Electrically charged but non-rotating black holes are often called *Reissner–Nordström black holes*, after the German physicist Hans Reissner and the Finnish physicist Gunnar Nordström. The general case, charged and rotating, is sometimes named after Kerr and Newman.

Ref. 518

Ref. 519

** Wheeler claims that he was inspired by the difficulty of distinguishing between bald men; however, Feynman, Ruffini and others had a clear anatomical image in mind when they stated that 'black holes, in contrast to their surroundings, have no hair.'

Ref. 406

*** More about the still hypothetical magnetic charge later on. In black holes, it enters like an additional type of charge into all expressions in which electric charge appears.

Page 693

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 313 The ergosphere of a rotating black hole

gravity or infinite red-shift, called the *static limit*, is different from their (outer) horizon. The region in between is called the *ergosphere*; this is a misnomer as it is *not* a sphere. (It is so called because, as we will see shortly, it can be used to extract energy from the black hole.) The motion of bodies within the ergosphere can be quite complex. It suffices to mention that rotating black holes drag any in-falling body into an orbit around them; this is in contrast to non-rotating black holes, which swallow in-falling bodies. In other words, rotating black holes are not really 'holes' at all, but rather vortices.

The distinction between rotating and non-rotating black holes also appears in the horizon surface area. The (horizon) surface area A of a non-rotating and uncharged black hole is obviously related to its mass M by

Challenge 961 e

$$A = \frac{16\pi G^2}{c^4} M^2 \,. \tag{407}$$

The relation between surface area and mass for a rotating and charged black hole is more complex: it is given by

$$A = \frac{8\pi G^2}{c^4} M^2 \left(1 + \sqrt{1 - \frac{J^2 c^2}{M^4 G^2} - \frac{Q^2}{4\pi\varepsilon_0 G M^2}}\right) \tag{408}$$

where J is the angular momentum and Q the charge. In fact, the relation

$$A = \frac{8\pi G}{c^2} M r_\mathrm{h} \tag{409}$$

is valid for *all* black holes. Obviously, in the case of an electrically charged black hole, the rotation also produces a magnetic field around it. This is in contrast with non-rotating black holes, which cannot have a magnetic field.

Black holes as energy sources

Can one extract energy from a black hole? Roger Penrose has discovered that this is possible for *rotating* black holes. A rocket orbiting a rotating black hole in its ergosphere

Ref. 523

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

could switch its engines on and would then get hurled into outer space at tremendous velocity, much greater than what the engines could have produced by themselves. In fact, the same effect is used by rockets on the Earth, and is the reason why all satellites orbit the Earth in the same direction; it would require much more fuel to make them turn the other way.*

The energy gained by the rocket would be lost by the black hole, which would thus slow down and lose some mass; on the other hand, there is a mass increases due to the exhaust gases falling into the black hole. This increase always is larger than, or at best equal to, the loss due to rotation slowdown. The best one can do is to turn the engines on exactly at the horizon; then the horizon area of the black hole stays constant, and only its rotation is slowed down.**

As a result, for a neutral black hole *rotating* with its maximum possible angular momentum, $1 - 1/\sqrt{2} = 29.3\,\%$ of its total energy can be extracted through the Penrose process. For black holes rotating more slowly, the percentage is obviously smaller.

Challenge 963 ny

For *charged* black holes, such irreversible energy extraction processes are also possible. Can you think of a way? Using expression (405), we find that up to 50 % of the mass of a non-rotating black hole can be due to its charge. In fact, in the quantum part of our mountain ascent we will encounter an energy extraction process which nature seems to use quite frequently.

Challenge 964 ny

Challenge 965 ny

Page 1211

The Penrose process allows one to determine how angular momentum and charge increase the mass of a black hole. The result is the famous mass–energy relation

Ref. 524

$$M^2 = \frac{E^2}{c^4} = \left(m_{\text{irr}} + \frac{Q^2}{16\pi\varepsilon_0 G m_{\text{irr}}}\right)^2 + \frac{J^2}{4m_{\text{irr}}^2}\frac{c^2}{G^2} = \left(m_{\text{irr}} + \frac{Q^2}{8\pi\varepsilon_0 \rho_{\text{irr}}}\right)^2 + \frac{J^2}{\rho_{\text{irr}}^2}\frac{1}{c^2} \tag{410}$$

which shows how the electrostatic and the rotational energy enter the mass of a black hole. In the expression, m_{irr} is the *irreducible mass* defined as

$$m_{\text{irr}}^2 = \frac{A(M, Q = 0, J = 0)}{16\pi}\frac{c^4}{G^2} = \left(\rho_{\text{irr}}\frac{c^2}{2G}\right)^2 \tag{411}$$

and ρ_{irr} is the *irreducible radius*.

Detailed investigations show that there is no process which *decreases* the horizon area, and thus the irreducible mass or radius, of the black hole. People have checked this in all ways possible and imaginable. For example, when two black holes merge, the total area increases. One calls processes which keep the area and energy of the black hole constant *reversible*, and all others irreversible. In fact, the area of black holes behaves like the *entropy* of a closed system: it never decreases. That the area in fact *is* an entropy was first stated in 1970 by Jacob Bekenstein. He deduced that only when an entropy is

Ref. 525

* And it would be much more dangerous, since any small object would hit such an against-the-stream satellite at about 15.8 km/s, thus transforming the object into a dangerous projectile. In fact, any power wanting to destroy satellites of the enemy would simply have to load a satellite with nuts or bolts, send it into space the wrong way, and distribute the bolts into a cloud. It would make satellites impossible for many decades to come.

Challenge 962 ny

** It is also possible to extract energy from rotational black holes through gravitational radiation.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

ascribed to a black hole, is it possible to understand where the entropy of all the material falling into it is collected.

The black hole entropy is a function only of the mass, the angular momentum and the charge of the black hole. You might want to confirm Bekenstein's deduction that the
Challenge 966 ny entropy S is proportional to the horizon area. Later it was found, using quantum theory, that

$$S = \frac{A}{4}\frac{kc^3}{\hbar G} = \frac{A\,k}{4\,l_{\mathrm{Pl}}^2} \,. \tag{412}$$

This famous relation cannot be deduced without quantum theory, as the absolute value of entropy, as for any other observable, is never fixed by classical physics alone. We will
Page 1213 discuss this expression later on in our mountain ascent.

If black holes have an entropy, they also must have a temperature. If they have a temperature, they must shine. Black holes thus cannot be black! This was proven by Stephen Hawking in 1974 with extremely involved calculations. However, it could have been de-
Page 1208 duced in the 1930s, with a simple Gedanken experiment which we will present later on. You might want to think about the issue, asking and investigating what strange consequences would appear if black holes had no entropy. Black hole radiation is a further, though tiny (quantum) mechanism for energy extraction, and is applicable even to non-
Page 1208 rotating, uncharged black holes. The interesting connections between black holes, thermodynamics, and quantum theory will be presented in the upcoming parts of our mountain ascent. Can you imagine other mechanisms that make black holes shine?
Challenge 967 ny

Curiosities and fun challenges about black holes

> Tiens, les trous noirs. C'est troublant.*
>
> Anonymous

Black holes have many counter-intuitive properties. We will first have a look at the clas-
Page 1216 sical effects, leaving the quantum effects for later on.

* *

Following universal gravity, light could climb upwards from the surface of a black hole and then fall back down. In general relativity, a black hole does not allow light to climb
Challenge 968 ny up at all; it can only fall. Can you confirm this?

* *

What happens to a person falling into a black hole? An outside observer gives a clear answer: the falling person *never* arrives there since she needs an infinite time to reach the
Challenge 969 ny horizon. Can you confirm this result? The falling person, however, reaches the horizon
Challenge 970 ny in a *finite* amount of her own time. Can you calculate it?

This result is surprising, as it means that for an outside observer in a universe with *finite* age, black holes cannot have formed yet! At best, we can only observe systems that are busy forming black holes. In a sense, it might be correct to say that black holes do not exist. Black holes could have existed right from the start in the fabric of space-time. On

* No translation possible.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 314 Motion of some light rays from a dense body to an observer

the other hand, we will find out later why this is impossible. In short, it is important to keep in mind that the idea of black hole is a limit concept but that usually, limit concepts (like baths or temperature) are useful descriptions of nature. Independently of this last issue, we can confirm that in nature, the length-to-mass ratio always satisfies

$$\frac{L}{M} \geqslant \frac{4G}{c^2} \,. \tag{413}$$

* *

Interestingly, the *size* of a person falling into a black hole is experienced in vastly different ways by the falling person and a person staying outside. If the black hole is large, the infalling observer feels almost nothing, as the tidal effects are small. The outside observer makes a startling observation: he sees the falling person *spread* all over the horizon of the black hole. *In-falling, extended bodies cover the whole horizon.* Can you explain this fact, for example by using the limit on length-to-mass ratios?

Challenge 971 ny

This strange result will be of importance later on in our exploration, and lead to important results about the size of point particles.

* *

An observer near a (non-rotating) black hole, or in fact near any object smaller than 7/4 times its gravitational radius, can even see the complete *back* side of the object, as shown in Figure 314. Can you imagine what the image looks like? Note that in addition to the paths shown in Figure 314, light can also turn several times around the black hole before reaching the observer! Therefore, such an observer sees an infinite number of images of the black hole. The resulting formula for the angular size of the innermost image was given above.

Challenge 972 ny

Page 517

In fact, the effect of gravity means that it is possible to observe more than half the surface of *any* spherical object. In everyday life, however, the effect is small: for example, light bending allows us to see about 50.0002 % of the surface of the Sun.

* *

A mass point inside the smallest circular path of light around a black hole, at $3R/2$, cannot stay in a circle, because in that region, something strange happens. A body which circles another in everyday life always feels a tendency to be pushed outwards; this centrifugal effect is due to the inertia of the body. But at values below $3R/2$, a circulating body is pushed *inwards* by its inertia. There are several ways to explain this paradoxical effect. The simplest is to note that near a black hole, the weight increases faster than the centrifugal force, as you may want to check yourself. Only a rocket with engines switched on and pushing towards the sky can orbit a black hole at $3R/2$.

Ref. 526

Challenge 973 ny

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

By the way, how can gravity, or an electrical field, come out of a black hole, if no signal and no energy can leave it? Challenge 974 s

* *

Do *white holes* exist, i.e., time-inverted black holes, in which everything flows out of, instead of into, some bounded region? Challenge 975 ny

* *

Challenge 976 ny Show that a cosmological constant Λ leads to the following metric for a black hole:

$$\mathrm{d}\tau^2 = \frac{\mathrm{d}s^2}{c^2} = \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{rc^2} - \frac{\Lambda}{3}r^2\right)\mathrm{d}t^2 - \frac{\mathrm{d}r^2}{c^2 - \frac{2GM}{r} - \frac{\Lambda c^2}{3}r^2} - \frac{r^2}{c^2}\mathrm{d}\varphi^2 \,. \tag{414}$$

Note that this metric does not turn into the Minkowski metric for large values of r. However, in the case that Λ is small, the metric is almost flat for values of r that satisfy $1/\sqrt{\Lambda} \gg r \gg 2Gm/c^2$.

As a result, the inverse square law is also modified:

$$F = -\frac{Gm}{r^2} + \frac{c^2\Lambda}{6}r \,. \tag{415}$$

With the known values of the cosmological constant, the second term is negligible inside the solar system.

* *

In quantum theory, the *gyromagnetic ratio* is an important quantity for any rotating charged system. What is the gyromagnetic ratio for rotating black holes? Challenge 977 ny

* *

A large black hole is, as the name implies, black. Still, it can be seen. If we were to travel towards it in a spaceship, we would note that the black hole is surrounded by a bright circle, like a thin halo. The ring at the radial distance of the photon sphere is due to those photons which come from other luminous objects, then circle the hole, and finally, after one or several turns, end up in our eye. Can you confirm this result? Challenge 978 s

* *

Challenge 979 ny Do moving black holes Lorentz-contract? Black holes do shine a little bit. It is true that the images they form are complex, as light can turn around them a few times before reaching the observer. In addition, the observer has to be far away, so that the effects of curvature are small. All these effects can be taken into account; nevertheless, the question remains subtle. The reason is that the concept of Lorentz contraction makes no sense in general relativity, as the comparison with the uncontracted situation is difficult to define precisely.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

Challenge 980 ny Can you confirm that black holes imply a limit to power? Power is energy change over time. General relativity limits power to $P \leqslant c^5/4G$. In other words, no engine in nature can provide more than $0.92 \cdot 10^{52}$ W or $1.2 \cdot 10^{49}$ horsepower.

Formation of and search for black holes

How might black holes form? At present, at least three possible mechanisms have been distinguished; the question is still a hot subject of research. First of all, black holes could
Ref. 527 have formed during the early stages of the universe. These *primordial black holes* might grow through *accretion*, i.e., through the swallowing of nearby matter and radiation, or
Page 1210 disappear through one of the mechanisms to be studied later on.

Of the *observed* black holes, the so-called *supermassive* black holes are found at the centre of every galaxy studied so far. They have masses in the range from 10^6 to 10^9 solar masses and contain about 0.5 % of the mass of a galaxy. They are conjectured to exist at the centre of all galaxies, and seem to be related to the formation of galaxies themselves. Supermassive black holes are supposed to have formed through the collapse of large dust clouds, and to have grown through subsequent accretion of matter. The latest ideas imply that these black holes accrete a lot of matter in their early stage; the matter falling in emits lots of radiation, which would explain the brightness of quasars. Later on, the rate of accretion slows, and the less spectacular Seyfert galaxies form. It may even be that the supermassive black hole at the centre of the galaxy triggers the formation of stars. Still later, these supermassive black holes become almost dormant, like the one at the centre of the Milky Way.

Ref. 528 On the other hand, black holes can form when old massive stars *collapse*. It is estimated that when stars with at least three solar masses burn out their fuel, part of the matter remaining will collapse into a black hole. Such *stellar* black holes have a mass between one and a hundred solar masses; they can also continue growing through subsequent accretion. This situation provided the first ever candidate for a black hole, Cygnus X-1, which was discovered in 1971.

Recent measurements suggest also the existence of *intermediate* black holes, with masses around a thousand solar masses or more; the mechanisms and conditions for their formation are still unknown.

The search for black holes is a popular sport among astrophysicists. Conceptually, the simplest way to search for them is to look for strong gravitational fields. But only double stars allow one to measure gravitational fields directly, and the strongest ever measured
Ref. 529 is 30 % of the theoretical maximum value. Another way is to look for strong gravitational lenses, and try to get a mass-to-size ratio pointing to a black hole. Still another way is to look at the dynamics of stars near the centre of galaxies. Measuring their motion, one can deduce the mass of the body they orbit. The most favoured method to search for black holes is to look for extremely intense X-ray emission from point sources, using space-based satellites or balloon-based detectors. If the distance to the object is known, its absolute brightness can be deduced; if it is above a certain limit, it must be a black hole, since normal matter cannot produce an unlimited amount of light. This method is being perfected with the aim of directly observing of energy disappearing into a horizon.
Ref. 530 This may in fact have been observed.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

To sum up the experimental situation, measurements show that in all galaxies studied so far – more than a dozen – a supermassive black hole seems to be located at their centre. The masses vary: the black hole at the centre of our own galaxy has about 2.6 million solar masses, while the central black hole of the galaxy M87 has 3000 million solar masses. Ref. 514

About a dozen stellar black holes of between 4 and 20 solar masses are known in the rest of our own galaxy; all have been discovered since 1971, when Cygnus X-1 was found. In the year 2000, intermediate-mass black holes were found. Astronomers are also studying how large numbers of black holes in star clusters behave, how often they collide, and what sort of measurable gravitational waves these collisions produce. The list of discoveries is expected to expand dramatically in the coming years. Ref. 514

Singularities

Solving the equations of general relativity for various initial conditions, one finds that a cloud of dust usually collapses to a *singularity*, i.e., to a point of infinite density. The same conclusion appears when one follows the evolution of the universe backwards in time. In fact, Roger Penrose and Stephen Hawking have proved several mathematical theorems on the necessity of singularities for many classical matter distributions. These theorems assume only the continuity of space-time and a few rather weak conditions on the matter in it. The theorems state that in expanding systems such as the universe itself, or in collapsing systems such as black holes in formation, events with infinite matter density should exist somewhere in the past, or in the future, respectively. This result is usually summarized by saying that there is a mathematical proof that the universe started in a singularity. Ref. 531

In fact, the derivation of the initial singularities makes a hidden, but strong assumption about matter: that dust particles have no proper size. In other words, it is assumed that dust particles are singularities. Only with this assumption can one deduce the existence of initial singularities. However, we have seen that the maximum force principle can be reformulated as a minimum size principle for matter. The argument that there must have been an initial singularity of the universe is thus flawed. The experimental situation is clear: there is overwhelming evidence for an early state of the universe that was extremely hot and dense; but there is *no* evidence for infinite temperature or density.

Mathematically inclined researchers distinguish two types of singularities: those with and without a horizon. The latter ones, the so-called *naked* singularities, are especially strange: for example, a toothbrush can fall into a naked singularity and disappear without leaving any trace. Since the field equations are time invariant, we could thus expect that every now and then, naked singularities emit toothbrushes. (Can you explain why 'dressed' singularities are less dangerous?) Challenge 981 ny

To avoid the spontaneous appearance of toothbrushes, over the years many people have tried to discover some theoretical principles forbidding the existence of naked singularities. It turns out that there are two such principles. The first is the maximum force or maximum power principle we encountered above. The maximum force implies that no infinite force values appear in nature; in other words, there are no naked singularities in nature. This statement is often called *cosmic censorship*. Obviously, if general relativity were not the correct description of nature, naked singularities *could* still appear. Cosmic censorship is thus still discussed in research articles. The experimental search for naked Ref. 532

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

singularities has not yielded any success; in fact, there is not even a candidate observation for the less abstruse dressed singularities. But the theoretical case for 'dressed' singularities is also weak. Since there is no way to interact with anything behind a horizon, it is futile to discuss what happens there. There is no way to prove that behind a horizon a singularity exists. Dressed singularities are articles of faith, not of physics.

In fact, there is another principle preventing singularities, namely *quantum theory*. Whenever we encounter a prediction of an infinite value, we have extended our description of nature to a domain for which it was not conceived. To speak about singularities, one must assume the applicability of pure general relativity to very small distances and very high energies. As will become clear in the next two parts of this book, nature does not allow this: the combination of general relativity and quantum theory shows that it makes no sense to talk about 'singularities', nor about what happens 'inside' a black hole horizon. The reason is that time and space are not continuous at very small scales. *

Page 1436
Page 1401

A QUIZ – IS THE UNIVERSE A BLACK HOLE?

Could it be that we live inside a black hole? Both the universe and black holes have horizons. Interestingly, the horizon distance r_0 of the universe is about

$$r_0 \approx 3ct_0 \approx 4 \cdot 10^{26}\,\mathrm{m} \tag{416}$$

and its matter content is about

$$m_0 \approx \frac{4\pi}{3}\rho_0 r_0^3 \quad \text{whence} \quad \frac{2Gm_0}{c^2} = 72\pi G\rho_0 c t_0^3 = 6 \cdot 10^{26}\,\mathrm{m} \tag{417}$$

for a density of $3 \cdot 10^{-27}\,\mathrm{kg/m^3}$. Thus we have

$$r_0 \approx \frac{2Gm_0}{c^2}\,, \tag{418}$$

which is similar to the black hole relation $r_S = 2Gm/c^2$. Is this a coincidence? No, it is not: all systems with high curvature more or less obey this relation. But are we nevertheless falling into a large black hole? You can answer that question by yourself.

Challenge 982 ny
Challenge 983 ny



* Many physicists are still wary of making such strong statements at this point; and there are still some who claim that space and time are continuous even down to the smallest distances. Our discussion of quantum theory, and the first sections of the final part of our mountain ascent, will give the precise arguments leading to the opposite conclusion.

Page 1396

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 21

DOES SPACE DIFFER FROM TIME?

> Tempori parce.*
>
> Seneca

People in a bad mood say that time is our master. Nobody says that of space. Time and space are obviously different in everyday life. But what is the precise difference between them in general relativity? And do we need them at all? In general relativity it is assumed that we live in a (pseudo-Riemannian) space-time of variable curvature. The curvature is an observable and is related to the distribution and motion of matter and energy in the way described by the field equations.

However, there is a fundamental problem. The equations of general relativity are invariant under numerous transformations which *mix* the coordinates x_0, x_1, x_2 and x_3. For example, the viewpoint transformation

$$\begin{aligned} x'_0 &= x_0 + x_1 \\ x'_1 &= -x_0 + x_1 \\ x'_2 &= x_2 \\ x'_3 &= x_3 \end{aligned} \tag{419}$$

is allowed in general relativity, and leaves the field equations invariant. You might want to search for other examples.

Challenge 984 ny

This has a consequence that is clearly in sharp contrast with everyday life: diffeomorphism invariance makes it *impossible* to distinguish space from time *inside* general relativity. More explicitly, the coordinate x_0 cannot simply be identified with the physical time t, as implicitly done up to now. This identification is only possible in *special* relativity. In special relativity the invariance under Lorentz (or Poincaré) transformations of space and time singles out energy, linear momentum and angular momentum as the fundamental observables. In general relativity, there is *no* (non-trivial) metric isometry group; consequently, there are *no* basic physical observables singled out by their characteristic of being conserved. But invariant quantities are necessary for communication! In fact, we can *talk* to each other only because we live in an approximately *flat* space-time: if the angles of a triangle did not add up to π (two right angles), there would be *no* invariant quantities and we would not be able to communicate.

* 'Care about time.' Lucius Annaeus Seneca (*c.* 4 BCE–65), *Epistolae* 88, 39.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

How have we managed to sweep this problem under the rug so far? We have done so in several ways. The simplest was to always require that in some part of the situation under consideration space-time was our usual flat Minkowski space-time, where x_0 can be identified with t. We can fulfil this requirement either at infinity, as we did around spherical masses, or in zeroth approximation, as we did for gravitational radiation and for all other perturbation calculations. In this way, we eliminate the free mixing of coordinates and the otherwise missing invariant quantities appear as expected. This pragmatic approach is the usual way out of the problem. In fact, it is used in some otherwise excellent texts on general relativity that preclude any deeper questioning of the issue.

Ref. 488

A common variation of this trick is to let the distinction 'sneak' into the calculations by the introduction of matter and its properties, or by the introduction of radiation. The material properties of matter, for example their thermodynamic state equations, always distinguish between space and time. Radiation does the same, by its propagation. Obviously this is true also for those special combinations of matter and radiation called clocks and metre bars. In fact, the method of introducing matter is the same as the method of introducing Minkowski space-time, if one looks closely: properties of matter are always defined using space-time descriptions of special relativity.*

Another variation of the pragmatic approach is the use of the cosmological time coordinate. An isotropic and homogeneous universe does have a preferred time coordinate, namely the one used in all the tables on the past and the future of the universe. This method is in fact a combination of the previous two.

Page 577, page 800

But we are on a special quest here. We want to *understand* motion in principle, not only to calculate it in practice. We want a *fundamental* answer, not a pragmatic one. And for this we need to know how the positions x_i and time t are connected, and how we can define invariant quantities. The question also prepares us for the task of combining gravity with quantum theory, which is the aim of the final part of our mountain ascent.

A fundamental solution requires a description of clocks together with the system under consideration, and a deduction of how the reading t of a clock relates to the behaviour of the system in space-time. But we know that any description of a system requires measurements: for example, in order to determine the initial conditions. And initial conditions require space and time. We thus enter a vicious circle: that is precisely what we wanted to avoid in the first place.

A suspicion arises. Is there in fact a fundamental difference between space and time? Let us take a tour of various ways to investigate this question.

Can space and time be measured?

In order to distinguish between space and time in general relativity, we must be able to measure them. But already in the section on universal gravity we have mentioned the impossibility of measuring lengths, times and masses with gravitational effects alone. Does this situation change in general relativity? Lengths and times are connected by the speed of light, and in addition lengths and masses are connected by the gravitational

Page 317

* We note something astonishing here: the inclusion of some condition at small distances (matter) has the same effect as the inclusion of some condition at infinity. Is this just coincidence? We will come back to this issue in the last part of our mountain ascent.

Challenge 985 ny
Page 1445

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

constant. Despite this additional connection, it takes only a moment to convince oneself that the problem persists.

In fact, we need *electrodynamics* to solve it. It is only be using the elementary charge Ref. 533 e that we can form length scales, of which the simplest one is

$$l_{\text{emscale}} = \frac{e}{\sqrt{4\pi\varepsilon_0}} \frac{\sqrt{G}}{c^2} \approx 1.4 \cdot 10^{-36}\,\text{m} \,. \tag{420}$$

Page 678 Here, ε_0 is the permittivity of free space. Alternatively, we can argue that *quantum mechanics* provides a length scale, since one can use the quantum of action $\hbar$ to define the length scale

$$l_{\text{qtscale}} = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar G}{c^3}} \approx 1.6 \cdot 10^{-35}\,\text{m} \,, \tag{421}$$

which is called the *Planck length* or *Planck's natural length unit*. However, this does not change the argument, because one needs electrodynamics to measure the value of $\hbar$. The equivalence of the two arguments is shown by rewriting the elementary charge e as a combination of nature's fundamental constants:

$$e = \sqrt{4\pi\varepsilon_0 c\hbar\alpha} \,. \tag{422}$$

Here, $\alpha \approx 1/137.06$ is the fine-structure constant that characterizes the strength of electromagnetism. In terms of α, expression (420) becomes

$$l_{\text{scale}} = \sqrt{\frac{\alpha\hbar G}{c^3}} = \sqrt{\alpha}\, l_{\text{Pl}} \,. \tag{423}$$

Summing up, every length measurement is based on the electromagnetic coupling constant α and on the Planck length. Of course, the same is true for time and mass measurements. There is thus no way to define or measure lengths, times and masses using gravitation or general relativity only.* Challenge 986 e

Given this sobering result, we can ask whether in general relativity space and time are really required at all.

Are space and time necessary?

Ref. 535 Robert Geroch answers this question in a beautiful five-page article. He explains how to formulate the general theory of relativity without the use of space and time, by taking as starting point the physical observables only.

He starts with the set of all observables. Among them there is one, called v, which stands out. It is the only observable which allows one to say that for any two observables

Ref. 534 * In the past, John Wheeler used to state that his *geometrodynamic clock*, a device which measures time by bouncing light back and forth between two parallel mirrors, was a counter-example; that is not correct, however. Can you confirm this? Challenge 987 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

a_1, a_2 there is a third one a_3, for which

$$(a_3 - v) = (a_1 - v) + (a_2 - v) \,. \tag{424}$$

Such an observable is called the *vacuum*. Geroch shows how to use such an observable to construct the derivatives of observables. Then the so-called Einstein algebra can be built, which comprises the whole of general relativity.

Usually one describes motion by deducing space-time from matter observables, by calculating the evolution of space-time, and then by deducing the motion of matter following from it. Geroch's description shows that the middle step, and thus the use of space and time, is not necessary.

Indirectly, the principle of maximum force makes the same statement. General relativity can be derived from the existence of limit values for force or power. Space and time are only tools needed to translate this principle into consequences for real-life observers.

Thus, it is possible to formulate general relativity without the use of space and time. Since both are unnecessary, it seems unlikely that there should be a fundamental difference between them. Nevertheless, one difference is well-known.

Do closed timelike curves exist?

Is it possible that the time coordinate behaves, at least in some regions, like a torus? When we walk, we can return to the point of departure. Is it possible, to come back in time to where we have started? The question has been studied in great detail. The standard reference is the text by Hawking and Ellis; they list the required properties of space-time, explaining which are mutually compatible or exclusive. They find, for example, that space-times which are smooth, globally hyperbolic, oriented and time-oriented do not contain any such curves. It is usually assumed that the observed universe has these properties, so that observation of closed timelike curves is unlikely. Indeed, no candidate has ever been suggested. Later on, we will show that searches for such curves at the microscopic scale have also failed to find any.

Ref. 494

Page 1219

The impossibility of closed timelike curves seems to point to a difference between space and time. But in fact, this difference is only apparent. All these investigations are based on the behaviour of matter. Thus these arguments assume a specific distinction between space and time right from the start. In short, this line of enquiry cannot help us to decide whether space and time differ. Let us look at the issue in another way.

Is general relativity local? – The hole argument

When Albert Einstein developed general relativity, he had quite some trouble with diffeomorphism invariance. Most startling is his famous *hole argument*, better called the *hole paradox*. Take the situation shown in Figure 315, in which a mass deforms the space-time around it. Einstein imagined a small region of the vacuum, the *hole*, which is shown as a small ellipse. What happens if we somehow change the curvature inside the hole while leaving the situation outside it unchanged, as shown in the inset of the picture?

Ref. 536

On the one hand, the new situation is obviously physically different from the original one, as the curvature inside the hole is different. This difference thus implies that the curvature outside a region does not determine the curvature inside it. That is extremely

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 315 A 'hole' in space

unsatisfactory. Worse, if we generalize this operation to the time domain, we seem to get the biggest nightmare possible in physics: determinism is lost.

On the other hand, general relativity is diffeomorphism invariant. The deformation shown in the figure is a diffeomorphism; so the new situation must be physically equivalent to the original situation.

Which argument is correct? Einstein first favoured the first point of view, and therefore dropped the whole idea of diffeomorphism invariance for about a year. Only later did he understand that the second assessment is correct, and that the first statement makes a fundamental mistake: it assumes an independent existence of the coordinate axes x and y, as shown in the figure. But during that deformation, the coordinates x and y automatically change as well, so that there is *no* physical difference between the two situations.

The moral of the story is that *there is no difference between space-time and gravitational field*. Space-time is a quality of the field, as Einstein put it, and not an entity with a separate existence, as suggested by the graph. Coordinates have no physical meaning; only distances (intervals) in space and time have one. In particular, diffeomorphism invariance proves that *there is no flow of time*. Time, like space, is only a relational entity: time and space are relative; they are not absolute.

The relativity of space and time has practical consequences. For example, it turns out that many problems in general relativity are equivalent to the Schwarzschild situation, even though they appear completely different at first sight. As a result, researchers have 'discovered' the Schwarzschild solution (of course with different coordinate systems) over twenty times, often thinking that they had found a new, unknown solution. We will now discuss a startling consequence of this insight.

Is the Earth hollow?

The *hollow Earth hypothesis*, i.e., the conjecture that we live on the *inside* of a sphere, was popular in paranormal circles around the year 1900, and still remains so among certain eccentrics today, especially in Britain, Germany and the US. They maintain, as illustrated in Figure 316, that the solid Earth *encloses* the sky, together with the Moon, the Sun and the stars. Most of us are fooled by education into another description, because we are brought up to believe that light travels in straight lines. Get rid of this wrong belief, they say, and the hollow Earth appears in all its glory.

Page 61

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 316 A model of the hollow Earth theory (© Helmut Diehl)

Interestingly, the reasoning is correct. There is *no way* to disprove this sort of description of the universe. In fact, as the great Austrian physicist Roman Sexl used to explain, the diffeomorphism invariance of general relativity even proclaims the equivalence between the two views. The fun starts when either of the two camps wants to tell the other that *only* its own description can be correct. You might check that any such argument is wrong; it is fun to slip into the shoes of such an eccentric and to defend the hollow Earth hypothesis against your friends. It is easy to explain the appearance of day and night, of the horizon, and of the satellite images of the Earth. It is easy to explain what happened during the flight to the Moon. You can drive many bad physicists crazy in this way. The usual description and the hollow Earth description are exactly equivalent. Can you confirm that even quantum theory, with its introduction of length scales into nature, does not change this situation?

Ref. 537

Challenge 988 e

Challenge 989 s

Such investigations show that diffeomorphism invariance is not an easy symmetry to swallow. But it is best to get used to it now, as the rest of our adventure will throw up even more surprises. Indeed, in the final part of our walk we will discover that there is an even larger symmetry of nature that is similar to the change in viewpoint from the hollow Earth view to the standard view. This symmetry, space-time duality, is valid not only for distances measured from the centre of the Earth, but for distances measured from any point in nature.

Page 1445

Are space, time and mass independent?

We can conclude from this short discussion that there is no fundamental distinction between space and time in general relativity. Pragmatic distinctions, using matter, radiation or space-time at infinity, are the only possible ones.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

In the last part of our adventure we will discover that even the inclusion of quantum theory is consistent with this view. We will show explicitly that no distinction is possible in principle. We will discover that mass and space-time are on an equal footing, and that, in a sense, particles and vacuum are made of the same substance. Distinctions between space and time turn out to be possible only at low, everyday energies.

Page 1413

In the beginning of our mountain ascent we found that we needed matter to define space and time. Now we have found that we even need matter to *distinguish* between space and time. Similarly, in the beginning we found that space and time are required to define matter; now we have found that we even need *flat* space-time to define it.

Page 317

Page 558

In summary, general relativity does not provide a way out of the circular reasoning we discovered in Galilean physics. Indeed, it makes the issue even less clear than before. Continuing the mountain ascent is really worth the effort.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 22

GENERAL RELATIVITY IN TEN POINTS – A SUMMARY FOR THE LAYMAN

Sapientia felicitas.*

General relativity is the final description of *paths of motion*, or if one prefers, of *macroscopic motion*. General relativity describes how the observations of motion of *any* two observers are related to each other; it also describes motion due to gravity. In fact, general relativity is based on the following observations:

— All observers agree that there is a 'perfect' speed in nature, namely a common maximum energy speed relative to matter. This speed is realized by massless radiation, such as light or radio signals.
— All observers agree that there is a 'perfect' force in nature, a common maximum force that can be realized or measured by realistic observers. This force is realized on event horizons.

These two statements contain the full theory of relativity. From them we deduce:

— Space-time consists of events in 3 + 1 *continuous dimensions*, with a variable curvature. The curvature can be deduced from distance measurements among events or from tidal effects. We thus live in a pseudo-Riemannian space-time. Measured times, lengths and curvatures vary from observer to observer.
— Space-time and space are *curved near mass and energy*. The curvature at a point is determined by the energy–momentum density at that point, and described by the field equations. When matter and energy move, the space curvature moves along with them. A built-in delay in this movement renders faster-than-light transport of energy impossible. The proportionality constant between energy and curvature is so small that the curvature is not observed in everyday life; only its indirect manifestation, namely gravity, is observed.
— Space is also *elastic*: it prefers being flat. Being elastic, it can oscillate independently of matter; one then speaks of gravitational radiation or of gravity waves.
— Freely falling matter moves along *geodesics*, i.e., along paths of maximal length in curved space-time; in space this means that light bends when it passes near large masses by twice the amount predicted by universal gravity.
— To describe gravitation one *needs* curved space-time, i.e., general relativity, *at the latest* whenever distances are of the order of the Schwarzschild radius $r_S = 2Gm/c^2$. When

* 'Wisdom is happiness.' A well-known inscription in Oxford University.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

distances are much larger than this value, the relativistic description with gravity and gravitomagnetism (frame-dragging) is sufficient. When distances are even larger, the description by universal gravity, namely $a = Gm/r^2$, together with flat Minkowski space-time, will do as a first approximation.
— Space and time are not distinguished globally, but only locally. *Matter* is required to make the distinction.

In addition, all the matter and energy we observe in the sky lead us to the following conclusions:

— On the cosmological scale, everything moves away from everything else: the universe is *expanding*. This expansion of space-time is described by the field equations.
— The universe has a *finite age*; this is the reason for the darkness of the sky at night. A horizon limits the measurable space-time intervals to about fourteen thousand million years.

The accuracy of the description

Was general relativity worth the effort? The discussion of its accuracy is most conveniently split into two sets of experiments. The first set consists of measurements of how *matter moves*. Do objects really follow geodesics? As summarized in Table 56, all experiments agree with the theory to within measurement errors, i.e., at least within 1 part in 10^{12}. In short, the way matter falls is indeed well described by general relativity.

Ref. 538

Ref. 539

The second set of measurements concerns the dynamics of space-time itself. Does *space-time move* following the field equations of general relativity? In other words, is space-time really bent by matter in the way the theory predicts? Many experiments have been performed, near to and far from Earth, in both weak and strong fields. All agree with the predictions to within measurement errors. However, the best measurements so far have only about 3 significant digits. Note that even though numerous experiments have been performed, there are only few *types* of tests, as Table 56 shows. The discovery of a new type of experiment almost guarantees fame and riches. Most sought after, of course, is the direct detection of gravitational waves.

Ref. 538, Ref. 539

Challenge 990 ny

Another comment on Table 56 is in order. After many decades in which all measured effects were only of the order v^2/c^2, several so-called *strong field effects* in pulsars allowed us to reach the order v^4/c^4. Soon a few effects of this order should also be detected even inside the solar system, using high-precision satellite experiments. The present crown of all measurements, the gravity wave emission delay, is the only v^5/c^5 effect measured so far.

Ref. 538

Page 531

The difficulty of achieving high precision for space-time curvature measurements is the reason why mass is measured with balances, always (indirectly) using the prototype kilogram in Paris, instead of defining some standard curvature and fixing the value of G. Indeed, no useful terrestrial curvature experiment has ever been carried out. A breakthrough in this domain would make the news. The terrestrial curvature methods currently available would not even allow one to define a kilogram of gold or of oranges with a precision of a single kilogram!

Another way to check general relativity is to search for alternative descriptions of gravitation. Quite a number of alternative theories of gravity have been formulated and

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 56 Types of tests of general relativity

Measured effect	Confirmation	Type	Reference
Equivalence principle	10^{-12}	motion of matter	Ref. 419, Ref. 538, Ref. 540
$1/r^2$ dependence (dimensionality of space-time)	10^{-10}	motion of matter	Ref. 541
Time independence of G	10^{-19} /s	motion of matter	Ref. 538
Red-shift (light and microwaves on Sun, Earth, Sirius)	10^{-4}	space-time curvature	Ref. 398, Ref. 397, Ref. 538
Perihelion shift (four planets, Icarus, pulsars)	10^{-3}	space-time curvature	Ref. 538
Light deflection (light, radio waves around Sun, stars, galaxies)	10^{-3}	space-time curvature	Ref. 538
Time delay (radio signals near Sun, near pulsars)	10^{-3}	space-time curvature	Ref. 538, Ref. 427
Gravitomagnetism (Earth, pulsar)	10^{-1}	space-time curvature	Ref. 422
Geodesic effect (Moon, pulsars)	10^{-1}	space-time curvature	Ref. 443, Ref. 538
Gravity wave emission delay (pulsars)	10^{-3}	space-time curvature	Ref. 538

Ref. 539, Ref. 542 studied, but so far, only general relativity is in agreement with all experiments.

In summary, as Thibault Damour likes to explain, general relativity is at least 99.999 999 999 9 % correct concerning the motion of matter and energy, and at least Ref. 538 99.9 % correct about the way matter and energy curve and move space-time. No exceptions, no anti-gravity and no unclear experimental data are known. All motion on Earth and in the skies is described by general relativity. Albert Einstein's achievement has no flaws.

We note that general relativity has not been tested for microscopic motion. In this context, *microscopic motion* is any motion for which the action is around the quantum of action, namely 10^{-34} Js. This issue is central to the last part of our adventure.

Research in general relativity and cosmology

Ref. 543 Research in general relativity is more intense than ever.*

* *

The most interesting experimental studies at present are those of double pulsars, the search for gravitational waves and various dedicated satellites; among others a special satellite will capture all possible pulsars of the galaxy. All these experiments will allow experimental tests in domains that have not been accessible up to now.

* There is even a free and excellent internet-based research journal, called *Living Reviews in Relativity*, to be found at the www.livingreviews.org website.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

The description of collisions and many-body problems, involving stars, neutron stars and black holes helps astrophysicists to improve their understanding of the rich behaviour they observe in their telescopes. Ref. 544

* *

The study of the early universe and of elementary particle properties, with phenomena such as *inflation*, a short period of accelerated expansion during the first few seconds, is still an important topic of investigation. Ref. 545

* *

The study of chaos in the field equations is of fundamental interest in the study of the early universe, and may be related to the problem of galaxy formation, one of the biggest open problems in physics. Ref. 546

* *

Gathering data about galaxy formation is the main aim of many satellite systems and purpose-build telescopes. The main focus is the search for localized cosmic microwave background anisotropies due to protogalaxies. Ref. 547

* *

The determination of the cosmological parameters, such as the matter density, the curvature and the vacuum density, is a central effort of modern astrophysics. Ref. 490

* *

Astrophysicists regularly discover new phenomena in the skies. For example, the various types of gamma-ray bursts, X-ray bursts and optical bursts are still not completely understood. Gamma-ray bursts, for example, can be as bright as 10^{17} sun-like stars combined; however, they last only a few seconds. More details on this research are given later on. Ref. 548 Page 1211

* *

A computer database of all solutions of the field equations is being built. Among other things, researchers are checking whether they really are all different from each other. Ref. 549

* *

Solutions with non-trivial topology, such as wormholes and particle-like solutions, constitue a fascinating field of enquiry, related to quantum gravity. Ref. 551 Page 1219

* *

Other formulations of general relativity, describing space-time with quantities other than the metric, are continuously being developed, in the hope of clarifying its relationship to the quantum world. The so-called Ashtekar variables are such a modern description. Ref. 552

* *

The unification of quantum physics and general relativity, the topic of the final part of

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

this mountain ascent, will occupy researchers for many years to come. Ref. 553

* *

Finally, the teaching of general relativity, which for many decades has been hidden behind Greek indices, differential forms and other antididactic methods, will benefit greatly from future improvements focusing more on the physics and less on the formalism. Ref. 554

In short, general relativity is still an extremely interesting field of research and important discoveries are still expected.

Could general relativity be different?

The constant of gravitation provides a limit for the density and the acceleration of objects, as well as for the power of engines. We based all our deductions on its invariance. Is it possible that the constant of gravitation G changes from place to place or that it changes with time? The question is tricky. At first sight, the answer is a loud: 'Yes, of course! Just see what happens when the value of G is changed in formulae.' However, this answer is wrong, as it was wrong for the speed of light c. Page 469

Since the constant of gravitation enters into our definition of gravity and acceleration, and thus, even if we do not notice it, into the construction of all rulers, all measurement standards and all measuring set-ups, there is *no way* to detect whether its value actually varies. No imaginable experiment could detect a variation. Every measurement of force is, whether we like it or not, a comparison with the limit force. There is no way, in principle, to check the invariance of a standard. This is even more astonishing because measurements of this type are regularly reported, as in Table 56. But the result of any such experiment is easy to predict: no change will ever be found. Challenge 991 ny Page 628

Could the number of space dimension be different from 3? This issue is quite involved. For example, three is the smallest number of dimensions for which a vanishing Ricci tensor is compatible with non-vanishing curvature. On the other hand, more than three dimensions give deviations from the inverse square 'law' of gravitation. So far, there are no data pointing in this direction.

Could the equations of general relativity be different? Theoreticians have explored many alternative theories, such as scalar-tensor theories, theories with torsion, or theories which break Lorentz invariance. However, almost none of the alternative theories proposed so far seem to fit experimental data. However, two candidates might exist.

The inclusion of torsion in the field equations, a possible extension of the theory, is one of the more promising attempts to include particle spin in general relativity. The inclusion of torsion in general relativity does not require new fundamental constants; indeed, the absence of torsion was assumed in the Raychaudhuri equation. The use of the extended Raychaudhuri equation, which includes torsion, should allow one to deduce the full Einstein–Cartan theory from the maximum force principle. This issue is a topic of research. Ref. 550 Ref. 555

Finally, there is one experimental result that still is unexplained. The rotation speed of matter far from the centre of galaxies does not seem to be consistent with the inverse square dependence. There could be many reasons for this effect. The most popular models are the existence of dark matter on one side or a modification in the field equations

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Ref. 556 for astronomically large distances on the other side. The dark matter model assumes that we have difficulties observing something, the modified dynamics model assumes that we missed something in the equations. The issue is still open.

The limits of general relativity

Despite its successes, the description of motion presented so far is unsatisfactory; maybe Challenge 992 e you already have some gut feeling about certain unresolved issues.

First of all, even though the speed of light is the starting point of the whole theory, we still do not know what light actually *is*. This will be our next topic.

Secondly, we have seen that everything falls along geodesics. But a mountain does not fall. Somehow the matter below prevents it from falling. How? And where does mass come from anyway? What is mass? What is matter? General relativity does not provide an answer; in fact, it does not describe matter *at all*. Einstein used to say that the left-hand side of the field equations, describing the curvature of space-time, was granite, while the right-hand side, describing matter, was sand. Indeed, at this point we still do not know what matter and mass are. As already remarked, to change the sand into rock we first need quantum theory and then, in a further step, its unification with relativity. This is the programme for the rest of our adventure.

We have also seen that matter is necessary to clearly distinguish between space and time, and in particular, to understand the working of clocks, metre bars and balances. In particular, one question remains: why are there units of mass, length and time in nature *at all*? This deep question will also be addressed in the following part of our ascent.

Finally, we know little about the vacuum. We need to understand the magnitude of the cosmological constant and the number of space-time dimensions. Only then can we answer the simple question: Why is the sky so far away? General relativity does not help here. Worse, the smallness of the cosmological constant contradicts the simplest version of quantum theory; this is one of the reasons why we still have quite some height to scale Page 1396 before we reach the top of Motion Mountain.

In short, to describe motion well, we need a more precise description of light, of matter and of the vacuum. In other words, we need to know more about everything we know. Page 1152 Otherwise we cannot hope to answer questions about mountains, clocks and stars. In a sense, it seems that we have not achieved much. Fortunately, this is not true. We have learned so much that for the following topic we are forced to go backwards, to situations *without* gravity, i.e., back to the framework of special relativity. That is the next, middle section of our mountain ascent. Despite this simplification to flat space-time, a lot of fun awaits us there.

> It's a good thing we have gravity, or else when birds died they'd just stay right up there. Hunters would be all confused.
>
> Steven Wright, comedian.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

BIBLIOGRAPHY

> A man will turn over half a library to make one book.
>
> Samuel Johnson*

294 Aristotle, On sense and the sensible, section 1, part 1, 350 bce. Cited in Jean-Paul Dumont, *Les écoles présocratiques*, Folio Essais, Gallimard, p. 157, 1991. Cited on page 401.

295 Anonymous, Demonstration touchant le mouvement de la lumière trouvé par M. Römer de l'Academie Royale des Sciences, *Journal des Scavans* pp. 233–236, 1676. An English summary is found in O. C. Rømer, A demonstration concerning the motion of light, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* **136**, pp. 893–894, 1677. You can read the two papers at dbhs.wvusd.k12.ca.us/webdocs/Chem-History/Roemer-1677/Roemer-1677.html. Cited on page 403.

296 F. Tuinstra, Rømer and the finite speed of light, *Physics Today* **57**, pp. 16–17, December 2004. Cited on page 403.

297 The history of the measurement of the speed of light can be found in chapter 19 of the text by Francis A. Jenkins & Harvey E. White, *Fundamentals of Optics*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1957. Cited on page 403.

298 On the way to perform such measurements, see Sydney G. Brewer, *Do-it-yourself Astronomy*, Edinburgh University Press, 1988. Kepler himself never measured the distances of planets to the Sun, but only *ratios* of planetary distances. The parallax of the Sun from two points of the Earth is at most 8.79″; it was first measured in the eighteenth century. Cited on page 403.

299 Aristarchos, On the sizes and the distances of the Sun and the Moon, *c.* 280 bce, in Michael J. Crowe, *Theories of the World From Antiquity to the Copernican Revolution*, Dover, 1990. Cited on page 404.

300 J. Frercks, Creativity and technology in experimentation: Fizeau's terrestrial determination of the speed of light, *Centaurus* **42**, pp. 249–287, 2000. See also the beautiful website on reconstrutions of historical science experiments at www.uni-oldenburg.de/histodid/forschung/nachbauten. Cited on page 404.

301 The way to make pictures of light pulses with an ordinary photographic camera, without any electronics, is described by M. A. Duguay & A. T. Mattick, Ultrahigh speed photography of picosecond light pulses and echoes, *Applied Optics* **10**, pp. 2162–2170, 1971. The picture on page 405 is taken from it. Cited on page 404.

302 You can learn the basics of special relativity with the help of the web, without referring to any book, using the physics.syr.edu/research/relativity/RELATIVITY.html web page as a

* Samuel Johnson (1709–1784), famous English poet and intellectual.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

starting point. This page mentions most of the English-language relativity resources available on the web. Links in other languages can be found with search engines. Cited on page 405.

303 Observations of gamma ray bursts show that the speed of light does not depend on the lamp speed to within one part in 10^{20}, as shown by K. Brecher, *Bulletin of the American Physical Society* **45**, 2000. He assumed that both sides of the burster emit light. The large speed difference and the pulse sharpness then yield this result. See also his older paper K. Brecher, Is the speed of light independent of the source?, *Physics Letters* **39**, pp. 1051–1054, Errata 1236, 1977. Measuring the light speed from rapidly moving stars is another way. Some of these experiments are not completely watertight, however. There is a competing theory of electrodynamics, due to Ritz, which maintains that the speed of light is c only when measured with respect to the source; The light from stars, however, passes through the atmosphere, and its speed might thus be reduced to c.

The famous experiment with light emitted from rapid pions at CERN is not subject to this criticism. It is described in T. Alväger, J. M. Bailey, F. J. M. Farley, J. Kjellman & I. Wallin, Test of the second postulate of relativity in the GeV region, *Physics Letters* **12**, pp. 260–262, 1964. See also T. Alväger & al., Velocity of high-energy gamma rays, *Arkiv för Fysik* **31**, pp. 145–157, 1965.

Another precise experiment at extreme speeds is described by G. R. Kalbfleisch, N. Baggett, E. C. Fowler & J. Alspector, Experimental comparison of neutrino, anti-neutrino, and muon velocities, *Physical Review Letters* **43**, pp. 1361–1364, 1979. Cited on page 406.

304 See e.g. C. Will, *Theory and Experiment in Gravitational Physics*, Revised edition, Cambridge University Press, 1993. Cited on pages 407 and 409.

305 B. E. Schaefer, Severe limits on variations of the speed of light with frequency, *Physical Review Letters* **82**, pp. 4964–4966, 21 June 1999. Cited on page 407.

306 The beginning of the modern theory of relativity is the famous paper by Albert Einstein, Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper, *Annalen der Physik* **17**, pp. 891–921, 1905. It still well worth reading, and every physicist should have done so. The same can be said of the famous paper, probably written after he heard of Olinto De Pretto's idea, found in Albert Einstein, Ist die Trägheit eines Körpers von seinem Energieinhalt abhängig?, *Annalen der Physik* **18**, pp. 639–641, 1905. See also the review Albert Einstein, Über das Relativitätsprinzip und die aus demselben gezogenen Folgerungen, *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik* **4**, pp. 411–462, 1907. These papers are now available in many languages. A later, unpublished review is available in facsimile and with an English translation as Albert Einstein, Hanoch Gutfreund, ed., *Einstein's 1912 Manuscript on the Theory of Relativity*, George Braziller, 2004. Cited on pages 407, 409, and 447.

307 Albert Einstein, *Mein Weltbild*, edited by Carl Selig, Ullstein Verlag, 1998. Cited on page 408.

308 Jean van Bladel, *Relativity and Engineering*, Springer, 1984. Cited on page 407.

309 Albrecht Fölsing, *Albert Einstein – eine Biographie*, Suhrkamp p. 237, 1993. Cited on pages 409 and 418.

310 R. J. Kennedy & E. M. Thorndike, Experimental establishment of the relativity of time, *Physical Review* **42**, pp. 400–418, 1932. See also H. E. Ives & G. R. Stilwell, An experimental study of the rate of a moving atomic clock, *Journal of the Optical Society of America* **28**, pp. 215–226, 1938, and **31**, pp. 369–374, 1941. For a modern, high-precision versions, see C. Braxmeier, H. Müller, O. Pradl, J. Mlynek, A. Peters & S. Schiller, New tests of relativity using a cryogenic optical resonator, *Physical Re-*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

view Letters **88**, p. 010401, 2002. The newest result is in P. Antonini, M. Okhapkin, E. Göklü & S. Schiller, Test of constancy of speed of light with rotating cryogenic optical resonators, *Physical Review A* **71**, p. 050101, 2005, or arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0504109. See also P. Antonini, M. Okhapkin, E. Göklü & S. Schiller, Reply to "Comment on 'Test of constancy of speed of light with rotating cryogenic optical resonators' ", *Physical Review A* **72**, p. 066102, 2005. Cited on page 410.

311 Edwin F. Taylor & John A. Wheeler, *Spacetime Physics – Introduction to Special Relativity*, second edition, Freeman, 1992. See also Nick M. J. Woodhouse, *Special Relativity*, Springer, 2003. Cited on pages 409 and 455.

312 Wolfgang Rindler, *Relativity – Special, General and Cosmological*, Oxford University Press, 2001. A beautiful book by one of the masters of the field. Cited on pages 409 and 459.

313 The slowness of the speed of light inside stars is due to the frequent scattering of photons by the star matter. The most common estimate for the Sun is an escape time of 40 000 to 1 million years, but estimates between 17 000 years and 50 million years can be found in the literature. Cited on page 410.

314 L. Vestergaard Hau, S. E. Harris, Z. Dutton & C. H. Behroozi, Light speed reduction to 17 meters per second in an ultracold atomic gas, *Nature* **397**, pp. 594–598, 1999. See also Ref. 27. Cited on page 410.

315 The method of explaining special relativity by drawing a few lines on paper is due to Hermann Bondi, *Relativity and Common Sense: A New Approach to Einstein*, Dover, New York, 1980. See also Dierck-Ekkehard Liebscher, *Relativitätstheorie mit Zirkel und Lineal*, Akademie-Verlag Berlin, 1991. Cited on page 410.

316 Rod S. Lakes, Experimental limits on the photon mass and cosmic vector potential, *Physical Review Letters* **80**, pp. 1826–1829, 1998. The speed of light is independent of frequency within a factor of $6 \cdot 10^{-21}$, as was shown from gamma ray studies by B. E. Schaefer, Severe limits on variations of the speed of light with frequency, *Physical Review Letters* **82**, pp. 4964–4966, 1999. Cited on page 412.

317 An overview of experimental results is given in Yuan Zhong Zhang, *Special Relativity and its Experimental Foundations*, World Scientific, 1998. Cited on pages 406, 412, 417, 428, 441, 467, and 636.

318 R. W. McGowan & D. M. Giltner, New measurement of the relativistic Doppler shift in neon, *Physical Review Letters* **70**, pp. 251–254, 1993. Cited on page 414.

319 The present record for clock synchronization seems to be 1 ps for two clocks distant 3 km from each other. See A. Valencia, G. Scarcelli & Y. Shih, Distant clock synchronization using entangled photon pairs, *Applied Physics Letters* **85**, pp. 2655–2657, 2004, or arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0407204. Cited on page 414.

320 J. Frenkel & T. Kontorowa, Über die Theorie der plastischen Verformung, *Physikalische Zeitschrift der Sowietunion* **13**, p. 1, 1938. F. C. Frank, On the equations of motion of crystal dislocations, *Proceedings of the Physical Society A* **62**, pp. 131–134, 1949. J. Eshelby, Uniformly moving dislocations, *Proceedings of the Physical Society A* **62**, pp. 307–314, 1949. See also G. Leibfried & H. Dietze, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **126**, p. 790, 1949. A general introduction can be found in A. Seeger & P. Schiller, Kinks in dislocation lines and their effects in internal friction in crystals, *Physical Acoustics* **3A**, W. P. Mason, ed., Academic Press, 1966. See also the textbooks by Frank R. N. Nabarro, *Theory of Crystal Dislocations*, Oxford University Press, 1967, or J. P. Hirth & J. Lothe, *Theory of Dislocations*, McGraw Hill, 1968. Cited on page 415.

321 This beautiful graph is taken from Z. G. T. Guiragossian, G. B. Rothbart,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

M. R. Yearian, R. Gearhart & J. J. Murray, Relative velocity measurements of electrons and gamma rays at 15 GeV, *Physical Review Letters* **34**, pp. 335–338, 1975. Cited on page 416.

322 To find out more about the best-known crackpots, and their ideas, send an email to majordomo@zikzak.net with the one-line body 'subscribe psychoceramics'. Cited on page 416.

323 The speed of neutrinos is the same as that of light to 9 decimal digits. This is explained by Leo Stodolsky, The speed of light and the speed of neutrinos, *Physics Letters B* **201**, p. 353, 1988. An observation of a small mass for the neutrino has been published by the Japanese Super-Kamiokande collaboration, in Y. Fukuda & al., Evidence for oscillation of atmospheric neutrinos, *Physical Review Letters* **81**, pp. 1562–1567, 1998. The newer results published by the Canadian Sudbury Neutrino Observatory, as Q. R. Ahmad & al., Direct evidence for neutrino flavor transformation from neutral-current interactions in the Sudbury Neutrino Observatory, *Physical Review Letters* **89**, p. 011301, 2002, also confirm that neutrinos have a mass in the 1 eV region. Cited on pages 417 and 656.

324 B. Rothenstein & G. Eckstein, Lorentz transformations directly from the speed of light, *American Journal of Physics* **63**, p. 1150, 1995. See also the comment by E. Kapuścik, Comment on "Lorentz transformations directly from the speed of light" by B. Rothenstein and G. Eckstein, *American Journal of Physics* **65**, p. 1210, 1997. Cited on page 418.

325 See e.g. the 1922 lectures by Lorentz at Caltech, published as H. A. Lorentz, *Problems of Modern Physics*, edited by H. Bateman, Ginn and Company, page 99, 1927. Cited on page 418.

326 A. A. Michelson & E. W. Morley, On the relative motion of the Earth and the luminiferous ether, *American Journal of Science (3rd series)* **34**, pp. 333–345, 1887. Michelson published many other papers on the topic after this one. Cited on page 418.

327 S. Schiller, P. Antonini & M. Okhapkin, A precision test of the isotropy of the speed of light using rotating cryogenic cavities, arxiv.org/abs/physics/0510169. Cited on page 418.

328 H. A. Lorentz, De relative beweging van de aarde en dem aether, *Amst. Versl.* **1**, p. 74, 1892, and also H. A. Lorentz, Electromagnetic phenomena in a system moving with any velocity smaller than that of light, *Amst. Proc.* **6**, p. 809, 1904, or *Amst. Versl.* **12**, p. 986, 1904. Cited on page 421.

329 A general refutation of such proposals is discussed by S. R. Mainwaring & G. E. Stedman, Accelerated clock principles, *Physical Review A* **47**, pp. 3611–3619, 1993. Experiments on *muons* at CERN in 1968 showed that accelerations of up to $10^{20}\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$ have no effect, as explained by D. H. Perkins, *Introduction to High Energy Physics*, Addison-Wesley, 1972, or by J. Bailey & al., *Il Nuovo Cimento* **9A**, p. 369, 1972. Cited on page 422.

330 W. Rindler, General relativity before special relativity: an unconventional overview of relativity theory, *American Journal of Physics* **62**, pp. 887–893, 1994. Cited on page 422.

331 Steven K. Blau, Would a topology change allow Ms. Bright to travel backward in time?, *American Journal of Physics* **66**, pp. 179–185, 1998. Cited on page 424.

332 On the 'proper' formulation of relativity, see for example D. Hestenes, Proper particle mechanics, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **15**, pp. 1768–1777, 1974. Cited on page 425.

333 The simple experiment to take a precise clock on a plane, fly it around the world and then compare it with an identical one left in place was first performed by J. C. Hafele &

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

R. E. Keating, Around-the-world atomic clocks: predicted relativistic time gains, *Science* **177**, pp. 166–167, and Around-the-world atomic clocks: observed relativistic time gains, pp. 168–170, 14 July 1972. See also Ref. 317. Cited on page 426.

334 A readable introduction to the change of time with observers, and to relativity in general, is Roman U. Sexl & Herbert Kurt Schmidt, *Raum-Zeit-Relativität*, 2. Auflage, Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig, 1991. Cited on page 426.

335 Most famous is the result that moving muons stay younger, as shown for example by D. H. Frisch & J. B. Smith, Measurement of the relativistic time dilation using μ-mesons, *American Journal of Physics* **31**, pp. 342–355, 1963. For a full pedagogical treatment of the twin paradox, see E. Sheldon, Relativistic twins or sextuplets?, *European Journal of Physics* **24**, pp. 91–99, 2003. Cited on page 426.

336 Paul J. Nahin, *Time Machines – Time Travel in Physics, Metaphysics and Science Fiction*, Springer Verlag and AIP Press, second edition, 1999. Cited on page 427.

337 The first muon experiment was B. Rossi & D. B. Hall, Variation of the rate of decay of mesotrons with momentum, *Physical Review* **59**, pp. 223–228, 1941. 'Mesotron' was the old name for muon. Cited on page 427.

338 A. Harvey & E. Schucking, A small puzzle from 1905, *Physics Today*, pp. 34–36, March 2005. Cited on page 428.

339 W. Rindler, Length contraction paradox, *American Journal of Physics* **29**, pp. 365–366, 1961. For a variation without gravity, see R. Shaw, Length contraction paradox, *American Journal of Physics* **30**, p. 72, 1962. Cited on page 429.

340 van Lintel & C. Gruber, The rod and hole paradox re-examined, *European Journal of Physics* **26**, pp. 19–23, 2005. Cited on page 429.

341 This situation is discussed by G. P. Sastry, Is length contraction paradoxical?, *American Journal of Physics* **55**, 1987, pp. 943–946. This paper also contains an extensive literature list covering variants of length contraction paradoxes. Cited on page 430.

342 S. P. Boughn, The case of the identically accelerated twins, *American Journal of Physics* **57**, pp. 791–793, 1989. Cited on pages 430 and 431.

343 J. M. Supplee, Relativistic buoyancy, *American Journal of Physics 57* **1**, pp. 75–77, January 1989. See also G. E. A. Matsas, Relativistic Arquimedes law for fast moving bodies and the general-relativistic resolution of the 'submarine paradox', *Physical Review D* **68**, p. 027701, 2003, or arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0305106. Cited on page 430.

344 The distinction was first published by J. Terrell, Invisibility of Lorentz contraction, *Physical Review* **116**, pp. 1041–1045, 1959, and R. Penrose, The apparent shape of a relativistically moving sphere, *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* **55**, pp. 137–139, 1959. Cited on page 431.

345 G. R. Rybicki, Speed limit on walking, *American Journal of Physics* **59**, pp. 368–369, 1991. Cited on page 434.

346 The first examples of such astronomical observations were provided by A. R. Whitney & al., Quasars revisited: rapid time variations observed via very-long-baseline interferometry, *Science* **173**, pp. 225–230, 1971, and by M. H. Cohen & al., The small-scale structure of radio galaxies and quasi-stellar sources at 3.8 centimetres, *Astrophysical Journal* **170**, pp. 207–217, 1971. See also T. J. Pearson, S. C. Unwin, M. H. Cohen, R. P. Linfield, A. C. S. Readhead, G. A. Seielstad, R. S. Simon & R. C. Walker, Superluminal expansion of quasar 3C 273, *Nature* **290**, pp. 365–368, 1981. An overview is given in J. A. Zensus & T. J. Pearson, editors, *Superluminal radio sources*, Cambridge University Press, 1987. Another measurement, using very long baseline interferometry with radio

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

waves, was shown on the cover of *Nature*: I. F. Mirabel & L. F. Rodríguez, A superluminal source in the galaxy, *Nature* **371**, pp. 46–48, 1994. A more recent example was reported in *Science News* **152**, p. 357, 6 December 1997.

Pedagogical explanations are given by D. C. Gabuzda, The use of quasars in teaching introductory special relativity, *American Journal of Physics* **55**, pp. 214–215, 1987, and by Edwin F. Taylor & John A. Wheeler, *Spacetime Physics – Introduction to Special Relativity*, second edition, Freeman, 1992, pages 89-92. This excellent book was mentioned already in the text. Cited on page 436.

347 O. M. Bilaniuk & E. C. Sudarshan, Particles beyond the light barrier, *Physics Today* **22**, pp. 43–51, 1969, and O. M. P. Bilaniuk, V. K. Deshpande & E. C. G. Sudarshan, 'Meta' relativity, *American Journal of Physics* **30**, pp. 718–723, 1962. See also E. Recami, editor, *Tachyons, Monopoles and Related Topics*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1978. Cited on page 437.

348 J. P. Costella, B. H. J. McKellar, A. A. Rawlinson & G. J. Stephenson, The Thomas rotation, *American Journal of Physics* **69**, pp. 837–847, 2001. Cited on page 438.

349 See for example S. S. Costa & G. E. A. Matsas, Temperature and relativity, preprint available at arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9505045. Cited on page 438.

350 R. C. Tolman & G. N. Lewis, The principle of relativity and non-Newtonian mechanics, *Philosophical Magazine* **18**, pp. 510–523, 1909, and R. C. Tolman, Non-Newtonian mechanics: the mass of a moving body, *Philosophical Magazine* **23**, pp. 375–380, 1912. Cited on page 439.

351 S. Rainville, J.K. Thompson, E.G. Myers, J.M. Brown, M.S. Dewey, E.G. Kessler, R.D. Deslattes, H.G. Börner, M. Jentschel, P. Mutti & D.E. Pritchard, World year of physics: a direct test of $E = mc^2$, *Nature* **438**, pp. 1096–1097, 2005. Cited on page 443.

352 This information is due to a private communication by Frank DiFilippo; part of the story is given in F. DiFilippo, V. Natarajan, K. R. Boyce & D. E. Pritchard, Accurate atomic masses for fundamental metrology, *Physical Review Letters* **73**, pp. 1481–1484, 1994. These measurements were performed with Penning traps; a review of the possibilities they offer is given by R. C. Thompson, Precision measurement aspects of ion traps, *Measurement Science and Technology* **1**, pp. 93–105, 1990. The most important experimenters in the field of single particle levitation were awarded the Nobel Prize in 1989. One of the Nobel Prize lectures can be found in W. Paul, Electromagnetic traps for neutral and charged particles, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **62**, pp. 531–540, 1990. Cited on page 443.

353 J. L. Synge, *Relativity: The Special Theory*, North-Holland, 1956, pp. 208–213. More about antiparticles in special relativity can be found in J. P. Costella, B. H. J. McKellar & A. A. Rawlinson, Classical antiparticles, *American Journal of Physics* **65**, pp. 835–841, 1997. See also Ref. 368. Cited on page 444.

354 A. Papapetrou, Drehimpuls- und Schwerpunktsatz in der relativistischen Mechanik, *Praktika Acad. Athenes* **14**, p. 540, 1939, and A. Papapetrou, Drehimpuls- und Schwerpunktsatz in der Diracschen Theorie, *Praktika Acad. Athenes* **15**, p. 404, 1940. See also M. H. L. Pryce, The mass-centre in the restricted theory of relativity and its connexion with the quantum theory of elementary particles, *Proceedings of the Royal Society in London, A* **195**, pp. 62–81, 1948. Cited on page 446.

355 The references preceding Einstein's $E = mc^2$ are: Tolver Preston, *Physics of the Ether*, E. & F.N. Spon, 1875, J. H. Poincaré, La théorie de Lorentz et le principe de réaction, *Archives néerlandaises des sciences exactes et naturelles* **5**, pp. 252–278, 1900,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

O. De Pretto, Ipotesi dell'etere nella vita dell'universo, *Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti* **tomo LXIII**, parte 2, pp. 439–500, Febbraio 1904, F. Hasenöhrl, *Berichte der Wiener Akademie* **113**, p. 1039, 1904, F. Hasenöhrl, Zur Theorie der Strahlung in bewegten Körpern, *Annalen der Physik* **15**, pp. 344–370, 1904, F. Hasenöhrl, Zur Theorie der Strahlung in bewegten Körpern – Berichtigung, *Annalen der Physik* **16**, pp. 589–592, 1905. Hasenöhrl died in 1915, De Pretto in 1921. All these publications were published before the famous paper by Albert Einstein, Ist die Trägheit eines Körpers von seinem Energieinhalt abhängig?, *Annalen der Physik* **18**, pp. 639–641, 1905. Cited on page 447.

356 A jewel among the textbooks on special relativity is the booklet by Ulrich E. Schröder, *Spezielle Relativitätstheorie*, Verlag Harri Deutsch, Thun, 1981. Cited on pages 450 and 452.

357 A readable article showing a photocopy of a letter by Einstein making this point is Lev B. Okun, The concept of mass, *Physics Today*, pp. 31–36, June 1989. The topic is not without controversy, as the letters by readers following that article show; they are found in *Physics Today*, pp. 13–14 and pp. 115–117, May 1990. The topic is still a source of debates. Cited on page 452.

358 Christian Møller, *The Theory of Relativity*, Clarendon Press, 1952, 1972. This standard text has been translated in several languages. Cited on page 452.

359 P. Ehrenfest, Gleichförmige Rotation starrer Körper und Relativitätstheorie, *Physikalische Zeitschrift* **10**, pp. 918–928, 1909. Ehrenfest (incorrectly) suggested that this meant that relativity cannot be correct. A modern summary of the issue can be found in M. L. Ruggiero, The relative space: space measurements on a rotating platform, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0309020. Cited on page 453.

360 R. J. Low, When moving clocks run fast, *European Journal of Physics* **16**, pp. 228–229, 1995. Cited on page 458.

361 G. Stephenson & C. W. Kilmister, *Special Relativity for Physicists*, Longmans, London, 1965. See also W. N. Matthews, Relativistic velocity and acceleration transformations from thought experiments, *American Journal of Physics* **73**, pp. 45–51, 2005. Cited on page 459.

362 The impossibility of defining rigid coordinate frames for non-uniformly accelerating observers is discussed by Charles Misner, Kip Thorne & John A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, Freeman, p. 168, 1973. Cited on page 461.

363 E. A. Desloge & R. J. Philpott, Uniformly accelerated reference frames in special relativity, *American Journal of Physics* **55**, pp. 252–261, 1987. Cited on page 461.

364 R. H. Good, Uniformly accelerated reference frame and twin paradox, *American Journal of Physics* **50**, pp. 232–238, 1982. Cited on pages 461, 462, and 465.

365 Dwayne Hamilton, The uniformly accelerated reference frame, *American Journal of Physics* **46**, pp. 83–89, 1978. Cited on page 462.

366 The best and cheapest mathematical formula collection remains the one by K. Rottmann, *Mathematische Formelsammlung*, BI Hochschultaschenbücher, 1960. Cited on page 462.

367 C. G. Adler & R. W. Brehme, Relativistic solutions to a falling body in a uniform gravitation field, *American Journal of Physics* **59**, pp. 209–213, 1991. Cited on page 463.

368 See for example the excellent lecture notes by D. J. Raymond, A radically modern approach to freshman physics, on the www.physics.nmt.edu/~raymond/teaching.html website. Cited on pages 463 and 637.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

369 L. Mishra, The relativistic acceleration addition theorem, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **11**, pp. L97–L102, 1994. Cited on page 463.

370 Edward A. Desloge, The gravitational red-shift in a uniform field, *American Journal of Physics* **58**, pp. 856–858, 1990. Cited on page 465.

371 One of the latest of these debatable experiments is T. P. Krisher, L. Maleki, G. F. Lutes, L. E. Primas, R. T. Logan, J. D. Anderson & C. M. Will, Test of the isotropy of the one-way speed of light using hydrogen-maser frequency standards, *Physical Review D* **42**, pp. 731–734, 1990. Cited on page 467.

372 H. C. Ohanian, The role of dynamics in the synchronization problem, *American Journal of Physics* **72**, pp. 141–148, 2004. Cited on page 467.

373 Edwin F. Taylor & A. P. French, Limitation on proper length in special relativity, *American Journal of Physics* **51**, pp. 889–893, 1983. Cited on page 468.

374 Similar statements are made by Michael Duff in several of his publications. See, for example, M. J. Duff, Comment on time-variation of fundamental constants, arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0208093. Cited on page 469.

375 The quote is form a letter of Gibbs to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, in which he thanks the Academy for their prize. The letter was read in a session of the Academy and thus became part of the proceedings: J. W. Gibbs, Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, **16**, p. 420, 1881. Cited on page 472.

376 It seems that the first published statement of the principle was in the year 2000 edition of this text, in the chapter on gravitation and relativity. The present author discovered the maximum force principle in 1998, when searching for a way to derive the results of chapter 52 that would be so simple that it would convince even a secondary-school student. The reference is Christoph Schiller, *Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics*, found at www.motionmountain.eu. The idea of a maximum force was also proposed by Gary Gibbons in 2002 (see reference below). Nowadays Gary Gibbons is more cautious than the author about whether the maximum force can be seen as an actual physical principle (despite the title of his paper). The approach of a maximum force was discussed in various usenet discussion groups in the early twenty-first century. These discussion showed that the idea of a maximum force (and a maximum power) were known to some people, but that before Gibbons and the author few had put it in writing. Also this physics discovery was thus made much too late. In short, only the idea to raise maximum force or power to a *principle* seems to be original; it was published first in the reference following this one and then in C. Schiller, General relativity and cosmology derived from principle of maximum power or force, *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **44**, pp. 1629–1647, 2005, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/physics/0607090. Cited on page 472.

377 C. Schiller, Maximum force and minimum distance: physics in limit statements, part of this text and downloadable at www.motionmountain.eu/MotionMountain-Part6.pdf, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/physics/0309118. Cited on pages 474, 477, 486, and 495.

378 G. W. Gibbons, The maximum tension principle in general relativity, *Foundations of Physics* **32**, pp. 1891–1901, 2002, or arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0210109. Gary Gibbons explains that the maximum force follows from general relativity; he does not make a statement about the converse. See also L. Kostro & B. Lange, Is c^4/G the greatest possible force in nature?, *Physics Essays* **12**, pp. 182–189, 1999. See also C. Massa, Does the gravitational constant increase?, *Astrophysics and Space Science* **232**, pp. 143–148, 1995. Cited on pages 472 and 509.

379 H. C. Ohanian & R. Ruffini, *Gravitation and Spacetime*, W.W. Norton & Co., 1994. Another textbook that talks about the power limit is Ian R. Kenyon, *General Relativity*,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Oxford University Press, 1990. The maximum power is also discussed in L. Kostro, The quantity c^5/G interpreted as the greatest possible power in nature, *Physics Essays* **13**, pp. 143–154, 2000. Cited on pages 476, 485, 487, 489, 493, and 494.

380 See for example Wolfgang Rindler, *Relativity – Special, General and Cosmological*, Oxford University Press, 2001, p. 70 ff, or Ray d'Inverno *Introducing Einstein's Relativity*, Clarendon Press, 1992, p. 36 ff. Cited on page 478.

381 See for example A. Ashtekar, S. Fairhust & B. Krishnan, Isolated horizons: Hamiltonian evolution and the first law, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0005083. Cited on page 478.

382 T. Jacobson, Thermodynamics of spacetime: the Einstein equation of state, *Physical Review Letters* **75**, pp. 1260–1263, 1995 or arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9504004. Cited on page 479.

383 See for example Ekkehart Kröner, *Kontinuumstheorie der Versetzungen und Eigenspannungen*, Springer, 1958, volume 5 of the series 'Ergebnisse der angewandten Mathematik'. Kröner shows the similarity between the equations, methods and results of solid-state continuum physics and those of general relativity. Cited on page 482.

384 Edwin F. Taylor & John A. Wheeler, *Spacetime Physics – Introduction to Special Relativity*, second edition, Freeman, 1992. Cited on page 482.

385 This counter-example was suggested by Steve Carlip. Cited on page 485.

386 E. R. Caianiello, *Lettere al Nuovo Cimento* **41**, p. 370, 1984. Cited on page 487.

387 R. Penrose, Naked singularities, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* **224**, pp. 125–134, 1973. Cited on page 493.

388 G. Huisken & T. Ilmanen, The Riemannian Penrose inequality, *International Mathematics Research Notices* **59**, pp. 1045–1058, 1997. Cited on page 493.

389 S. A. Hayward, Inequalities relating area, energy, surface gravity and charge of black holes, *Physical Review Letters* **81**, pp. 4557–4559, 1998. Cited on page 493.

390 C. Will, *Was Einstein Right? – Putting General Relativity to the Test*, Oxford University Press, 1993. See also his paper arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9811036. Cited on page 493.

391 The measurement results by the WMAP satellite are summarized on the website map.gsfc.nasa.gov/m_mm.html; the papers are available at lambda.gsfc.nasa.gov/product/map/current/map_bibliography.cfm. Cited on page 495.

392 The simplest historical source is Albert Einstein, *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* II pp. 844–846, 1915. It is the first explanation of the general theory of relativity, in only three pages. The theory is then explained in detail in the famous article Albert Einstein, Die Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie, *Annalen der Physik* **49**, pp. 769–822, 1916. The historic references can be found in German and English in John Stachel, ed., *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volumes 1–9, Princeton University Press, 1987–2004.

Below is a selection of English-language textbooks for deeper study, in ascending order of depth and difficulty:

— An entertaining book without any formulae, but nevertheless accurate and detailed, is the paperback by Igor Novikov, *Black Holes and the Universe*, Cambridge University Press, 1990.
— Almost no formulae, but loads of insight, are found in the enthusiastic text by John A. Wheeler, *A Journey into Gravity and Spacetime*, W.H. Freeman, 1990.
— An excellent didactical presentation is Edwin F. Taylor & John A. Wheeler, *Exploring Black Holes: Introduction to General Relativity*, Addison Wesley Longman, 2000.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

— Beauty, simplicity and shortness are the characteristics of Malcolm Ludvigsen, *General Relativity, a Geometric Approach*, Cambridge University Press, 1999.
— Good explanation is the strength of Bernard Schutz, *Gravity From the Ground Up*, Cambridge University Press, 2003.
— A good overview of experiments and theory is given in James Foster & J. D. Nightingale, *A Short Course in General Relativity*, Springer Verlag, 2nd edition, 1998.
— A pretty text is Sam Lilley, *Discovering Relativity for Yourself*, Cambridge University Press, 1981.
— A modern text is by Ray d'Inverno *Introducing Einstein's Relativity*, Clarendon Press, 1992. It includes an extended description of black holes and gravitational radiation, and regularly refers to present research.
— A beautiful, informative and highly recommended text is Hans C. Ohanian & Remo Ruffini, *Gravitation and Spacetime*, W.W. Norton & Co., 1994.
— A well written and modern book, with emphasis on the theory, by one of the great masters of the field is Wolfgang Rindler, *Relativity – Special, General and Cosmological*, Oxford University Press, 2001.
— A classic is Steven Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology*, Wiley, 1972.
— The passion of general relativity can be experienced also in John Klauder, ed., *Magic without Magic: John Archibald Wheeler – A Collection of Essays in Honour of His Sixtieth Birthday*, W.H. Freeman & Co., 1972.
— An extensive text is Kip S. Thorne, *Black Holes and Time Warps – Einstein's Outrageous Legacy*, W.W. Norton, 1994.
— The most mathematical – and toughest – text is Robert M. Wald, *General Relativity*, University of Chicago Press, 1984.
— Much information about general relativity is available on the internet. As a good starting point for US-American material, see the math.ucr.edu/home/baez/physics/ website.

There is still a need for a large and modern textbook on general relativity, with colour material, that combines experimental and theoretical aspects.

For texts in other languages, see the next reference. Cited on pages 498, 535, 536, 555, and 557.

393 A beautiful German teaching text is the classic G. Falk & W. Ruppel, *Mechanik, Relativität, Gravitation – ein Lehrbuch*, Springer Verlag, third edition, 1983.

A practical and elegant booklet is Ulrich E. Schröder, *Gravitation – Einführung in die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie*, Verlag Harri Deutsch, Frankfurt am Main, 2001.

A modern reference is Torsten Fliessbach, *Allgemeine Relativitätstheorie*, Akademischer Spektrum Verlag, 1998.

Excellent is Hubert Goenner, *Einführung in die spezielle und allgemeine Relativitätstheorie*, Akademischer Spektrum Verlag, 1996.

In Italian, there is the beautiful, informative, but expensive Hans C. Ohanian & Remo Ruffini, *Gravitazione e spazio-tempo*, Zanichelli, 1997. It is highly recommended. A modern update of that book would be without equals. Cited on pages 498, 530, 531, 535, 536, 555, 557, and 645.

394 P. Mohazzabi & J. H. Shea, High altitude free fall, *American Journal of Physics* **64**, pp. 1242–1246, 1996. As a note, due to a technical failure Kittinger had his hand in (near) vacuum during his ascent, without incurring any permanent damage. On the consequences of human exposure to vacuum, see the www.sff.net/people/geoffrey.landis/vacuum.html website. Cited on page 498.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

395 This story is told e.g. by W. G. Unruh, Time, gravity, and quantum mechanics, preprint available at arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9312027. Cited on page 499.

396 H. Bondi, Gravitation, *European Journal of Physics* **14**, pp. 1–6, 1993. Cited on page 500.

397 J. W. Brault, Princeton University Ph.D. thesis, 1962. See also J. L. Snider, *Physical Review Letters* **28**, pp. 853–856, 1972, and for the star Sirius see J.L. Greenstein & al., *Astrophysical Journal* **169**, p. 563, 1971. Cited on pages 501 and 628.

398 The famous paper is R. V. Pound & G. A. Rebka, Apparent weight of photons, *Physical Review Letters* **4**, pp. 337–341, 1960. A higher-precision version was published by R. V. Pound & J. L. Snider, *Physical Review Letters* **13**, p. 539, 1964, and R. V. Pound & J. L. Snider, *Physical Review B* **140**, p. 788, 1965. Cited on pages 501 and 628.

399 J. C. Hafele & Richard E. Keating, Around-the-world atomic clocks: predicted relativistic time gains, *Science* **177**, pp. 166–167, and Around-the-world atomic clocks: observed relativistic time gains, pp. 168–170, 14 July 1972. Cited on page 502.

400 R.F.C. Vessot & al., Test of relativistic gravitation with a space-borne hydrogen maser, *Physical Review Letters* **45**, pp. 2081–2084, 1980. The experiment was performed in 1976; there are more than a dozen co-authors involved in this work, which involved shooting a maser into space with a scout missile to a height of *c.* 10 000 km. Cited on page 502.

401 L. Briatore & S. Leschiutta, Evidence for Earth gravitational shift by direct atomic-time-scale comparison, *Il Nuovo Cimento* **37B**, pp. 219–231, 1977. Cited on page 502.

402 More information about tides can be found in E. P. Clancy, *The Tides*, Doubleday, New York, 1969. Cited on page 503.

403 The expeditions had gone to two small islands, namely to Sobral, north of Brazil, and to Principe, in the gulf of Guinea. The results of the expedition appeared in *The Times* before they appeared in a scientific journal. Today this would be seen as a gross violation of scientific honesty. The results were published as F. W. Dyson, A. S. Eddington & C. Davidson, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society (London)* **220A**, p. 291, 1920, and *Memoirs of the Royal Astronomical Society* **62**, p. 291, 1920. Cited on page 504.

404 A good source for images of space-time is the text by G. F. R. Ellis & R. Williams, *Flat and Curved Space-times*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1988. Cited on page 505.

405 J. Droste, Het veld van een enkel centrum in Einstein's theorie der zwaartekracht, en de beweging van een stoffelijk punt, *Verslag gew. Vergad. Wiss. Amsterdam* **25**, pp. 163–180, 1916. Cited on page 506.

406 The name *black hole* was introduced in 1967 at a pulsar conference, as described in his autobiography by John A. Wheeler, *Geons, Black Holes, and Quantum Foam: A Life in Physics*, W.W. Norton, 1998, pp. 296–297: 'In my talk, I argued that we should consider the possibility that at the center of a pulsar is a gravitationally completely collapsed object. I remarked that one couldn't keep saying "gravitationally completely collapsed object" over and over. One needed a shorter descriptive phrase. "How about black hole?" asked someone in the audience. I had been searching for just the right term for months, mulling it over in bed, in the bathtub, in my car, whenever I had quiet moments. Suddenly, this name seemed exactly right. When I gave a more formal ... lecture ... a few weeks later on, on December 29, 1967, I used the term, and then included it into the written version of the lecture published in the spring of 1968 ... I decided to be casual about the term "black hole", dropping it into the lecture and the written version as if it were an old familiar friend. Would it catch on? Indeed it did. By now every schoolchild has heard the term.'

The widespread use of the term began with the article by R. Ruffini & J. A. Wheeler, Introducing the black hole, *Physics Today* **24**, pp. 30–41, January 1971.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

In his autobiography, Wheeler also writes that the expression 'black hole has no hair' was criticized as 'obscene' by Feynman. An interesting comment by a physicist who used to write his papers in topless bars. Cited on pages 507, 604, 605, and 610.

407 L. B. Kreuzer, Experimental measurement of the equivalence of active and passive gravitational mass, *Physical Review* **169**, pp. 1007–1012, 1968. With a clever experiment, he showed that the gravitational masses of fluorine and of bromine are equal. Cited on page 507.

408 A good and accessible book on the topic is David Blair & Geoff McNamara, *Ripples on a cosmic sea*, Allen & Unwin, 1997. Cited on page 508.

409 That bodies fall along geodesics, independently of their mass, the so-called weak equivalence principle, has been checked by many experiments, down to the 10^{-13} level. The most precise experiments use so-called torsion balances. See, for example, the website of the Eőt-Wash group at www.npl.washington.edu/eotwash/experiments/experiments.html. Cited on page 511.

410 So far, the experiments confirm that electrostatic and (strong) nuclear energy fall like matter to within one part in 10^8, and weak (nuclear) energy to within a few per cent. This is summarized in Ref. 414. Cited on page 512.

411 J. Soldner, *Berliner Astronomisches Jahrbuch auf das Jahr 1804*, 1801, p. 161. Cited on page 512.

412 See for example K. D. Olum, Superluminal travel requires negative energies, *Physical Review Letters* **81**, pp. 3567–3570, 1998, or M. Alcubierre, The warp drive: hyper-fast travel within general relativity, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **11**, pp. L73–L77, 1994. See also Chris Van Den Broeck, A warp drive with more reasonable total energy requirements, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **16**, pp. 3973–3979, 1999. Cited on page 515.

413 See the *Astronomical Almanac*, and its *Explanatory Supplement*, H.M. Printing Office, London and U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1992. For the information about various time coordinates used in the world, such as barycentric coordinate time, the time at the barycentre of the solar system, see also the tycho.usno.navy.mil/systime.html web page. It also contains a good bibliography. Cited on page 516.

414 An overview is given in C. Will, *Theory and Experiment in Gravitational Physics*, chapter 14.3, Cambridge University Press, revised edition, 1993. (Despite being a standard reference, his view the role of tides and the role of gravitational energy within the principle of equivalence has been criticised by other researchers.) See also C. Will, *Was Einstein Right? – Putting General Relativity to the Test*, Oxford University Press, 1993. See also his paper arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9811036. Cited on pages 516, 535, and 643.

415 The calculation omits several smaller effects, such as rotation of the Earth and red-shift. For the main effect, see Edwin F. Taylor, 'The boundaries of nature: special and general relativity and quantum mechanics, a second course in physics' – Edwin F. Taylor's acceptance speech for the 1998 Oersted Medal presented by the American Association of Physics Teachers, 6 January 1998, *American Journal of Physics* **66**, pp. 369–376, 1998. Cited on page 517.

416 A. G. Lindh, Did Popper solve Hume's problem?, *Nature* **366**, pp. 105–106, 11 November 1993, Cited on page 517.

417 P. Kaaret, S. Piraino, P. F. Bloser, E. C. Ford, J. E. Grindlay, A. Santangelo, A. P. Smale & W. Zhang, Strong Field Gravity and X-Ray Observations of 4U1820-30, *Astrophysical Journal* **520**, pp. L37–L40, 1999, or at arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

9905236. Some beautiful graphics at the research.physics.uiuc.edu/CTA/movies/spm website show the models of this star system. Cited on page 517.

418 R. J. Nemiroff, Visual distortions near a black hole and a neutron star, *American Journal of Physics* **61**, pp. 619–632, 1993. Cited on page 517.

419 The equality was first tested with precision by R. von Eötvös, *Annalen der Physik & Chemie* **59**, p. 354, 1896, and by R. von Eötvös, V. Pekár, E. Fekete, Beiträge zum Gesetz der Proportionalität von Trägheit und Gravität, *Annalen der Physik 4, Leipzig* **68**, pp. 11–66, 1922. Eötvös found agreement to 5 parts in 10^9. More experiments were performed by P. G. Roll, R. Krotkow & R. H. Dicke, The equivalence of inertial and passive gravitational mass, *Annals of Physics (NY)* **26**, pp. 442–517, 1964, one of the most interesting and entertaining research articles in experimental physics, and by V. B. Braginsky & V. I. Panov, *Soviet Physics – JETP* **34**, pp. 463–466, 1971. Modern results, with errors less than one part in 10^{12}, are by Y. Su & al., New tests of the universality of free fall, *Physical Review* **D50**, pp. 3614–3636, 1994. Several experiments have been proposed to test the equality in space to less than one part in 10^{16}. Cited on pages 518 and 628.

420 Nigel Calder, *Einstein's Universe*, Viking, 1979. Weizmann and Einstein once crossed the Atlantic on the same ship. Cited on page 520.

421 The Thirring effect was predicted in H. Thirring, Über die Wirkung rotierender ferner Massen in der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie, *Physikalische Zeitschrift* **19**, pp. 33–39, 1918, and in H. Thirring, Berichtigung zu meiner Arbeit: "Über die Wirkung rotierender Massen in der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie", *Physikalische Zeitschrift* **22**, p. 29, 1921. The Thirring–Lense effect was predicted in J. Lense & H. Thirring, Über den Einfluß der Eigenrotation der Zentralkörper auf die Bewegung der Planeten und Monde nach der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie, *Physikalische Zeitschrift* **19**, pp. 156–163, 1918. See also Ref. 442. Cited on page 520.

422 The feat used the LAGEOS and LAGEOS II satellites and is told in Ignazio Ciufolini, The 1995–99 measurements of the Thirring–Lense effect using laser-ranged satellites, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **17**, pp. 2369–2380, 2000. See also I. Ciufolini & E. C. Pavlis, A confirmation of the general relativistic prediction of the Lense–Thirring effect, *Nature* **431**, pp. 958–960, 2004. Cited on pages 522, 525, and 628.

423 The detection of the Thirring–Lense effect in binary pulsars is presented in R. D. Blandford, Lense–Thirring precession of radio pulsars, *Journal of Astrophysics and Astronomy* **16**, pp. 191–206, 1995. Cited on page 522.

424 G. Holzmüller, *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik* **15**, p. 69, 1870, F. Tisserand, *Comptes Rendus* **75**, p. 760, 1872, and *Comptes Rendus* **110**, p. 313, 1890. Cited on page 522.

425 B. Mashhoon, Gravitoelectromagnetism, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0011014. See also its extensive reference list on gravitomagnetism. Cited on page 523.

426 D. Bedford & P. Krumm, On relativistic gravitation, *American Journal of Physics* **53**, pp. 889–890, 1985, and P. Krumm & D. Bedford, The gravitational Poynting vector and energy transfer, *American Journal of Physics* **55**, pp. 362–363, 1987. Cited on pages 523 and 530.

427 M. Kramer & al., Tests of general relativity from timing the double pulsar, prerpint at arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0609417. Cited on pages 525 and 628.

428 This is told in John A. Wheeler, *A Journey into Gravity and Spacetime*, W.H. Freeman, 1990. Cited on page 526.

429 See, for example, K. T. McDonald, Answer to question #49. Why c for gravitational waves?, *American Journal of Physics* **65**, pp. 591–592, 1997, and section III of V. B. Bra-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

GINSKY, C. M. CAVES & K. S. THORNE, Laboratory experiments to test relativistic gravity, *Physical Review D* **15**, pp. 2047–2068, 1992. Cited on page 527.

430 A. TARTAGLIA & M. L. RUGGIERO, Gravito-electromagnetism versus electromagnetism, *European Journal of Physics* **25**, pp. 203–210, 2004. Cited on page 527.

431 The original theoretical proposal is by S. M. KOPEIKIN, Testing the relativistic effect of the propagation of gravity by Very Long Baseline Interferometry, *Astrophysical Journal* **556**, pp. L1–L5, 2001, and the experimental data is E. B. FORMALONT & S. M. KOPEIKIN, The measurement of the light deflection from Jupiter: experimental results, *Astrophysical Journal* **598**, pp. 704–711, 2003. See also S. M. KOPEIKIN, The post-Newtonian treatment of the VLBI experiment on September 8, 2002, *Physics Letters A* **312**, pp. 147–157, 2003, or arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0212121. Several arguments against the claim were published, such as C. M. WILL, Propagation speed of gravity and the relativistic time delay, arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0301145, and S. SAMUEL, On the speed of gravity and the v/c corrections to the Shapiro time delay, arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0304006. The discussion went on, as shown in S. M. KOPEIKIN & E. B. FORMALONT, Aberration and the fundamental speed of gravity in the Jovian deflection experiment, *Foundations of Physics* **36**, pp. 1244–1285, 2006, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0311063. Both sides claim to be right: the experiment claims to deduce the speed of gravity from the lack of a tangential component of the light deflection by the gravity of Jupiter, and the critical side claims that the speed of gravity does not enter in this measurement. If one compares the situation with analogous systems in transparent fluids or solids, which also show no tangential deflection component, the critical side has a point. Cited on pages 528 and 533.

432 The quadrupole formula is explained clearly in the text by Goenner. See Ref. 393. Cited on page 530.

433 For an introduction to gravitational waves, see B. F. SCHUTZ, Gravitational waves on the back of an envelope, *American Journal of Physics* **52**, pp. 412–419, 1984. Cited on page 529.

434 The beautiful summary by DANIEL KLEPPNER, The gem of general relativity, *Physics Today* **46**, pp. 9–11, April 1993, appeared half a year before the authors of the cited work, Joseph Taylor and Russel Hulse, received the Nobel Prize for the discovery of millisecond pulsars. A more detailed review article is J. H. TAYLOR, Pulsar timing and relativistic gravity, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, London A* **341**, pp. 117–134, 1992. The original paper is J. H. TAYLOR & J. M. WEISBERG, Further experimental tests of relativistic gravity using the binary pulsar PSR 1913+16, *Astrophysical Journal* **345**, pp. 434–450, 1989. See also J. M. WEISBERG, J. H. TAYLOR & L. A. FOWLER, Pulsar PSR 1913+16 sendet Gravitationswellen, *Spektrum der Wissenschaft*, pp. 53–61, December 1981. Cited on page 531.

435 D. R. LORIMER, Binary and millisecond pulsars, in www.livingreviews.org/lrr-2005-7, and J. M. WEISBERG & J. H. TAYLOR, The relativistic binary pulsar B1913+16: thirty years of observations and analysis, pp. 25–31, in F. A. RASIO & I. H. STAIRS, editors, *Binary Radio Pulsars*, Proceedings of a meeting held at the Aspen Center for Physics, USA, 12 Janaury - 16 January 2004, volume 328 of ASP Conference Series, Astronomical Society of the Pacific, 2005. Cited on page 531.

436 W. B. BONNOR & M. S. PIPER, The gravitational wave rocket, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **14**, pp. 2895–2904, 1997, or arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9702005. Cited on page 533.

437 L. LERNER, A simple calculation of the deflection of light in a Schwarzschild gravitational field, *American Journal of Physics* **65**, pp. 1194–1196, 1997. Cited on page 533.

438 A. EINSTEIN, Über den Einfluß der Schwerkraft auf die Ausbreitung des Lichtes, *Annalen der Physik* **35**, p. 898, 1911. Cited on page 534.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

439 I.I. Shapiro & al., Fourth test of general relativity, *Physical Review Letters* **13**, pp. 789–792, 1964. Cited on page 535.

440 I.I. Shapiro & al., Fourth test of general relativity: preliminary results, *Physical Review Letters* **20**, pp. 1265–1269, 1968. Cited on page 535.

441 J. H. Taylor, Pulsar timing and relativistic gravity, *Proceedings of the Royal Society, London A* **341**, pp. 117–134, 1992. Cited on pages 535 and 538.

442 de Sitter, On Einstein's theory of gravitation and its astronomical consequences, *Monthly Notes of the Royal Astrononmical Society* **77**, pp. 155–184, p. 418E, 1916. For a discussion of de Sitter precession and Thirring–Lense precession, see also B. R. Holstein, Gyroscope precession in general relativity, *American Journal of Physics* **69**, pp. 1248–1256, 2001. Cited on pages 539 and 644.

443 B. Bertotti, I. Ciufolini & P. L. Bender, New test of general relativity: measurement of de Sitter geodetic precession rate for lunar perigee, *Physical Review Letters* **58**, pp. 1062–1065, 1987. Later it was confirmed by I.I. Shapiro & al., Measurement of the de Sitter precession of the moon: a relativistic three body effect, *Physical Review Letters* **61**, pp. 2643–2646, 1988. Cited on pages 539 and 628.

444 Wolfgang Rindler, *Essential Relativity*, Springer, revised second edition, 1977. Cited on page 541.

445 This is told (without the riddle solution) on p. 67, in Wolfgang Pauli, *Relativitätstheorie*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2000, the edited reprint of a famous text originally published in 1921. The reference is H. Vermeil, Notiz über das mittlere Krümmungsmaß einer n-fach ausgedehnten Riemannschen Mannigfalktigkeit, *Göttinger Nachrichten, mathematische–physikalische Klasse* p. 334, 1917. Cited on page 542.

446 M. Santander, L. M. Nieto & N. A. Cordero, A curvature based derivation of the Schwarzschild metric, *American Journal of Physics* **65**, pp. 1200–1209, 1997. Cited on pages 545 and 547.

447 Michael H. Soffel, *Relativity in Astronomy, Celestial Mechanics and Geodesy*, Springer Verlag, 1989. Cited on page 545.

448 Richard P. Feynman, Fernando B. Morinigo, William G. Wagner & Brian Hatfield, *Feynman Lectures on Gravitation*, Westview Press, 1995. Cited on page 546.

449 C. G. Torre & I. M. Anderson, Symmetries of the Einstein equations, *Physical Review Letters* **70**, pp. 3525–3529, 1993, or arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9302033. Cited on page 552.

450 H. Nicolai, Gravitational billiards, dualities and hidden symmetries, arxiv.org//abs/gr-qc/0506031. Cited on page 552.

451 Y. Wang & M. Tegmark, New dark energy constraints from supernovae, microwave background and galaxy clustering, *Physical Review Letters* **92**, p. 241302, 2004, or arxiv.org/astro-ph/0403292. Cited on page 553.

452 Arguments for the emptiness of general covariance are given by John D. Norton, General covariance and the foundations of general relativity, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **56**, pp. 791–858, 1993. The opposite point, including the discussion of 'absolute elements', is made in the book by J. L. Anderson, *Principles of Relativity Physics*, chapter 4, Academic Press, 1967. Cited on page 553.

453 For a good introduction to mathematical physics, see the famous three-women text in two volumes by Yvonne Choquet-Bruhat, Cecile DeWitt-Morette & Margaret Dillard-Bleick, *Analysis, Manifolds, and Physics*, North-Holland, 1996 and 2001. The first edition of this classic appeared in 1977. Cited on page 554.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

454 See for example R.A. Knop & al., New constraints on Ω_M, Ω_Λ, and w from an independent set of eleven high-redshift supernovae observed with HST, *Astrophysical Journal* **598**, pp. 102–137, 2003. Cited on page 555.

455 Richard P. Feynman, Robert B. Leighton & Matthew Sands, *The Feynman Lectures on Physics*, Addison Wesley, 1977, volume II, p. 42–14. Cited on page 557.

456 A recent overview on the experimental tests of the universality of free fall is that by R. J. Hughes, The equivalence principle, *Contemporary Physics* **4**, pp. 177–191, 1993. Cited on page 558.

457 See for example H. L. Bray, Black holes, geometric flows, and the Penrose inequality in general relativity, *Notices of the AMS* **49**, pp. 1372–1381, 2002. Cited on page 559.

458 See for example the paper by K. Dalton, Gravity, geometry and equivalence, preprint to be found at arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9601004, and L. Landau & E. Lifshitz, *The Classical Theory of Fields*, Pergamon, 4th edition, 1975, p. 241. Cited on page 560.

459 Ekkehart Kröner, *Kontinuumstheorie der Versetzungen und Eigenspannungen*, Springer, 1958. Kröner shows how to use the Ricci formalism in the solid state. Cited on page 560.

460 Black hole analogues appear in acoustics, fluids and several other fields. Cited on page 560.

461 The equivalence of the various definitions of the Riemann tensor is explained in ...Cited on page 562.

462 K. Tangen, Can the Pioneer anomaly have a gravitational origin?, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0602089. Cited on page 563.

463 H. Dittus & C. Lämmerzahl, Die Pioneer-Anomalie, *Physik Journal* **5**, pp. 25–31, January 2006. Cited on page 563.

464 This famous quote is the first sentence of the final chapter, the 'Beschluß', of Immanuel Kant, *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, 1797. Cited on page 564.

465 Aetius, Opinions, III, I, 6. See Jean-Paul Dumont, *Les écoles présocratiques*, Folio Essais, Gallimard, 1991, p. 445. Cited on page 564.

466 A beautiful introduction to modern astronomy was Paolo Maffei, *I mostri del cielo*, Mondadori Editore, 1976. Cited on page 567.

467 See for example A. N. Cox, ed., *Allen's Astrophysical Quantities*, AIP Press and Springer Verlag, 2000. An overview of optical observations is given by the Sloan Digital Sky Survey at skyserver.sdss.org. More details about the universe can be found in the beautiful text by W. J. Kaufmann & R. A. Fredman, *Universe*, fifth edition, W.H. Freeman & Co., 1999. The most recent discoveries are best followed on the sci.esa.int and hubble.nasa.gov websites. Cited on page 568.

468 P. Jetzer, Gravitational microlensing, *Naturwissenschaften* **86**, pp. 201–211, 1999. Measurements using orbital speeds around the Galaxy gives agree with this value. Cited on pages 566 and 569.

469 D. R. Lorimer, A. J. Faulkner, A. G. Lyne, R. N. Manchester, M. Kramer, M. A. McLaughlin, G. Hobbs, A. Possenti, I. H. Stairs, F. Camilo, M. Burgay, N. D'Amico, A. Corongiu & F. Crawford, The Parkes multibeam pulsar survey: VI. Discovery and timing of 142 pulsars and a Galactic population analysis, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* preprint at arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0607640. Cited on page 569.

470 D. Figer, An upper limit to the masses of stars, *Nature* **434**, pp. 192–194, 2005. Cited on page 570.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

471 G. Basri, The discovery of brown dwarfs, *Scientific American* **282**, pp. 77–83, April 2001. Cited on page 570.

472 P. M. Woods & C. Thompson, Soft gamma repeaters and anomalous X-ray pulsars: magnetar candidates, arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0406133. Cited on page 570.

473 B. M. Gaensler, N. M. McClure-Griffiths, M. S. Oey, M. Haverkorn, J. M. Dickey & A. J. Green, A stellar wind bubble coincident with the anomalous X-ray pulsar 1E 1048.1-5937: are magnetars formed from massive progenitors?, *The Astrophysical Journal (Letters)* **620**, pp. L95–L98, 2005, or arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0501563. Cited on page 570.

474 An opposite idea is defended by ... Cited on page 574.

475 C. Wirtz, *Scientia* **38**, p. 303, 1925, and K. Lundmark, The motions and the distances of the spiral nebulae, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **85**, pp. 865–894, 1925. See also G. Stromberg, Analysis of radial velocities of globular clusters and non-galactic nebulae, *Astrophysical Journal* **61**, pp. 353–362, 1925. Cited on page 574.

476 G. Gamow, The origin of the elements and the separation of galaxies, *Physical Review* **74**, p. 505, 1948. Cited on page 575.

477 A. G. Doroshkevich & I. D. Novikov, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR* **154**, p. 809, 1964. It appeared translated into English a few months later. The story of the prediction was told by Penzias in his Nobel lecture. Cited on page 575.

478 Arno A. Penzias & Robert W. Wilson, A measurement of excess antenna temperature at 4080 Mcs, *Astrophysical Journal* **142**, pp. 419–421, 1965. Cited on page 575.

479 Macrobius, *Somnium Scipionis*, XIV, 19. See Jean-Paul Dumont, *Les écoles présocratiques*, Folio Essais, Gallimard, 1991, p. 61. Cited on page 577.

480 On the remote history of the universe, see the excellent texts by G. Börner, *The Early Universe – Facts & Fiction*, Springer Verlag, 3rd edition, 1993, or Barry Parker, *Creation – The Story of the Origin and the Evolution of the Universe*, Plenum Press, 1988. For an excellent popular text, see M. Longair, *Our Evolving Universe*, Cambridge University Press, 1996. Cited on page 577.

481 The first oxygen seems to have appeared in the atmosphere, produced by microorganisms, 2.32 thousand million years ago. See A. Becker & al., Dating the rise of atmospheric oxygen, *Nature* **427**, pp. 117–120, 2003. Cited on page 578.

482 Gabriele Walker, *Snowball Earth – The Story of the Great Global Catastrophe That Spawned Life as We Know It*, Crown Publishing, 2003. Cited on page 578.

483 K. Knie, Spuren einer Sternexplosion, *Physik in unserer Zeit* **36**, p. 8, 2005. The first step of this connection is found in K. Knie, G. Korschinek, T. Faestermann, E. A. Dorfi, G. Rugel & A. Wallner, ^{60}Fe anomaly in a deep-sea manganese crust and implications for a nearby supernova source, *Physics Review Letters* **93**, p. 171103, 2004, the second step in N. D. Marsh & H. Svensmark, Low cloud properties influenced by cosmic rays, *Physics Review Letters* **85**, pp. 5004–5007, 2000, and the third step in de Menocal, Plio-Pleistocene African climate, *Science* **270**, pp. 53–59, 1995. Cited on page 579.

484 A. Friedman, Über die Krümmung des Raumes, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **10**, pp. 377–386, 1922, and A. Friedmann, Über die Möglichkeit einer Welt mit konstanter negativer Krümmung des Raumes, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **21**, pp. 326–332, 1924. (In the Latin transliteration, the author aquired a second 'n' in his second paper.) Cited on page 580.

485 H. Knutsen, Darkness at night, *European Journal of Physics* **18**, pp. 295–302, 1997. Cited on pages 585 and 586.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

486 See for example P.D. Pešić, Brightness at night, *American Journal of Physics* **66**, pp. 1013–1015, 1998. Cited on page 586.

487 Paul Wesson, Olbers' paradox and the spectral intensity of extra-galactic background light, *Astrophysical Journal* **367**, p. 399, 1991. Cited on page 586.

488 Steven Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology*, John Wiley, 1972. An excellent book written with a strong personal touch and stressing most of all the relation with experimental data. It does not develop a strong feeling for space-time curvature, and does not address the basic problems of space and time in general relativity. Excellent for learning how to actually calculate things, but less for the aims of our mountain ascent. Cited on pages 586 and 620.

489 Supernova searches are being performed by many research groups at the largest optical and X-ray telescopes. ... Cited on page 587.

490 The experiments are discussed in detail in the excellent review by D. Giulini & N. Straumann, Das Rätsel der kosmischen Vakuumenergiedichte und die beschleunigte Expansion des Universums, *Physikalische Blätter* **556**, pp. 41–48, 2000. See also N. Straumann, The mystery of the cosmic vacuum energy density and the accelerated expansion of the universe, *European Journal of Physics* **20**, pp. 419–427, 1999. Cited on pages 587 and 629.

491 A. Harvey & E. Schucking, Einstein's mistake and the cosmological contant, *American Journal of Physics* **68**, pp. 723–727, 2000. Cited on page 588.

492 The author of the bible explains *rain* in this way, as can be deduced from its very first page, Genesis 1: 6-7. Cited on page 588.

493 Up to his death, Fred Hoyle defended his belief that the universe is static, e.g. in G. Burbidge, F. Hoyle & J. V. Narlikar, A different approach to cosmology, *Physics Today* **52**, pp. 38–44, 1999. This team has also written a book with the same title, published in 2000 by Cambridge University Press. Cited on page 589.

494 Stephen W. Hawking & G. F. R. Ellis, *The Large Scale Structure of Space-Time*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1973. Among other things, this reference text discusses the singularities of space-time, and their necessity in the history of the universe. Cited on pages 589, 622, and 652.

495 Augustine, *Confessions*, 398, writes: 'My answer to those who ask 'What was god doing before he made Heaven and Earth?' is not 'He was preparing Hell for people who pry into mysteries'. This frivolous retort has been made before now, so we are told, in order to evade the point of the question. But it is one thing to make fun of the questioner and another to find the answer. So I shall refrain from giving this reply. [...] But if before Heaven and Earth there was no time, why is it demanded what you [god] did then? For there was no "then" when there was no time.' (Book XI, chapter 12 and 13). Cited on page 591.

496 Stephen Hawking, *A Brief History of Time – From the Big Bang to Black Holes*, 1988. Reading this bestseller is almost a must for any physicist, as it is a frequent topic at dinner parties. Cited on page 591.

497 Star details are explained in many texts. See for example ... Cited on page 593.

498 J. Pelt, R. Kayser, S. Refsdal & T. Schramm, The light curve and the time delay of QSO 0957+561, *Astronomy and Astrophysics* **305**, p. 97, 1996. Cited on page 595.

499 F. Zwicky, Nebulae as gravitational lenses, *Physical Review Letters* **51**, p. 290, and F. Zwicky, On the probability to detect nebulae which act as gravitational lenses, p. 679, 1937. The negative view by Einstein is found in A. Einstein, Lens-like action of a star by the deviatioin of light in the gravitational field, *Science* **84**, pp. 506–507, 1936. A review on gravitational lensing can even be found online, in the paper by J. Wambsganss, Gravitational lensing in astronomy, *Living Reviews in Relativity* **1-12**, pp. 1–80, 1998, to be found

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

on the www.livingreviews.org/Articles/Volume1/1998-12wamb website.

There is also the book by P. Schneider, J. Ehlers & E. E. Falco, *Gravitational Lenses*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1992. Cited on page 595.

500 M. Lachièze-Rey & J.-P. Luminet, Cosmic topology, *Physics Reports* **254**, pp. 135–214, 1995. See also B. F. Roukema, The topology of the universe, arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0010185 preprint. Cited on page 596.

501 Thanks to Steve Carlip for clarifying this point. Cited on page 597.

502 G. F. R. Ellis & T. Rothman, Lost horizons, *American Journal of Physics* **61**, pp. 883–893, 1993. Cited on page 597.

503 A. Guth, *Die Geburt des Kosmos aus dem Nichts – Die Theorie des inflationären Universums*, Droemer Knaur, 1999. Cited on page 598.

504 Entropy values for the universe have been discussed by Ilya Prigogine, *Is Future Given?*, World Scientific, 2003. This was his last book. For a different approach, see G. A. Mena Marugán & S. Carneiro, Holography and the large number hypothesis, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0111034. This paper also repeats the often heard statement that the universe has an entropy that is much smaller than the theoretical maximum. The maximum is often estimated to be $10^{120}\,k$, whereas the actual value is 'estimated' to be $10^{100}\,k$. However, other authors give $10^{84}\,k$. In 1974, Roger Penrose also made statements about the entropy of the universe. Cited on page 599.

Challenge 993 ny

505 C. L. Bennet, M. S. Turner & M. White, The cosmic rosetta stone, *Physics Today* **50**, pp. 32–38, November 1997. The cosmic background radiation differs from black hole radiation by less than 0.005 %. Cited on page 600.

506 The lack of expansion in the solar system is shown in ... Cited on page 600.

507 A pretty article explaining how one can make experiments to find out how the human body senses rotation even when blindfolded and earphoned is described by M.-L. Mittelstaedt & H. Mittelstaedt, The effect of centrifugal force on the perception of rotation about a vertical axis, *Naturwissenschaften* **84**, pp. 366–369, 1997. Cited on page 601.

508 The independence of inertia has been tested ... Cited on page 601.

509 The present status is given in the conference proceedings by Julian Barbour & Herbert Pfister, eds., *Mach's Principle: From Newton's Bucket to Quantum Gravity*, Birkhäuser, 1995. Various formulations of Mach's principle – in fact, 21 different ones – are compared on page 530.

In a related development, in 1953, Dennis Sciama published a paper in which he argues that inertia of a particle is due to the gravitational attraction of all other matter in the universe. The paper is widely quoted, but makes no new statements on the issue. See D. W. Sciama, On the origin of inertia, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **113**, pp. 34–42, 1953. Cited on pages 601 and 602.

510 Information on the rotation of the universe is given in A. Kogut, G. Hinshaw & A. J. Banday, Limits to global rotation and shear from the COBE DMR four-year sky maps, *Physical Review D* **55**, pp. 1901–1905, 1997. Earlier information is found in J. D. Barrow, R. Juszkiewicz & D. H. Sonoda, Universal rotation: how large can it be?, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **213**, pp. 917–943, 1985. See also J. D. Barrow, R. Juszkiewicz & D. H. Sonoda, Structure of the cosmic microwave background, *Nature* **309**, pp. 397–402, 1983, or E. F. Bunn, P. G. Fereira & J. Silk, How anisotropic is the universe?, *Physical Review Letters* **77**, pp. 2883–2886, 1996. Cited on page 602.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

511 The issue has been discussed within linearized gravity by RICHARD TOLMAN, in his textbook *Relativity, Thermodynamics, and Cosmology*, Clarendon Press, 1934, on pp. 272–290. The exact problem has been solved by A. PERES, Null electromagnetic fields in general relativity theory, *Physical Review* **118**, pp. 1105–1110, 1960, and by W. B. BONNOR, The gravitational field of light, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **13**, pp. 163–174, 1969. See also N. V. MITSKIEVIC & K. K. KUMARADTYA, The gravitational field of a spinning pencil of light, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **30**, pp. 1095–1099, 1989, and P. C. AICHELBURG & R. U. SEXL, On the gravitational field of a spinning particle, *General Relativity and Gravitation* **2**, pp. 303–312, 1971. Cited on page 603.

512 See the delightful popular account by IGOR NOVIKOV, *Black Holes and the Universe*, Cambridge University Press, 1990. The consequences of light decay were studied by M. BRONSTEIN, Die Ausdehnung des Weltalls, *Physikalische Zeitschrift der Sowjetunion* **3**, pp. 73–82, 1933. Cited on pages 603 and 607.

513 C. L. CARILLI, K. M. MENTEN, J. T. STOCKE, E. PERLMAN, R. VERMEULEN, F. BRIGGS, A. G. DE BRUYN, J. CONWAY & C. P. MOORE, Astronomical constraints on the cosmic evolution of the fine structure constant and possible quantum dimensions, *Physical Review Letters* **85**, pp. 5511–5514, 25 December 2000. Cited on page 603.

514 The observations of black holes at the centre of galaxies and elsewhere are summarised by R. BLANDFORD & N. GEHRELS, Revisiting the black hole, *Physics Today* **52**, pp. 40–46, June 1999. Cited on pages 604 and 617.

515 An excellent and entertaining book on black holes, without any formulae, but nevertheless accurate and detailed, is the paperback by IGOR NOVIKOV, *Black Holes and the Universe*, Cambridge University Press, 1990. See also EDWIN F. TAYLOR & JOHN A. WHEELER, *Exploring Black Holes: Introduction to General Relativity*, Addison Wesley Longman 2000.

For a historical introduction, see the paper by R. RUFFINI, The physics of gravitationally collapsed objects, pp. 59–118, in *Neutron Stars, Black Holes and Binary X-Ray Sources*, Proceedings of the Annual Meeting, San Francisco, Calif., February 28, 1974, Reidel Publishing, 1975. Cited on page 604.

516 J. MICHELL, On the means of discovering the distance, magnitude, etc of the fixed stars, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society London* **74**, p. 35, 1784, reprinted in S. DETWEILER, *Black Holes – Selected Reprints*, American Association of Physics Teachers, 1982. Cited on page 604.

517 The beautiful paper is R. OPPENHEIMER & H. SNYDER, On continued gravitational contraction, *Physical Review* **56**, pp. 455–459, 1939. Cited on page 606.

518 R. P. KERR, Gravitational field of a spinning mass as an example of algebraically special metrics, *Physical Review Letters* **11**, pp. 237–238, 1963. Cited on page 610.

519 E. T. NEWMAN, E. COUCH, R. CHINNAPARED, A. EXTON, A. PRAKASH & R. TORRENCE, Metric of a rotating, charged mass, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **6**, pp. 918–919, 1965. Cited on page 610.

520 For a summary, see P. O. MAZUR, Black hole uniqueness theorems, pp. 130–157, in M. A. H. MACCALLUM, editor, *General Relativity and Gravitation*, Cambridge University Press, 1987, or the update at arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0101012. See also D. C. ROBINSON, Four decades of black hole uniqueness theorems,, available at www.mth.kcl.ac.uk/staff/dc_robinson/blackholes.pdf Cited on page 610.

521 H. P. KÜNZLE & A. K. M. MASOOD-UL-ALAM, Spherically symmetric static SU(2) Einstein-Yang-Mills fields, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **31**, pp. 928–935, 1990. Cited on page 610.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

522 For information about the tendency of gravitational radiation to produce spherical shapes, see for example ... Cited on page 610.

523 R. Penrose & R. M. Floyd, Extraction of rotational energy from a black hole, *Nature* **229**, pp. 177–179, 1971. Cited on page 611.

524 The mass–energy relation for a rotating black hole is due to D. Christodoulou, Reversible and irreversible transformations in black hole physics, *Physical Review Letters* **25**, pp. 1596–1597, 1970. For a general, charged and rotating black hole it is due to D. Christodoulou & R. Ruffini, Reversible transformations of a charged black hole, *Physical Review D* **4**, pp. 3552–3555, 1971. Cited on page 612.

525 J. D. Bekenstein, Black holes and entropy, *Physical Review* **D7**, pp. 2333–2346, 1973. Cited on page 612.

526 The paradox is discussed in M. A. Abramowicz, Black holes and the centrifugal force paradox, *Scientific American* **266**, pp. 74–81, March 1993, and in the comment by Don N. Page, Relative alternatives, *Scientific American* **266**, p. 5, August 1993. See also M. A. Abramowicz & E. Szuszkiewicz, The wall of death, *American Journal of Physics* **61**, pp. 982–991, 1993, and M. A. Abramowicz & J. P. Lasota, On traveling round without feeling it and uncurving curves, *American Journal of Physics* **54**, pp. 936–939, 1986. Cited on page 614.

527 For information about black holes in the early universe, see ... Cited on page 616.

528 For information about black holes formation via star collapse, see ... Cited on page 616.

529 Frederick Lamb, APS meeting 1998 press conference: Binary star 4U1820-30, 20 000 light years from Earth, *Physics News Update*, April 27, 1998. Cited on page 616.

530 The first direct evidence for matter falling into a black hole was publicised in early 2001. ... Cited on page 616.

531 For a readable summary of the Penrose–Hawking singularity theorems, see ... Details can be found in Ref. 494. Cited on page 617.

532 For an overview of cosmic censorship, see T. P. Singh, Gravitational collapse, black holes and naked singularities, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9805066, or R. M. Wald, Gravitational collapse and cosmic censorship, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9710068. The original idea is due to R. Penrose, Gravitational collapse: the role of general relativity, *Rivista del Nuovo Cimento* **1**, pp. 252–276, 1969. Cited on page 617.

533 G. J. Stoney, On the physical units of nature, *Philosophical Magazine* **11**, pp. 381–391, 1881. Cited on page 621.

534 The geometrodynamic clock is discussed in D. E. Brahm & R. P. Gruber, Limitations of the geometrodynamic clock, *General Relativity and Gravitation* **24**, pp. 297–303, 1992. The clock itself was introduced by R. F. Marzke, in his Ph.D. thesis *The theory of measurement in general relativity*, 1959, with John Wheeler as thesis adviser. Cited on page 621.

535 R. Geroch, Einstein algebras, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **26**, pp. 271–275, 1972. Cited on page 621.

536 A. Macdonald, Einstein's hole argument, *American Journal of Physics* **69**, pp. 223–225, 2001. Cited on page 622.

537 Roman U. Sexl, Die Hohlwelttheorie, *Der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftliche Unterricht* **368**, pp. 453–460, 1983. Roman U. Sexl, Universal conventionalism and space-time., *General Relativity and Gravitation* **1**, pp. 159–180, 1970. See also Roman U. Sexl, Die Hohlwelttheorie, in Arthur Scharmann & Herbert Schramm, editors, *Physik, Theorie, Experiment, Geschichte, Didaktik – Festschrift für Wilfried Kuhn zum*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

60. Geburtstag am 6. Mai 1983, Aulis Verlag Deubner, 1984, pp. 241–258. Cited on page 624.

538 T. Damour, Experimental tests of relativistic gravity, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9904057. It is the latest in a series of his papers on the topic; the first was T. Damour, Was Einstein 100 % right?, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9412064. Cited on pages 627 and 628.

539 H. Dittus, F. Everitt, C. Lämmerzahl & G. Schäfer, Die Gravitation im Test, *Physikalische Blätter* **55**, pp. 39–46, 1999. Cited on pages 627 and 628.

540 See S. Bässler & al., Improved test of the equivalence principle for gravitational self-energy, *Physical Review Letters* **83**, pp. 3585–3588, 1999. See also C. M. Will, Gravitational radiation and the validity of general relativity, *Physics Today* **52**, p. 38, October 1999. Cited on page 628.

541 The inverse square dependence has been checked down to 60 μm, as reported by E. Adelberger, B. Heckel & C. D. Hoyle, Testing the gravitational inverse-square law, *Physics World* **18**, pp. 41–45, 2005. Cited on page 628.

542 For theories competing with general relativity, see for example C. M. Will, The confrontation between general relativity and experiment, *Living Reviews of Relativity* 2001, www.iews.org/lrr-2001-4. For example, the absence of the Nordtvedt effect, a hypothetical 28-day oscillation in the Earth–Moon distance, which was looked for by laser ranging experiments without any result, 'killed' several competing theories. This effect, predicted by Kenneth Nordtvedt, would only appear if the gravitational energy in the Earth–Moon system would fall in a different way than the Earth and the Moon themselves. For a summary of the measurements, see J. Müller, M. Schneider, M. Soffel & H. Ruder, *Astrophysical Journal Letters* **382**, p. L101, 1991. Cited on page 628.

543 Almost everything of importance in general relativity is published in the Journal *Classical and Quantum Gravity*. Cited on page 628.

544 Collisions and many body problems ... Cited on page 629.

545 Inflation and early universe ... Cited on page 629.

546 The study of chaos in Einstein's field equations is just beginning. See e.g. L. Bombelli, F. Lombardo & M. Castagnino, Chaos in Robertson-Walker cosmology, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9707051. Cited on page 629.

547 The ESA satellite called 'Planck' will measure the polarization of the cosmic microwave background. Cited on page 629.

548 A good introduction to the topic of gamma-ray bursts is S. Klose, J. Greiner & D. Hartmann, Kosmische Gammastrahlenausbrüche – Beobachtungen und Modelle, Teil I und II, *Sterne und Weltraum* March and April 2001. Cited on page 629.

549 The field solution database is built around the work of A. Karlhede, which allows one to distinguish between solutions with a limited amount of mathematical computation. Cited on page 629.

550 Torsion is presented in R. T. Hammond, New fields in general relativity, *Contemporary Physics* **36**, pp. 103–114, 1995. Cited on page 630.

551 Wormholes and nontrivial topologies ...A basic approach is the one by T. Diemer & M. Hadley, Charge and the topology of spacetime, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **16**, pp. 3567–3577, 1999, or arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9905069 and M. Hadley, Spin half in classical general relativity, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **17**, pp. 4187–4194, 2000, or arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0004029. Cited on page 629.

552 An important formulation of relativity is A. Ashtekar, New variables for classical and quantum gravity, *Physical Review Letters* **57**, pp. 2244–2247, 1986. Cited on page 629.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

553 A well written text on the connections between the big bang and particle physics is by I. L. Rozental, *Big Bang – Big Bounce, How Particles and Fields Drive Cosmic Evolution*, Springer, 1988. For another connection, see M. Nagano & A. A. Watson, Observations and implications of the ultrahigh energy cosmic rays, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **72**, pp. 689–732, 2000. Cited on page 630.

554 Teaching will benefit in particular from new formulations, from concentration on principles and their consequences, as has happened in special relativity, from simpler descriptions at the weak field level, and from future research in the theory of general relativity. The newer textbooks cited above are all steps in these directions. Cited on page 630.

555 G. E. Prince & M. Jerie, Generalising Raychaudhuri's equation, in *Differential Geometry and Its Applications*, Proc. Conf., Opava (Czech Republic), August 27-31, 2001, Silesian University, Opava, 2001, pp. 235–242. Cited on page 630.

556 A well-known approach is that by Bekenstein; he proposes a modification of general relativity that modifies univesal, $1/r^2$ gravity at galactic distances. This is done in order to explain the hundreds of measured galactic rotation curves that seem to require such a modification. (This approach is called *modified Newtonian dynamics* or *MOND*.) An introduction is given by Jacob D. Bekenstein, The modified Newtonian dynamics – MOND – and its implications for new physics, *Contemporary Physics* **47**, pp. 387–403, 2006, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0701848v2. Cited on page 631.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



CHALLENGE HINTS AND SOLUTIONS

Challenge 612, page 401: A cone or a hyperboloid also looks straight from all directions, provided the positioning is correct. One thus needs not only to turn the object, but also to displace it. The best method to check planarity is to use interference between an arriving and a departing coherent beam of light. If the fringes are straight, the surface is planar. (How do you ensure the wave front of the light beam is planar?)

Challenge 613, page 401: A fraction of infinity is still infinite.

Challenge 614, page 403: The time at which the Moon Io enters the shadow in the second measurement occurs about 1000 s later than predicted from the first measurement. Since the Earth is about $3 \cdot 10^{11}$ m further away from Jupiter and Io, we get the usual value for the speed of light.

Challenge 615, page 403: To compensate for the aberration, the telescope has to be inclined *along* the direction of motion of the Earth; to compensate for parallaxis, *against* the motion.

Challenge 616, page 403: Otherwise the velocity sum would be larger than c.

Challenge 617, page 403: The drawing shows it. Observer, Moon and Sun form a triangle. When the Moon is half full, the angle at the Moon is a right angle. Thus the distance ration can be determined, though not easily, as the angle at the observer is very close to a right angle as well.

Challenge 618, page 404: There are Cat's-eyes on the Moon deposited there during the Apollo and Lunokhod missions. They are used to reflect laser 35 ps light pulses sent there through telescopes. The timing of the round trip then gives the distance to the Moon. Of course, absolute distance is not know to high precision, but the variations are. The thickness of the atmosphere is the largest source of error. See the www.csr.utexas.edu/mlrs and ilrs.gsfc.nasa.gov websites.

Challenge 619, page 404: Fizeau used a mirror about 8.6 km away. As the picture shows, he only had to count the teeth of his cog-wheel and measure its rotation speed when the light goes in one direction through one tooth and comes back to the next.

Challenge 620, page 405: The time must be shorter than $T = l/c$, in other words, shorter than 30 ps; it was a *gas* shutter, not a solid one. It was triggered by a red light pulse (shown in the photograph) timed by the pulse to be photographed; for certain materials, such as the used gas, strong light can lead to bleaching, so that they become transparent. For more details about the shutter and its neat trigger technique, see the paper by the authors. For even faster shutters, see also the discussion on page 1492.

Challenge 621, page 405: Just take a photograph of a lightning while moving the camera horizontally. You will see that a lightning is made of several discharges; the whole shows that lightning is much slower than light.

If lightning moved only nearly as fast as light itself, the Doppler effect would change it colour depending on the angle at which we look at it, compared to its direction of motion. A nearby lightning would change colour from top to bottom.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 317 The original lines published by Fraunhofer (© Fraunhofer Gesellschaft)

Challenge 622, page 406: The fastest lamps were subatomic particles, such as muons, which decay by emitting a photon, thus a tiny flash of light. However, also some stars emit fasts jets of matter, which move with speeds comparable to that of light.

Challenge 623, page 407: The speed of neutrinos is the same as that of light to 9 decimal digits, since neutrinos and light were observed to arrive together, within 12 seconds of each other, after a trip of 170 000 light years from a supernova explosion.

Ref. 323

Challenge 625, page 411: This is best discussed by showing that other possibilities make no sense.

Challenge 626, page 411: The spatial coordinate of the event at which the light is reflected is $c(k^2-1)T/2$; the time coordinate is $(k^2+1)T/2$. Their ratio must be v. Solving for k gives the result.

Challenge 628, page 412: The motion of radio waves, infrared, ultraviolet and gamma rays is also unstoppable. Another past suspect, the neutrino, has been found to have mass and to be thus in principle stoppable. The motion of gravity is also unstoppable.

Challenge 630, page 414: $\lambda_R/\lambda_S = \gamma$.

Challenge 631, page 414: To change from bright red (650 nm) to green (550 nm), $v = 0.166c$ is necessary.

Challenge 632, page 414: People measure the shift of spectral lines, such as the shift of the so-called Lyman-α line of hydrogen, that is emitted (or absorbed) when a free electron is captured (or ejected) by a proton. It is one of the famous Fraunhofer lines.

Page 1041

Challenge 633, page 414: The speeds are given by

$$v/c = \frac{(z+1)^2-1}{(z+1)^2+1} \tag{425}$$

which implies $v(z=-0.1) = 31\,\mathrm{Mm/s} = 0.1c$ *towards* the observer and $v(z=5) = 284\,\mathrm{Mm/s} = 0.95c$ *away* from the observer.

A red-shift of 6 implies a speed of $0.96c$; such speeds appear because, as we will see in the section of general relativity, far away objects recede from us. And high red-shifts are observed only for objects which are extremely far from Earth, and the faster the further they are away. For a red-shift of 6 that is a distance of several thousand million light years.

Challenge 634, page 414: No Doppler effect is seen for a distant observer at rest with respect to the large mass. In other cases there obviously is a Doppler effect, but it is not due to the deflection.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 635, page 415: Sound speed is not invariant of the speed of observers. As a result, the Doppler effect for sound even confirms – within measurement differences – that time is the *same* for observers moving against each other.

Challenge 638, page 416: Inside colour television tubes (they use higher voltages than black and white ones), electrons are described by $v/c \approx \sqrt{2 \cdot 30/511}$ or $v \approx 0.3c$.

Challenge 639, page 416: If you can imagine this, publish it. Readers will be delighted to hear the story.

Challenge 641, page 417: The connection between observer invariance and limit property seems to be generally valid in nature, as shown in section 55. However, a complete and airtight argument is not yet at hand. If you have one, publish it!

Page 1458

Challenge 644, page 418: If the speed of light is the same for all observers, no observer can pretend to be more at rest than another (as long as space-time is flat), because there is no observation from electrodynamics, mechanics or another part of physics that allows to make the statement.

Challenge 647, page 421: Redrawing Figure 230 on page 410 for the other observer makes the point.

Challenge 648, page 421: The human value is achieved in particle accelerators; the value in nature is found in cosmic rays of the highest energies.

Challenge 649, page 422: The set of events behaves like a manifold, because it behaves like a four-dimensional space: it has infinitely many points around any given starting point, and distances behave as we are used to, limits behave as we are used to. It differs by one added dimension, and by the sign in the definition of distance; thus, properly speaking, it is a Riemannian manifold.

Challenge 650, page 423: Infinity is obvious, as is openness. Thus the topology equivalence can be shown by imagining that the manifold is made of rubber and wrapped around a sphere.

Challenge 651, page 424: The light cone remains unchanged; thus causal connection as well.

Challenge 652, page 424: In such a case, the division of space-time around an inertial observer into future, past and elsewhere would not hold any more, and the future could influence the past (as seen from another observer).

Challenge 656, page 427: The ratio predicted by naive reasoning is $(1/2)^{(}6.4/2.2) = 0.13$.

Challenge 657, page 427: The time dilation factor for $v = 0.9952c$ is 10.2, giving a proper time of 0.62 μs; thus the ratio predicted by special relativity is $(1/2)^{(}0.62/2.2) = 0.82$.

Challenge 658, page 428: Send a light signal from the first clock to the second clock and back. Take the middle time between the departure and arrival, and then compare it with the time at the reflection. Repeat this a few times. See also Figure 230.

Challenge 661, page 428: Hint: think about different directions of sight.

Challenge 662, page 429: Not with present experimental methods.

Challenge 664, page 429: Hint: be careful with the definition of 'rigidity'.

Challenge 666, page 430: While the departing glider passes the gap, the light cannot stay on at any speed, if the glider is shorter than the gap. This is strange at first sight, because the glider does not light the lamp even at high speeds, even though in the frame of the glider there is contact at both ends. The reason is that in this case there is not enough time to send the signal to the battery that contact is made, so that the current cannot start flowing.

Assume that current flows with speed u, which is of the order of c. Then, as Dirk Van de Moortel showed, the lamp will go off if the glider length l_{glider} and the gap length l_{gap} obey $l_{\text{glider}}/l_{\text{gap}} < \gamma(u+v)/u$. See also the cited reference.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

For a glider approaching the gap and the lamp, the situation is different: a glider shorter than the gap *can* keep the lamp on all the time, as pointed out by S.R. Madhu Rao.

Why are the debates often heated? Some people will (falsely) pretend that the problem is unphysical; other will say that Maxwell's equations are needed. Still others will say that the problem is absurd, because for larger lengths of the glider, the on/off answer depends on the precise speed value. However, this actually is the case in this situation.

Challenge 667, page 430: Yes, the rope breaks; in accelerated cars, distance changes, as shown later on in the text.

Challenge 668, page 430: The submarine will sink. The fast submarine will even be heavier, as his kinetic energy adds to his weight. The contraction effect would make it lighter, as the captain says, but by a smaller amount. The total weight – counting upwards as positive – is given by $F = -mg(\gamma - 1/\gamma)$.

Challenge 669, page 430: A relativistic submarine would instantly melt due to friction with the water. If not, it would fly of the planet because it moves faster than the escape velocity. And produce several other disasters.

Challenge 670, page 431: The question confuses observation of Lorentz contraction and its measurement. A relativistic pearl necklace does get shorter, but the shortening can only be measured, not photographed. The measured sizes of the pearls are flattened ellipsoids relativistic speeds. The observed necklace consists of overlapping spheres.

Challenge 673, page 434: Yes, ageing in a valley is slowed compared to mountain tops. However, the proper sensation of time is not changed. The reason for the appearance of grey hair is not known; if the timing is genetic, the proper time at which it happens is the same in either location.

Challenge 674, page 435: There is no way to put an observer at the specified points. Proper velocity can only be defined for observers, i.e., for entities which can carry a clock. That is not the case for images.

Challenge 675, page 435: Just use plain geometry to show this.

Challenge 676, page 435: Most interestingly, the horizon can easily move faster than light, if you move your head appropriately, as can the end of the rainbow.

Challenge 679, page 439: Relativity makes the arguments of challenge 161 watertight.

Challenge 684, page 441: The lower collision in Figure 254 shows the result directly, from energy conservation. For the upper collision the result also follows, if one starts from momentum conservation $\gamma mv = \Gamma MV$ and energy conservation $(gamma + 1)m = \Gamma M$.

Challenge 686, page 443: Annihilation of matter and antimatter.

Challenge 693, page 446: Just turn the left side of Figure 257 a bit in anti-clockwise direction.

Challenge 694, page 447: In collisions between relativistic charges, part of the energy is radiated away as light, so that the particles effectively lose energy.

Challenge 695, page 448: Probably not, as all relations among physical quantities are known now. However, you might check for yourself; one might never know. It is worth to mention that the maximum force in nature was discovered (in this text) after remaining hidden for over 80 years.

Challenge 696, page 450: Write down the four-vectors U' and U and then extract v' as function of v and the relative coordinate speed V. Then rename the variables.

Challenge 697, page 450: Any motion with light speed.

Challenge 698, page 450: $b^0 = 0$, $b^i = \gamma^2 a_i$.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 701, page 452: For ultrarelativistic particles, like for massless particles, one has $E = pc$.

Challenge 702, page 452: Hint: evaluate P_1 and P_2 in the rest frame of one particle.

Challenge 703, page 452: Use the definition $\boldsymbol{F} = \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{p}/\mathrm{d}t$ and the relation $\boldsymbol{K}U = 0 = \boldsymbol{f}v - \mathrm{d}E/\mathrm{d}t$ valid for rest-mass preserving forces.

Challenge 707, page 454: Yes, one can see such an object: the searchlight effect and the Doppler effect do not lead to invisibility. However, part of the object, namely the region rotating away from the observer, may become very dark.

Challenge 731, page 462: The energy contained in the fuel must be comparable to the rest mass of the motorbike, multiplied by c^2. Since fuel contains much more mass than energy, that gives a big problem.

Challenge 733, page 463: Constant acceleration and gravity are similar in their effects, as discussed in the section on general relativity.

Challenge 739, page 465: Yes, it is true.

Challenge 740, page 465: It is flat, like a plane.

Challenge 742, page 466: Yes; however, the effect is minimal and depends on the position of the Sun. In fact, what is white at one height is not white at another.

Challenge 744, page 466: Locally, light always moves with speed c.

Challenge 745, page 467: Away from Earth, g decreases; it is effectively zero over most of the distance.

Challenge 746, page 468: Light is necessary to determine distance *and* to synchronize clocks; thus there is no way to measure the speed of light from one point to another alone. The reverse motion needs to be included. However, some statements on the one-way speed of light can still be made (see math.ucr.edu/home/baez/physics/Relativity/SR/experiments.html). All experiments on the one-way speed of light performed so far are consistent with an isotropic value that is equal to the two-way velocity. However, no experiment is able to rule out a group of theories in which the one-way speed of light is anisotropic and thus different from the two-way speed. All theories from this group have the property that the *round-trip* speed of light is isotropic in any inertial frame, but the *one-way* speed is isotropic only in a preferred 'ether' frame. In all of these theories, in all inertial frames, the effects of slow clock transport exactly compensate the effects of the anisotropic one-way speed of light. All these theories are experimentally indistinguishable from special relativity. In practice, therefore, the one-way speed of light has been measured and is constant. But a small option remains.

Challenge 747, page 468: See the cited reference. The factor 2 was forgotten there; can you deduce it?

Challenge 750, page 470: Though there are many publications pretending to study the issue, there are also enough physicists who notice the impossibility. Measuring a variation of the speed of light is not much far from measuring the one way speed of light: it is not possible. However, the debates on the topic are heated; the issue will take long to be put to rest.

Challenge 751, page 471: The inverse square law of gravity does not comply with the maximum speed principle; it is not clear how it changes when one changes to a moving observer.

Challenge 752, page 476: Take a surface moving with the speed of light, or a surface defined with a precision smaller than the Planck length.

Challenge 753, page 481: Also shadows do not remain parallel in curved surfaces. forgetting this leads to strange mistakes: many arguments allegedly 'showing' that men have never been on the moon neglect this fact when they discuss the photographs taken there.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 754, page 482: If you find one, publish it and then send it to the author of this text.

Challenge 756, page 488: If so, publish it; then send it to the author of this text.

Challenge 757, page 490: For example, it is possible to imagine a surface that has such an intricate shape that it will pass all atoms of the universe at almost the speed of light. Such a surface is not physical, as it is impossible to imagine observers on all its points that move in that way all at the same time.

Challenge 759, page 491: Many do not believe the limits yet; so any proposed counter-example or any additional paradox is worth a publication.

Challenge 761, page 495: If so, publish it; then send it to the author of this text.

Challenge 764, page 496: If so, publish it; then send it to the author of this text.

Challenge 766, page 499: They are accelerated upwards.

Challenge 767, page 499: In everyday life, (a) the surface of the Earth can be taken to be flat, (b) the vertical curvature effects are negligible, and (c) the lateral length effects are negligible.

Challenge 771, page 500: For a powerful bus, the acceleration is $2\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$; in 100 m of acceleration, this makes a relative frequency change of $2.2 \cdot 10^{-15}$.

Challenge 772, page 500: Yes, light absorption and emission are always lossless conversions of energy into mass.

Challenge 775, page 501: For a beam of light, in both cases the situation is described by an environment in which masses 'fall' against the direction of motion. If the Earth and the train walls were not visible – for example if they were hidden by mist – there would not be any way to determine by experiment which situation is which. Or again, if an observer would be enclosed in a box, he could not distinguish between constant acceleration or constant gravity. (Important: this impossibility only applies if the observer has negligible size!)

Challenge 781, page 503: Both fall towards the centre of the Earth. Orbiting particles are also in free fall; their relative distance changes as well, as explained in the text.

Challenge 784, page 505: Such a graph would need four or even 5 dimensions.

Challenge 786, page 506: The energy due to the rotation can be neglected compared with all other energies in the problem.

Challenge 796, page 512: Different nucleons, different nuclei, different atoms and different molecules have different percentages of binding energies relative to the total mass.

Challenge 798, page 513: In free fall, the bottle and the water remain at rest with respect to each other.

Challenge 799, page 514: Let the device fall. The elastic rubber then is strong enough to pull the ball into the cup. See M. T. Westra, Einsteins verjaardagscadeau, *Nederlands tijdschrift voor natuurkunde* **69**, p. 109, April 2003. The original device also had a spring connected in series to the rubber.

Challenge 800, page 514: Apart the chairs and tables already mentioned, important anti-gravity devices are suspenders, belts and plastic bags.

Challenge 806, page 514: They use a spring scale, and measure the oscillation time. From it they deduce their mass.

Challenge 807, page 514: The apple hits the wall after about half an hour.

Challenge 811, page 515: With $\hbar$ as smallest angular momentum one get about 100 Tm.

Challenge 812, page 515: No. The diffraction of the beams does not allow it. Also quantum theory makes this impossible; bound states of massless particles, such as photons, are not stable.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 814, page 517: The orbital radius is 4.2 Earth radii; that makes *c.* 38 μs every day.

Challenge 815, page 517: To be honest, the experiments are not consistent. They assume that some other property of nature is constant – such as atomic size – which in fact also depends on *G*. More on this issue on page 630.

Challenge 816, page 517: Of course other spatial dimensions could exist which can be detected only with the help of measurement apparatuses. For example, hidden dimensions could appear at energies not accessible in everyday life.

Challenge 826, page 524: Since there is no negative mass, gravitoelectric fields cannot be neutralized. In contrast, electric fields can be neutralized around a metallic conductor with a Faraday cage.

Challenge 839, page 533: One needs to measure the timing of pulses which cross the Earth at different gravitational wave detectors on Earth.

Challenge 858, page 540: No; a line cannot have intrinsic curvature. A torus is indeed intrinsically curved; it cannot be cut open to a flat sheet of paper.

Challenge 880, page 549: The trace of the Einstein tensor is the negative of the Ricci scalar; it is thus the negative of the trace of the Ricci tensor.

Challenge 897, page 560: Indeed, in general relativity gravitational energy cannot be localized in space, in contrast to what one expects and requires from an interaction.

Challenge 910, page 568: There is a good chance that some weak form of a jet exists; but a detection will not be easy.

Challenge 914, page 574: Speed is measured with the Doppler effect, usually by looking at the Lyman-alpha line. Distance is much more difficult to explain. Measuring distances is a science on its own, depending on whether one measures distances of stars in the galaxy, to other galaxies, or to quasars. Any book on astronomy or astrophysics will tell more.

Challenge 917, page 580: The rabbit observes that all other rabbits seem to move away from him.

Challenge 923, page 585: Stand in a forest in winter, and try to see the horizon. If the forest is very deep, you hit tree trunks in all directions. If the forest is finite in depth, you have chance to see the horizon.

Challenge 939, page 599: The universe does not allow observation from outside. It thus has no state properties.

Challenge 944, page 602: Flattening due to rotation requires other masses to provide the background against which the rotation takes place.

Challenge 974, page 615: This happens in the same way that the static electric field comes out of a charge. In both cases, the transverse fields do not get out, but the longitudinal fields do. Quantum theory provides the deeper reason. Real radiation particles, which are responsible for free, transverse fields, cannot leave a black hole because of the escape velocity. However, virtual particles can, as their speed is not bound by the speed of light. All static, longitudinal fields are produced by virtual particles. In addition, there is a second reason. Classical field can come out of a black hole because for an outside observer everything that constitues the black hole is continuously falling, and no constituent has actually crossed the horizon. The field sources thus are not yet out of reach.

Challenge 978, page 615: The description says it all. A visual impression can be found in the room on black holes in the 'Deutsches Museum' in München.

Challenge 987, page 621: Any device that uses mirrors requires electrodynamics; without electrodynamics, mirrors are impossible.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 989, page 624: The hollow Earth theory is correct if usual distances are consistently changed according to $r_{\text{he}} = R_{\text{Earth}}^2/r$. This implies a quantum of action that decreases towards the centre of the hollow sphere. Then there is no way to prefer one description over the other, except for reasons of simplicity.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

CREDITS

Since May 2007, the production and distribution of this text is generously supported by the Klaus Tschira Foundation.

Image credits

The photograph of the night sky on page 397 is copyright and courtesy of Anthony Ayiomamitis; it is found on his splendid website www.perseus.gr. The photograph of the reconstruction of Fizeau's experiment one page 404 is copyright by AG Didaktik und Geschichte der Physik, Universität Oldenburg, and courtesy of Jan Frercks, Peter von Heering and Daniel Osewold. The photograph of a light pulse on page 405 is courtesy and copyright of Tom Mattick. The data and images of the Michelson–Morely experiment on page 419 are copyright and courtesy of Stephan Schiller. The relativistic images of the travel through the simplified Stonehenge on page 432 are copyright of Nicolai Mokros and courtesy of Norbert Dragon. The relativistic views on page 433 and 433 are courtesy and copyright of Daniel Weiskopf. The stalactite photograph on page 472 is courtesy and copyright of Richard Cindric and found on the website www.kcgrotto.org. The figures of galaxies on pages 565, 565, 566, 567, 567, 568, 572, 585, 596 and 596 are courtesy of NASA. The maps of the universe on page 573 and the Hertzsprung-Russell diagram on page 576 are courtesy and copyright of Richard Powell, and taken from his websites www.anzwers.org/free/universe and www.atlasoftheuniverse.com. The historical portraits of physicists in the text do not have copyright, except where mentioned. All drawings not explicitly mentioned are copyright © 1997 – 2009 by Christoph Schiller. If you suspect that a copyright is not correctly given or obtained, this has not done on purpose, and you are kindly asked to contact the author.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Third Part

Light, Charges and Brains

In our quest to learn how things move,
the experience of hiking and other motion
leads us to discover that images are produced by charges,
that charges move, accumulate and interact,
and that there is a smallest charge in nature.
We understand what love has to do with magnets and amber,
why the brain is such an interesting device,
and what distinguishes a good from a bad lie.

Contents

669 23 Liquid electricity, invisible fields and maximum speed
Amber, lodestone and mobile phones 669 • How can one make lightning? 671 • Electric charge and electric fields 675 • Can we detect the inertia of electricity? 680 • Feeling electric fields 682 • Magnets 684 • Can humans feel magnetic fields? 684 • How can one make a motor? 685 • Magnetic fields 687 • Electromagnetic fields and Lagrangians 691 • How motors prove relativity to be right 692 • Curiosities and fun challenges about things electric and magnetic 694 • A summary: three basic facts about electricity 705

706 24 The description of electromagnetic field evolution
Colliding charged particles 709 • The gauge field – the electromagnetic vector potential 710 • Energy and linear and angular momentum of the electromagnetic field 714 • The Lagrangian of electromagnetism 714 • The energy–momentum tensor and its symmetries of motion 715 • What is a mirror? 717 • What is the difference between electric and magnetic fields? 718 • Could electrodynamics be different? 719 • The brain: the toughest challenge for electrodynamics 720 • Challenges and fun curiosities about electrodynamics 721

723 25 What is light?
Polarization and electromagnetism 728 • The slowness of progress in physics 735 • Another look at electromagnetic radiation 735 • How does the world look when riding on a light beam? 737 • Does light always travel in a straight line? 737 • The concentration of light 743 • Can one touch light? 744 • War, light and lies 748 • What is colour? 748 • Fun with rainbows 751 • What is the speed of light? – Again 751 • 200 years too late – negative refraction indices 755 • Metamaterials 756 • Signals and predictions 757 • Does the aether exist? 757 • Challenges and fun curiosities about light 758

760 26 Images and the eye – optics
How to prove you're holy 760 • Do we see what exists? 760 • How does one make pictures of the inside of the eye? 763 • How does one make holograms and other three-dimensional images? 764 • Optical imaging 766 • Why can we see each other? 768 • Light as weapon? 770 • Challenges and fun curiosities about the eye and images 770

773 27 Charges are discrete – the limits of classical electrodynamics
How fast do charges move? 773 • Challenges and curiosities about charge discreteness 774

776 28 Electromagnetic effects
Is lightning a discharge? – Electricity in the atmosphere 776 • Does ball lightning exist? 778 • Does gravity make charges radiate? 780 • Research questions 780 • Levitation 782 • Matter, levitation and electromagnetic effects 786 • Challenges and fun curiosities about electromagnetic effects 793 • A summary of classical electrodynamics and of its limits 796

798 29 Classical physics in a nutshell
The future of planet Earth 799 • The essence of classical physics – the infinitely small and the lack of surprises 801 • Why have we not yet reached the top of the mountain? 802

804 30 The story of the brain

Evolution 805 • Children, laws and physics 805 • Polymer electronics 808 • Why a brain? 808 • What is information? 810 • What is memory? 811 • The capacity of the brain 813 • Curiosities about the brain 815

817 31 Thought and language

What is language? 817 • What is a concept? 821 • What are sets? What are relations? 822 • Infinity 825 • Functions and structures 826 • Numbers 827 • Why use mathematics? 832 • Is mathematics a language? 833 • Curiosities and fun challenges about mathematics 834

836 32 Concepts, lies and patterns of nature

Are physical concepts discovered or created? 837 • How do we find physical patterns and rules? 839 • What is a lie? 840 • Is this statement true? – A bit about nonsense 844 • Curiosities and fun challenges about lies and nonsense 846

849 **Observations**

Have enough observations been recorded? 849 • Are all physical observables known? 850 • Do observations take time? 852 • Is induction a problem in physics? 852

854 **The quest for precision and its implications**

What are interactions? – No emergence 855 • What is existence? 856 • Do things exist? 857 • Does the void exist? 858 • Is nature infinite? 859 • Is the universe a set? 860 • Does the universe exist? 861 • What is creation? 862 • Is nature designed? 864 • What is a description? 865 • Reason, purpose and explanation 866 • Unification and demarcation 867 • Pigs, apes and the anthropic principle 868 • Does one need cause and effect in explanations? 869 • Is consciousness required? 870 • Curiosity 871 • Courage 873

875 B Numbers and spaces

875 **Numbers as mathematical structures**

Complex numbers 877 • Quaternions 878 • Octonions 883 • Other types of numbers 885 • Grassmann numbers 886

886 **Vector spaces**

888 **Algebras**

Lie algebras 891 • Classification of Lie algebras 892 • Lie superalgebras 893 • The Virasoro algebra 894 • Kac–Moody algebras 894

895 **Topology – what shapes exist?**

Topological spaces 895 • Manifolds 897 • Holes, homotopy and homology 899

900 **Types and classification of groups**

Lie groups 901 • Connectedness 902 • Compactness 902

907 **Mathematical curiosities and fun challenges**

909 C Units, measurements and constants

Planck's natural units 912 • Other unit systems 913 • Curiosities and fun challenges about units 915 • Precision and accuracy of measurements 920 • Basic physical constants 921 • Useful numbers 926

927 D Sources of information on motion

933 Bibliography

955 Challenge hints and solutions

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

970 Credits
Film credits 970 • Image credits 970

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 23

LIQUID ELECTRICITY, INVISIBLE FIELDS AND MAXIMUM SPEED

What is light? The study of relativity left us completely in the dark, even though we had embarked in it precisely to find an answer to that question. True, we have learned how the motion of light compares with that of objects. We also learned that light is a moving entity that cannot be stopped; but we haven't learned anything about its nature. And what is contact? We still do not know. The answer to these long-standing questions emerges only from the study of those types of motion that are *not* related to gravitation, such as the ways magicians levitate objects.

Page 182

Revisiting the list of motors found in this world, we remark that gravitation hardly describes any of them. Neither the motion of sea waves, fire and earthquakes, nor that of a gentle breeze is caused by gravity. The same applies to the motion of muscles.* Have you ever listened to your own heart beat with a stethoscope? Without having done so, you cannot claim to have experienced the mystery of motion. Your heart has about 3000 million beats in your lifetime. Then it stops.

Challenge 994 e

It was one of the most astonishing discoveries of science that heart beats, sea waves and most other cases of everyday motion, as well as the nature of light itself, are connected to observations made thousands of years ago using two strange stones. These stones show that all those examples of motion that are called *mechanical* in everyday life are, without exception, of *electrical* origin.

In particular, the solidity, the softness and the impenetrability of matter are due to internal electricity; also the emission of light is an electrical process. As these aspects are part of everyday life, we will leave aside all complications due to gravity and curved space-time. The most productive way to study electrical motion is to start, as in the case of gravity, with those types of motion which are generated without any contact between the bodies involved.

Ref. 557

Amber, lodestone and mobile phones

The story of electricity starts with trees. Trees have a special relation to electricity. When a tree is cut, a viscous resin appears. With time it solidifies and, after millions of years, it forms *amber*. When amber is rubbed with a cat fur, it acquires the ability to attract small objects, such as saw dust or pieces of paper. This was already known to Thales of Miletus, one of the original seven sages, in the sixth century BCE. The same observation can be made with many other polymer combinations, for example with combs and hair,

* The photograph of a circular rainbow on page 665 was taken in 2006 from the Telstra Tower in Canberra (© Oat Vaiyaboon).

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 318 Objects surrounded by fields: amber (c. 1 cm), lodestone (c. 1 cm) and mobile phone (c. 10 cm) (© Philips)



FIGURE 319 How to amaze kids, especially in dry weather (photo © Robert Fritzius)

with soles of the shoe on carpets, and with a TV screen and dust. Children are always surprised by the effect, shown in Figure 319, that a comb rubbed on wool has on running tap water. The same effect can be produced with an air-filled rubber balloon rubbed on wool. Another interesting effect can be observed when a rubbed comb is put near a burning candle. (Can you imagine what happens?)

Challenge 995 ny

Another part of the story of electricity involves an iron mineral found in certain caves around the world, e.g. in a region (still) called Magnesia in the Greek province of Thessalia, and in some regions in central Asia. When two stones of this mineral are put near each other, they attract or repel each other, depending on their relative orientation. In addition, these stones attract objects made of cobalt, nickel or iron.

Today we also find various small objects in nature with more sophisticated properties, as shown in Figure 318. Some objects enable you to switch on a television, others unlock car doors, still others allow you to talk with far away friends.

All these observations show that in nature there are situations where bodies exert influence on others *at a distance*. The space surrounding a body exerting such an influence is said to contain a field. A *(physical) field* is thus an entity that manifests itself by accelerating other bodies in its region of space. A field is some 'stuff' taking up space. Experiments show that fields have no mass. The field surrounding the mineral found in Magne-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 57 Searches for magnetic monopoles, i.e., for magnetic charges

SEARCH	MAGNETIC CHARGE
Smallest magnetic charge suggested by quantum theory	$g = \frac{h}{e} = \frac{eZ_0}{2\alpha} = 4.1\,\mathrm{pWb}$
Search in minerals	none, only dipoles Ref. 558
Search in meteorites	none, only dipoles Ref. 558
Search in cosmic rays	none, only dipoles Ref. 558
Search with particle accelerators	none, only dipoles Ref. 558

sia is called a *magnetic field* and the stones are called *magnets*.* The field around amber – called ἤλεκτρον in Greek, from a root meaning 'brilliant, shining' – is called an *electric field*. The name is due to a proposal by the famous English part-time physicist William Gilbert (1544–1603) who was physician to Queen Elizabeth I. Objects surrounded by a permanent electric field are called *electrets*. They are much less common than magnets; among others, they are used in certain loudspeaker systems.**

The field around a mobile phone is called a *radio* field or, as we will see later, an *electromagnetic* field. In contrast to the previous fields, it oscillates over time. We will find out later that many other objects are surrounded by such fields, though these are often very weak. Objects that emit oscillating fields, such as mobile phones, are called radio transmitters or radio emitters.

Fields influence bodies over a distance, without any material support. For a long time, this was rarely found in everyday life, as most countries have laws to restrict machines that use and produce such fields. The laws require that for any device that moves, produces sound, or creates moving pictures, the fields need to remain inside them. For this reason a magician moving an object on a table via a hidden magnet still surprises and entertains his audience. To feel the fascination of fields more strongly, a deeper look into a few experimental results is worthwhile.

How can one make lightning?

Everybody has seen a lightning flash or has observed the effect it can have on striking a tree. Obviously lightning is a moving phenomenon. Photographs such as that of Figure 320 show that the tip of a lightning flash advance with an average speed of around 600 km/s. But *what* is moving? To find out, we have to find a way of making lightning for ourselves.

In 1995, the car company General Motors accidentally rediscovered an old and simple method of achieving this. Their engineers had inadvertently built a spark generating mechanism into their cars; when filling the petrol tank, sparks were generated, which sometimes lead to the explosion of the fuel. They had to recall 2 million vehicles of its Opel brand. Ref. 559

* A pretty book about the history of magnetism and the excitement it generates is JAMES D. LIVINGSTON, *Driving Force – the Natural Magic of Magnets*, Harvard University Press, 1996.

** The Kirlian effect, which allows one to make such intriguingly beautiful photographs, is due to a time-varying electric field.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 58 Some observed magnetic fields

OBSERVATION	MAGNETIC FIELD
Lowest measured magnetic field (e.g., fields of the Schumann resonances)	1 fT
Magnetic field produced by brain currents	0.1 pT to 3 pT
Magnetic field produced by single muscle action	1 pT
Intergalactic magnetic fields	1 pT to 10 pT
Magnetic field in the human chest, due to heart currents	100 pT
Magnetic field of our galaxy	0.5 nT
Magnetic field due to solar wind	0.2 to 80 nT
Magnetic field directly below high voltage power line	0.1 to 1 μT
Magnetic field of Earth	20 to 70 μT
Magnetic field inside home with electricity	0.1 to 100 μT
Magnetic field near mobile phone	100 μT
Magnetic field that influences visual image quality in the dark	100 μT
Magnetic field near iron magnet	100 mT
Solar spots	1 T
Magnetic fields near high technology permanent magnet	max 1.3 T
Magnetic fields that produces sense of coldness in humans	5 T or more
Magnetic fields in particle accelerator	10 T
Maximum static magnetic field produced with superconducting coils	22 T
Highest static magnetic fields produced in laboratory, using hybrid magnets	45 T
Highest *pulsed* magnetic fields produced without coil destruction	76 T
Pulsed magnetic fields produced, lasting about 1 μs, using imploding coils	1000 T
Field of white dwarf	10^4 T
Fields in petawatt laser pulses	30 kT
Field of neutron star	from 10^6 T to 10^{11} T
Quantum critical magnetic field	4.4 GT
Highest field ever measured, on magnetar and soft gamma repeater SGR-1806-20	$0.8 \text{ to } 1 \cdot 10^{11}$ T
Field near nucleus	1 TT
Maximum (Planck) magnetic field	$2.2 \cdot 10^{53}$ T

What had the engineers done wrong? They had unwittingly copied the conditions for a electrical device which anyone can build at home and which was originally invented by William Thomson:* the *Kelvin generator*. Repeating his experiment today, we would

* William Thomson (1824–1907), important Irish Unionist physicist and professor at Glasgow University. He worked on the determination of the age of the Earth, showing that it was much older than 6000 years, as several sects believed. He strongly influenced the development of the theory of magnetism and electricity, the description of the aether and thermodynamics. He propagated the use of the term 'energy' as it is

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 320 Lightning: a picture taken with a moving camera, showing its multiple strokes (© Steven Horsburgh)



FIGURE 321 A simple Kelvin generator (photograph © Harald Chmela)

take two water taps, four empty bean or coffee cans, of which two have been opened at both sides, some nylon rope and some metal wire. Ref. 560

Putting this all together as shown in Figure 321, and letting the water flow, we find a strange effect: large sparks periodically jump between the two copper wires at the point where they are nearest to each other, giving out loud bangs. Can you guess what condition

used today, instead of the confusing older terms. He was one of the last scientists to propagate mechanical analogies for the explanation of phenomena, and thus strongly opposed Maxwell's description of electromagnetism. It was mainly for this reason that he failed to receive a Nobel Prize. He was also one of the minds behind the laying of the first transatlantic telegraphic cable. Victorian to his bones, when he was knighted, he chose the name of a small brook near his home as his new name; thus he became Baron Kelvin of Largs. Therefore the unit of temperature obtained its name from a small Scottish river.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

for the flow has to be realized for this to work? And what did Opel do to repair the cars they recalled? Challenge 996 s

If we stop the water flowing just before the next spark is due, we find that both buckets are able to attract sawdust and pieces of paper. The generator thus does the same that rubbing amber does, just with more bang for the buck(et). Both buckets are surrounded by electric fields. The fields increase with time, until the spark jumps. Just after the spark, the buckets are (almost) without electric field. Obviously, the flow of water somehow builds up an entity on each bucket; today we call this *electric charge*. Charge can flow in metals and, when the fields are high enough, through air. We also find that the two buckets are surrounded by two different types of electric fields: bodies that are attracted by one bucket are repelled by the other.

All experiments confirm that there are *two* types of charges. The US politician and part-time physicist Benjamin Franklin (1706–1790) called the electricity created on a glass rod rubbed with a dry cloth *positive*, and that on a piece of amber *negative*. (Previously, the two types of charges were called 'vitreous' and 'resinous'.) Bodies with charges of the same sign repel each other, bodies with opposite charges attract each other; charges of opposite sign flowing together cancel each other out.*

Flows take time. How fast is electricity? A simple way to measure the speed of electricity is to produce a small spark at one end of a long wire, and to observe how long it takes until the spark appears at the other end of the wire. In practice, the two sparks are almost simultaneous; the speed one measures is much higher than everything else we observe in our environment. How can we measure the time nevertheless? And why did different researchers get very different speed values in this experiment? Challenge 997 s

In summary, electric fields start at bodies, provided they are charged. Charging can be achieved by rubbing and similar processes. Charge can flow: it is then called an electric *current*. The worst conductors of current are polymers; they are called *insulators* or *dielectrics*. A charge put on an insulator remains at the place where it was put. In contrast, metals are good conductors; a charge placed on a conductor spreads all over its surface. The best conductors are silver and copper. This is the reason that at present, after two hundred years of use of electricity, the highest concentration of copper in the world is below the surface of Manhattan.

Of course, one has to check whether natural lightning is actually electrical in origin. In 1752, experiments performed in France, following a suggestion by Benjamin Franklin, published in London in 1751, showed that one can indeed draw electricity from a thunderstorm via a long rod.** These French experiments made Franklin famous worldwide; they were also the start of the use of lightning rods all over the world. Later, Franklin had a lightning rod built through his own house, but of a somewhat unusual type, as shown in Figure 322. Can you guess what it did in his hall during bad weather, all parts being made of metal? (Do not repeat this experiment; the device can kill.) Ref. 561 Challenge 998 s

* In fact, there are many other ways to produces sparks or even *arcs*, i.e., sustained sparks; there is even a complete subculture of people who do this as a hobby at home. Those who have a larger budget do it professionally, in particle accelerators. See the www.kronjaeger.com/hv website.

** The details of how lightning is generated and how it propagates are still a topic of research. An introduction is given on page 776.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 322 Franklin's personal lightning rod

Electric charge and electric fields

If all experiments with charge can be explained by calling the two charges positive and negative, the implication is that some bodies have more, and some less charge than an uncharged, *neutral* body. Electricity thus only flows when two differently charged bodies are brought into contact. Now, if charge can flow and accumulate, we must be able to somehow measure its amount. Obviously, the *amount* of charge on a body, usually abbreviated q, is defined via the influence the body, say a piece of sawdust, feels when subjected to a field. Charge is thus defined by comparing it to a standard reference charge. For a charged body of mass m accelerated in a field, its charge q is determined by the relation

$$\frac{q}{q_{\text{ref}}} = \frac{ma}{m_{\text{ref}}a_{\text{ref}}} \,, \tag{426}$$

i.e., by comparing it with the acceleration and mass of the reference charge. This definition reflects the observation that mass alone is not sufficient for a complete characterization of a body. For a full description of motion we need to know its electric charge; charge is therefore the second intrinsic property of bodies that we discover in our walk.

Nowadays the unit of charge, the *coulomb*, is defined through a standard flow through metal wires, as explained in Appendix C. This is possible because all experiments show that charge is conserved, that it flows, that it flows continuously and that it can accumulate. Charge thus behaves like a fluid substance. Therefore we are forced to use for its description a scalar quantity q, which can take positive, vanishing, or negative values.

In practice, electric charge is measured with *electrometers*. A few such devices are shown in Figure 323. Experiments with these devices first of all conform that charges flow and accumulate. More precisely, all experiments show that charges are conserved. In other words, if the electric charge of a physical system changes, the reason always is that charge is flowing into or out of the system. This can be checked easily with two metal pots connected to two electrometers, as shown in Figure 324.

Ref. 562

The main experimental properties of electric charge that are discovered when experimenting with electrometers are listed in Table 59. These properties describe the behaviour electrical charge values. However, as in the case of all previously encountered

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 323 Various electrometers: a self-made electrometer based on a jam pot, an ancient (opened) high precision Dolezalek electrometer, the *Ampullae of Lorenzini* of a shark, and a modern digital electrometer (© Harald Chmela, Klaus Jost at www.jostimages.com, Advantest)

FIGURE 324 A simple set-up to confirm electric charge conservation: if rubbed fur is moved from the first pot to the second, the charge taken away from the first pot is transferred to the second, as shown by the two electrometers (© Wolfgang Rueckner)

classical concepts, many of these experimental results for electrical charge will turn out

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 59 Properties of *classical* electric charge: a scalar density

Electric charges	Physical property	Mathematical name	Definition
Can be distinguished	distinguishability	element of set	Page 822
Can be ordered	sequence	order	Page 876
Can be compared	measurability	metricity	Page 887
Can change gradually	continuity	completeness	Page 896
Can be added	accumulability	additivity	Page 77
Can be separated	separability	positive or negative	
Do not change	conservation	invariance	q = const

TABLE 60 Values of electrical charge observed in nature

Observation	Charge
Smallest measured non-vanishing charge	$1.6 \cdot 10^{-19}$ C
Charge per bit in computer memory	10^{-13} C
Charge in small capacitor	10^{-7} C
Charge flow in average lightning stroke	1 C to 100 C
Charge stored in a fully-charge car battery	0.2 MC
Charge of planet Earth	1 MC
Charge separated by modern power station in one year	$3 \cdot 10^{11}$ C
Total charge of positive (or negative) sign observed in universe	$10^{62\pm2}$ C
Total charge observed in universe	0 C

to be only approximate. More precise experiments will require a revision of several properties. However, one observation remains: no counter-example to charge conservation has as yet been observed.

A charged object brought near a neutral one polarizes it. *Electrical polarization* is the separation of the positive and negative charges in a body. For this reason, even neutral objects, such as hair, can be attracted to a charged body, such as a comb. Generally, both insulators and conductors can be polarized; this occurs for whole stars down to single molecules.

Attraction is a form of acceleration. Experiments show that the entity that accelerates charged bodies, the *electric field*, behaves like a small arrow fixed at each point $\boldsymbol{x}$ in space; its length and direction do not depend on the observer. In short, the electric field $\boldsymbol{E}(\boldsymbol{x})$ is a *vector* field. Experiments show that it is best defined by the relation

$$q\boldsymbol{E}(\boldsymbol{x}) = m\boldsymbol{a}(\boldsymbol{x}) \tag{427}$$

taken at every point in space $\boldsymbol{x}$. The definition of the electric field is thus based on how it *moves* charges.* The field is measured in multiples of the unit N/C or V/m.

Challenge 1000 e

Challenge 999 s

* Does the definition of electric field given here assume a charge speed that is much less than that of light?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 61 Some observed electric fields

OBSERVATION	ELECTRIC FIELD
Field 1 m away from an electron in vacuum	Challenge 1001 s
Field values sensed by sharks	down to 0.1 μV/m
Cosmic noise	10 μV/m
Field of a 100 W FM radio transmitter at 100 km distance	0.5 mV/m
Field inside conductors, such as copper wire	0.1 V/m
Field just beneath a high power line	0.1 to 1 V/m
Field of a GSM antenna at 90 m	0.5 V/m
Field inside a typical home	1 to 10 V/m
Field of a 100 W bulb at 1 m distance	50 V/m
Ground field in Earth's atmosphere	100 to 300 V/m
Field inside thunder clouds	up to over 100 kV/m
Maximum electric field in air before sparks appear	1 to 3 MV/m
Electric fields in biological membranes	10 MV/m
Electric fields inside capacitors	up to 1 GV/m
Electric fields in petawatt laser pulses	10 TV/m
Electric fields in U^{91+} ions, at nucleus	1 EV/m
Maximum practical electric field in vacuum, limited by electron pair production	1.3 EV/m
Maximum possible electric field in nature (corrected Planck electric field)	$2.4 \cdot 10^{61}$ V/m

To describe the motion due to electricity completely, we need a relation explaining how charges *produce* electric fields. This relation was established with precision (but not for the first time) by Charles-Augustin de Coulomb on his private estate, during the French Revolution.* He found that around any small-sized or any spherical charge Q *at rest* there is an electric field. At a position $\boldsymbol{r}$, the electric field $\boldsymbol{E}$ is given by

$$\boldsymbol{E}(\boldsymbol{r}) = \frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0}\frac{Q}{r^2}\frac{\boldsymbol{r}}{r} \quad \text{where} \quad \frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0} = 9.0\,\text{GV m/C}\,. \tag{428}$$

Later we will extend the relation for a charge in motion. The bizarre proportionality constant, built around the so-called *permittivity of free space* ε_0, is due to the historical way the unit of charge was defined first.** The essential point of the formula is the decrease of the field with the square of the distance; can you imagine the origin of this dependence? Challenge 1002 s

* Charles-Augustin de Coulomb (b. 1736 Angoulême, d. 1806 Paris), French engineer and physicist. His careful experiments on electric charges provided a firm basis for the study of electricity.

** Other definitions of this and other proportionality constants to be encountered later are possible, leading to *unit systems* different from the SI system used here. The SI system is presented in detail in Appendix C. Among the older competitors, the Gaussian unit system often used in theoretical calculations, the Heaviside–Lorentz unit system, the electrostatic unit system and the electromagnetic unit system are the most important ones. Ref. 563

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 62 Properties of the electric field: a (polar) vector

ELECTRIC FIELDS CAN	PHYSICAL PROPERTY	MATHEMATICAL NAME	DEFINITION
Attract bodies	accelerate charges	coupling	equation 428
Repel bodies	accelerate charges	coupling	equation 428
Be distinguished	distinguishability	element of set	Page 822
Change gradually	continuum	real vector space	Page 77, Page 896
Point somewhere	direction	vector space, dimensionality	Page 77
Be compared	measurability	metricity	Page 887
Be added	additivity	vector space	Page 77
Have defined angles	direction	Euclidean vector space	Page 77
Exceed any limit	infinity	unboundedness	Page 823
Change direction under reflection	polarity	parity-odd vector	
Keep direction under time reversal		time-even vector	

The two previous equations allow one to write the interaction between two charged bodies as

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{p}_1}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0}\frac{q_1 q_2}{r^2}\frac{\boldsymbol{r}}{r} = -\frac{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{p}_2}{\mathrm{d}t}\,, \tag{429}$$

where $\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{p}$ is the momentum change, and $\boldsymbol{r}$ is the vector connecting the two centres of mass. This famous expression for electrostatic attraction and repulsion, also due to Coulomb, is valid only for charged bodies that are of small size or spherical, and most of all, that are *at rest*.

Electric fields accelerate charges. As a result, in everyday life, electric fields have two main properties: they contain energy and they can polarize bodies. The energy content is due to the electrostatic interaction between charges. The strength of this interaction is considerable. For example, it is the basis for the force of our muscles. Muscular force is a macroscopic effect of equation 429. Another example is the material strength of steel or diamond. As we will discover, all atoms are held together by electrostatic attraction. To convince yourself of the strength of electrostatic attraction, answer the following: What is the force between two boxes with a gram of protons each, located on the two poles of the Earth? Try to guess the result before you calculate the astonishing value.

Challenge 1003 s

Coulomb's relation for the field around a charge can be rephrased in a way that helps to generalize it to non-spherical bodies. Take a closed surface, i.e., a surface than encloses a certain volume. Then the integral of the electric field over this surface, the electric flux,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

is the enclosed charge Q divided by ε_0:

$$\oint_{\text{closed surface}} \boldsymbol{E}\, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{A} = \frac{Q}{\varepsilon_0}\,. \tag{430}$$

Challenge 1004 s This mathematical relation, called *Gauss's 'law'*, follows from the result of Coulomb. (In the simplified form given here, it is valid only for static situations.) Since inside conductors the electrical field is zero, Gauss's 'law' implies, for example, that if a charge q is surrounded by a uncharged metal sphere, the outer surface of the metal sphere shows Challenge 1005 e the same charge q.

Owing to the strength of electromagnetic interactions, separating charges is not an easy task. This is the reason that electrical effects have only been commonly used for about a hundred years. We had to wait for practical and efficient devices to be invented for separating charges and putting them into motion. Of course this requires energy. Batteries, as used in mobile phones, use chemical energy to do the trick.* Thermoelectric elements, as used in some watches, use the temperature difference between the wrist and the air to separate charges; solar cells use light, and dynamos or Kelvin generators use kinetic energy.

Do uncharged bodies attract one other? In first approximation they do not. But when the question is investigated more precisely, one finds that they can attract one other. Can Challenge 1007 s you find the conditions for this to happen? In fact, the conditions are quite important, as our own bodies, which are made of neutral molecules, are held together in this way.

What then is electricity? The answer is simple: *electricity is nothing in particular*. It is the name for a field of inquiry, but not the name for any specific observation or effect. Electricity is neither electric current, nor electric charge, nor electric field. Electricity is not a specific term; it applies to *all* of these phenomena. In fact the vocabulary issue hides a deeper question that remains unanswered at the beginning of the twenty-first century: what is the nature of electric charge? In order to reach this issue, we start with the following question.

Can we detect the inertia of electricity?

If electric charge really is something *flowing* through metals, we should be able to observe the effects shown in Figure 325. Maxwell has predicted most of these effects: electric charge should fall, have inertia and be separable from matter. Indeed, each of these effects has been observed.** For example, when a long metal rod is kept vertically, we can measure an electrical potential difference, a voltage, between the top and the bottom. In other words, we can measure the *weight* of electricity in this way. Similarly, we can Ref. 564 measure the potential difference between the ends of an accelerated rod. Alternatively, we can measure the potential difference between the centre and the rim of a rotating metal disc. The last experiment was, in fact, the way in which the ratio q/m for currents

Challenge 1006 s * Incidentally, are batteries sources of charges?

** Maxwell also performed experiments to detect these effects (apart from the last one, which he did not predict), but his apparatuses were not sensitive enough.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009


If electric charge in metals moves like a fluid, it should:
fall under gravity
be subject to centrifugation
a
resist acceleration
spray when pumped
a
lead to recoil just after switching on a currrent
q
prevent free charges from falling through a thin hollow tube

FIGURE 325 Consequences of the flow of electricity

in metals was first measured with precision. The result is

$$q/m = 1.8 \cdot 10^{11}\,\mathrm{C/kg} \tag{431}$$

for all metals, with small variations in the second digit. In short, electrical current has mass. Therefore, whenever we switch on an electrical current, we get a *recoil*. This simple effect can easily be measured and confirms the mass to charge ratio just given. Also, the emission of current into air or into vacuum is observed; in fact, every television tube uses this principle to generate the beam producing the picture. It works best for metal objects with sharp, pointed tips. The rays created this way – we could say that they are 'free' electricity – are called *cathode rays*. Within a few per cent, they show the same mass to charge ratio as expression (431). This correspondence thus shows that charges move almost as freely in metals as in air; this is the reason metals are such good conductors.

Ref. 565

Ref. 566

If electric charge *falls* inside vertical metal rods, we can make the astonishing deduction that cathode rays – as we will see later, they consist of free electrons* – should not be able to fall through a vertical metal tube. This is due to exact compensation of the

* The name 'electron' is due to George Stoney. Electrons are the smallest and lightest charges moving in metals; they are, usually – but not always – the 'atoms' of electricity – for example in metals. Their charge is small, 0.16 aC, so that flows of charge typical of everyday life consist of large numbers of electrons; as a result, electrical charge behaves like a continuous fluid. The particle itself was discovered and presented in

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 63 Some observed electric current values

OBSERVATION	CURRENT
Smallest current ever measured (for one moving electron)	3 aA
Human nerve signals	20 μA
Lethal current for humans	as low as 20 mA, typically 100 mA
Current drawn by a train engine	600 A
Current in a lightning bolt	10 to 100 kA
Highest current produced by humans	20 MA
Current inside the Earth	around 100 MA

acceleration by the electrical field generated by the displaced electricity in the tube and the acceleration of gravity. Thus electrons should not be able to fall through a long thin cylinder. This would not be the case if electricity in metals did not behave like a fluid. The experiment has indeed been performed, and a reduction of the acceleration of free fall for electrons of 90 % has been observed. Can you imagine why the ideal value of 100 % is not achieved?

Challenge 1008 e

Ref. 567

Challenge 1009 s

If electric current behaves like a liquid, one should be able to measure its speed. The first to do so, in 1834, was Charles Wheatstone. In a famous experiment, he used a wire of a quarter of a mile length, to produce three sparks: one at the start, one at the middle, and one at the end. He then mounted a rapidly moving mirror on a mechanical watch; by noting how much the three spark images were shifted against each other on a screen, he determined the speed to be 0.45 Gm/s, though with a large error. Latter, more precise measurements showed that the speed is always below 0.3 Gm/s, and that it depends on the metal and the type of insulation of the wire. The high value of the speed convinced many people to use electricity for transmitting messages. A modern version of the experiment, for computer fans, uses the 'ping' command from the UNIX operating system. The 'ping' command measures the time for a computer signal to reach another computer and return back. If the cable length between two computers is known, the signal speed can be deduced. Just try.

Ref. 568

Challenge 1010 e

As a note, the speed of electricity is too slow for many people. Modern computers that are connected to stock exchanges are located as near as possible to the stock exchange, because the time advantage the short communication distance provides is essential for getting a good financial performance in certain trading markets.

Ref. 569

In summary, experiments show that all charges have mass. And like all massive bodies they move slower than light.

FEELING ELECTRIC FIELDS

Why is electricity dangerous to humans? The main reason is that the human body is controlled by 'electric wires' itself. As a result, outside electricity interferes with the internal

1897 by the Prussian physicist Johann Emil Wiechert (1861–1928) and, independently, three months later, by the British physicist Joseph John Thomson (1856–1940).

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 64 Some sensors for electrical current

Measurement	Sensor	Range
20 euro multimeter	voltage drop over resistor	up to *c.* 3 A
Contraction	human muscles	felt from 0.1 mA
Smoke emission	human muscles	from 1 A
Rhythm change	human heart	stops at 20 mA
Plants		

signals. This has been known since 1789. In that year the Italian medical doctor Luigi Galvani (1737–1798) discovered that electrical current makes the muscles of a dead animal contract. The famous first experiment used frog legs: when electricity was applied to them, they twitched violently. Subsequent investigations confirmed that all nerves make use of electrical signals. Nerves are the 'control wires' of animals. However, nerves are not made of metal: metals are not sufficiently flexible. As a result, nerves do not conduct electricity using electrons but by using *ions*. The finer details were clarified only in the twentieth century. Nerve signals propagate using the motion of sodium and potassium ions in the cell membrane of the nerve. The resulting signal speed is between 0.5 m/s and 120 m/s, depending on the type of nerve. This speed is sufficient for the survival of most species – it signals the body to run away in case of danger.

Being electrically controlled, all mammals can sense strong electric fields. Humans can sense fields down to around 10 kV/m, when hair stands on end. In contrast, several animals can sense weak electric and magnetic fields. Sharks, for example, can detect fields down to 1 μV/m using special sensors, the *Ampullae of Lorenzini*, which are found around their mouth. Sharks use them to detect the field created by prey moving in water; this allows them to catch their prey even in the dark. Several freshwater fish are also able to detect electric fields. The salamander and the platypus, the famous duck-billed mammal, can also sense electric fields. Like sharks, they use them to detect prey in water which is too muddy to see through. Certain fish, the so-called *weakly-electric fish*, even generate a weak field in order to achieve better prey detection.*

No land animal has special sensors for electric fields, because any electric field in air is strongly damped when it encounters a water-filled animal body. Indeed, the usual atmosphere has an electric field of around 100 V/m; inside the human body this field is damped to the μV/m range, which is much less than an animal's internal electric fields. In other words, humans do not have sensors for low electric fields because they are land animals. (Do humans have the ability to sense electric fields in water? Nobody seems to know.) However, there a few exceptions. You might know that some older people can sense approaching thunderstorms in their joints. This is due the coincidence between the electromagnetic field frequency emitted by thunderclouds – around 100 kHz – and the resonant frequency of nerve cell membranes.

Challenge 1011 r

Page 732

The water content of the human body also means that the electric fields in air that are

* It took until the year 2000 for technology to make use of the same effect. Nowadays, airbag sensors in cars often use electric fields to sense whether the person sitting in the seat is a child or an adult, thus changing the way that the bag behaves in an accident.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

found in nature are rarely dangerous to humans. Whenever humans do sense electric fields, such as when high voltage makes their hair stand on end, the situation is potentially dangerous.

The high impedance of air also means that, in the case of time-varying electromagnetic fields, humans are much more prone to be affected by the magnetic component than by the electric component.

Magnets

The study of magnetism progressed across the world independently of the study of electricity. Towards the end of the twelfth century, the compass came into use in Europe. At that time, there were heated debates on whether it pointed to the north or the south. In 1269, the French military engineer Pierre de Maricourt (1219–1292) published his study
Ref. 570 of magnetic materials. He found that every magnet has *two* points of highest magnetization, and he called them *poles*. He found that even after a magnet is cut, the resulting pieces always retain two poles: one points to the north and the other to the south when the stone is left free to rotate. Magnets are dipoles. Atoms are either dipoles or unmagnetic. There are no magnetic monopoles. Despite the promise of eternal fame, no magnetic monopole has ever been found, as shown in Table 57. Like poles repel, and unlike poles attract.

Magnets have a second property: magnets transform unmagnetic materials into magnetic ones. There is thus also a magnetic polarization, similar to the electric polarization. Unlike the electric case, some magnetic materials retain the induced magnetic polarization: they become magnetized. This happens when the atoms in the material get aligned by the external magnet.

Can humans feel magnetic fields?

> Any fool can ask more questions than seven sages can answer.
>
> Antiquity

It is known that honey bees, sharks, pigeons, salmon, trout, sea turtles and certain bacte-
Ref. 571 ria can feel magnetic fields. One speaks of the ability for magnetoreception. All these life forms use this ability for navigation. The most common detection method is the use of small magnetic particles inside a cell; the cell then senses how these small built-in magnets move in a magnetic field. The magnets are tiny, typically around 50 nm in size. These small magnets are used to navigate along the magnetic field of the Earth. For higher animals, the variations of the magnetic field of the Earth, 20 to 70 μT, produce a landscape that is similar to the visible landscape for humans. They can remember it and use it for navigation.

Can humans feel magnetic fields? Magnetic material seems to be present in the human brain, but whether humans can feel magnetic fields is still an open issue. Maybe you can
Challenge 1012 r devise a way to check this?

Are magnetism and electricity related? François Arago* found out that they were. He observed that a ship that had survived a bad thunderstorm and had been struck by light-

* François Arago (1786–1853) French physicist.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 326 The magnetotactic bacterium *Magnetobacterium bavaricum* with its magnetosomes (© Marianne Hanzlik)

ning, needed a new compass. Thus lightning has the ability to demagnetize compasses. Arago knew, like Franklin, that lightning is an electrical phenomena. In other words, electricity and magnetism must be related. More precisely, magnetism must be related to the *motion* of electricity.

How can one make a motor?

> Communism is the power of the local councils plus electricification of the whole country.
> Lenin.*

The reason for Lenin's famous statement were two discoveries. One was made in 1820 by the Danish physicist Hans Christian Oersted (1777–1851) and the other in 1831 by the English physicist Michael Faraday.** The consequences of these experiments changed the world completely in less than one century.

On the 21st of July of 1821, Oersted published a leaflet, in Latin, which took Europe by storm. Oersted had found (during a lecture demonstration to his students) that when a current is sent through a wire, a nearby magnet is put into motion. In other words, he found that the flow of electricity can move bodies.

Further experiments show that *two* wires in which charges flow attract or repel each other, depending on whether the currents are parallel or antiparallel. These and other experiments show that wires in which electricity flows behave like magnets.*** In other

* Lenin (b. 1870 Simbirsk, d. 1924 Gorki), founder of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in 1920 stated this as the centre of his development plan for the country. In Russian, the local councils of that time were called soviets.

** Michael Faraday (b. 1791 Newington Butts, d. 1867 London) was born to a simple family, without schooling, and of deep and naive religious ideas. As a boy he became assistant to the most famous chemist of his time, Humphry Davy (1778–1829). He had no mathematical training, but late in his life he became member of the Royal Society. A modest man, he refused all other honours in his life. He worked on chemical topics, the atomic structure of matter and, most of all, he developed the idea of (magnetic) fields and field lines. He used fields to describe all his numerous experimental discoveries about electromagnetism, such as the Faraday effect. Fields were later described mathematically by Maxwell, who at that time was the only person in Europe to take over Faraday's field concept.

*** In fact, if one imagines tiny currents moving in circles inside magnets, one gets a unique description for all magnetic fields observed in nature.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 327 An old and a newer version of an electric motor



FIGURE 328 An electrical current always produces a magnetic field



FIGURE 329 Current makes a metal rod rotate

words, Oersted had found the definite proof that electricity could be turned into magnetism.

Shortly afterwards, Ampère* found that *coils* increase these effects dramatically. Coils behave like small magnets. In particular, coils, like magnetic fields, always have two poles, usually called the north and the south pole. Opposite poles attract, like poles repel each other. As is well known, the Earth is itself a large magnet, with its magnetic north pole near the geographic south pole, and vice versa. (The magnetic field of the Earth is *not* due to a solid permanent magnet inside it. The Earth's solid core is too hot to be a permanent magnet; instead, the magnetic field is due to circulating currents in the outer, liquid core.)

Moving electric charge produces magnetic fields. This result explains why magnetic fields always have two poles. The lack of magnetic monopoles thus becomes clear. But one topic is strange. If magnetic fields are due to the motion of charges, this must be also the case for a normal magnet. Can this be shown?

In 1915, two men in the Netherlands found a simple way to prove that even in a magnet,

* André-Marie Ampère (b. 1775 Lyon, d. 1836 Marseille), French physicist and mathematician. Autodidact, he read the famous *Encyclopédie* as a child; in a life full of personal tragedies, he wandered from maths to chemistry and physics, worked as a school teacher, and published nothing of importance until 1820. Then the discovery of Oersted reached all over Europe: electrical current can deviate magnetic needles. Ampère worked for years on the problem, and in 1826 published the summary of his findings, which lead Maxwell to call him the 'Newton of electricity'. Ampère named and developed many areas of electrodynamics. In 1832, he and his technician also built the first dynamo, or rotative current generator. Of course, the unit of electrical current is named after him.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 330 The two basic types of magnetic material behaviour (tested in an inhomogeneous field): diamagnetism and paramagnetism

something is moving. They suspended a metal rod from the ceiling by a thin thread and then put a coil around the rod, as shown in Figure 329. They predicted that the tiny currents inside the rod would become aligned by the magnetic field of the coil. As a result, they expected that a current passing through the coil would make the rod turn around its axis. Indeed, when they sent a strong current through the coil, the rod rotated. (As a result of the current, the rod was magnetized.) Today, this effect is called the *Einstein–de Haas effect* after the two physicists who imagined, measured and explained it.* The effect thus shows that even in the case of a permanent magnet, the magnetic field is due to the internal motion of charges. The size of the effect also shows that the moving particles are electrons. (Twelve years later it became clear that the angular momentum of the electrons responsible for the effect is a mixture of orbital and spin angular momentum; in fact, the electron spin plays a central role in the effect.)

Ref. 572

Since magnetism is due to the alignment of microscopic rotational motions, an even more surprising effect can be predicted. Simply rotating a ferromagnetic material** should magnetize it, because the tiny rotating currents would then be aligned along the axis of rotation. This effect has indeed been observed; it is called the *Barnett effect* after its discoverer. Like the Einstein–de Haas effect, the Barnett effect can also be used to determine the gyromagnetic ratio of the electron; thus it also proves that the spins of electrons (usually) play a larger role in magnetism than their orbital angular momentum.

Ref. 573

Page 1037

Magnetic fields

Experiments show that the magnetic field always has a given direction in space, and a magnitude common to all (resting) observers, whatever their orientation. We are tempted to describe the magnetic field by a vector. However, this would be wrong, since a magnetic field does not behave like an arrow when placed before a mirror. Imagine that a system produces a magnetic field directed to the right. You can take any system, a coil, a machine, etc. Now build or imagine a second system that is the exact mirror version of the first: a mirror coil, a mirror machine, etc. The magnetic system produced by the

* Wander Johannes de Haas (1878–1960), Dutch physicist. De Haas is best known for two additional magneto-electric effects named after him, the Shubnikov–de Haas effect (the strong increase of the magnetic resistance of bismuth at low temperatures and high magnetic fields) and the de Haas–Van Alphen effect (the diamagnetic susceptibility of bismuth at low temperatures is a periodic function of the magnetic field).

** A ferromagnetic material is a special kind of paramagnetic material that has a permanent magnetization.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 65 The magnetic properties of materials

MATERIAL	RELATIVE MAGNETIC PERMEABILITY μ_r
Diamagnetic materials $\mu_r < 1$	
Type I superconductors	0
Highly oriented pyrolitic graphite	0.999 55
Bismuth	0.999 83
Graphite	0.999 84
Gold	0.999 966
Copper	0.999 9936
Water	0.999 9912
Paramagnetic materials $\mu_r > 1$	
Air, oxygen	1.000 0019
Aluminium	1.000 022
Platinum	1.000 26
Ferromagnetic materials $\mu_r \gg 1$	
Cobalt	80 to 200
Nickel	100
Iron	300 to 10 000
Permalloy	8 000
Ferrites	up to 15 000
μ-metal	up to 140 000
Amorphous metals	up to 500 000

mirror system does not point to the left, as maybe you expected: it still points to the right. (Check by yourself.) In simple words, magnetic fields do *not* fully behave like arrows.

Challenge 1013 e

In other words, it is not completely correct to describe a magnetic field by a vector $\boldsymbol{B} = (B_x, B_y, B_z)$, as vectors behave like arrows. One also speaks of a *pseudovector*; angular momentum and torque are also examples of such quantities. The precise way is to describe the magnetic field by the quantity*

$$\boldsymbol{B} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -B_z & B_y \\ B_z & 0 & -B_x \\ -B_y & B_x & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{432}$$

called an *antisymmetric tensor*. In summary, *magnetic fields* are defined by the accelera-

* The quantity $\boldsymbol{B}$ was not called the 'magnetic field' until recently. We follow here the modern, logical definition, which supersedes the traditional one, where $\boldsymbol{B}$ was called the 'magnetic flux density' or 'magnetic induction' and another quantity, $\boldsymbol{H}$, was called – incorrectly, but for over a century – the magnetic field. This quantity $\boldsymbol{H}$ will not appear in this walk, but it is important for the description of magnetism in materials.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 66 Properties of the magnetic field: an axial vector

Magnetic fields can	Physical property	Mathematical name	Definition
Attract currents	deflect charges	coupling	equation 433
Repel currents	deflect charges	coupling	equation 433
Be distinguished	distinguishability	element of set	Page 822
Change gradually	continuum	real vector space	Page 77, Page 896
Point somewhere	direction	vector space, dimensionality	Page 77
Be compared	measurability	metricity	Page 887
Be added	additivity	vector space	Page 77
Have defined angles	direction	Euclidean vector space	Page 77
Exceed any limit	infinity	unboundedness	Page 823
Keep direction under reflection	axiality	parity-even vector, pseudovector	
Change direction under time reversal	axiality	time-odd vector	

TABLE 67 Some sensors for magnetic fields

Measurement	Sensor	Range
Voltage	Hall probe	up to many T
Bone growth stimulation	piezoelectricity and magnetostriction of bones	from 50 mT
Induced electromotive force (voltage)	nerves	from a few T
Sensations in thorax and shoulders	nerves	strong switched gradients
Plants		

tion they impart on moving charges. This acceleration turns out to follow

$$\boldsymbol{a} = \frac{e}{m}\boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{B} = \frac{e}{m}\boldsymbol{v} \times \boldsymbol{b} \tag{433}$$

a relation which is often called *Lorentz acceleration*, after the important Dutch physicist Hendrik A. Lorentz (b. 1853 Arnhem, d. 1928 Haarlem) who first stated it clearly.* (The relation is also called the *Laplace acceleration*.) The unit of the magnetic field is called tesla and is abbreviated T. One has $1\,\mathrm{T} = 1\,\mathrm{N\,s/C\,m} = 1\,\mathrm{V\,s/m^2} = 1\,\mathrm{V\,s^2/A\,m}$.

The Lorentz acceleration is the effect at the root of any electric motor. An electric motor is a device that uses a magnetic field as efficiently as possible to accelerate charges

Challenge 1014 s

* Does the definition of magnetic field given here assume a charge speed much lower than that of light?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

flowing in a wire. Through the motion of the charges, the wire is then also moved. Electricity is thus transformed into magnetism and then into motion. The first efficient motor was built back in 1834.

As in the electric case, we need to know how the *strength* of a magnetic field is determined. Experiments such as Oersted's show that the magnetic field is due to moving charges, and that a charge moving with velocity $\boldsymbol{v}$ produces a field $\boldsymbol{B}$ given by

$$\boldsymbol{B}(\boldsymbol{r}) = \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi}\, q\, \frac{\boldsymbol{v}\times\boldsymbol{r}}{r^3} \quad \text{where} \quad \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} = 10^{-7}\,\mathrm{N/A^2}\,. \tag{434}$$

This is called *Ampère's 'law'*. Again, the strange factor $\mu_0/4\pi$ is due to the historical way in which the electrical units were defined. The constant μ_0 is called the *permeability of the vacuum* and is defined by the fraction of newtons per ampere squared given in the formula. It is easy to see that the magnetic field has an intensity given by $\boldsymbol{v}E/c^2$, where
Challenge 1015 e $\boldsymbol{E}$ is the electric field measured by an observer moving *with* the charge. This is the first hint that magnetism is a relativistic effect.

We note that equation (434) is valid only for small velocities and accelerations. Can
Challenge 1016 s you find the general one?

In 1831, Michael Faraday discovered an additional piece of the puzzle, one that even the great Ampère had overlooked. He found that a *moving* magnet could cause a current flow in an electrical circuit. Magnetism can thus be turned into electricity. This important discovery allowed the production of electrical current flow by generators, so-called *dynamos*, using water power, wind power or steam power. In fact, the first dynamo was built in 1832 by Ampère and his technician. Dynamos started the use of electricity throughout the world. Behind every electrical wall plug there is a dynamo somewhere.

Additional experiments show that magnetic fields also lead to electric fields when one changes to a moving viewpoint. You might check this on any of the examples of Figures 327 to 345. *Magnetism indeed is relativistic electricity*. Electric and magnetic fields are partly transformed into each other when switching from one inertial reference frame to the other. Magnetic and electrical fields thus behave like space and time, which are also mixed up when changing from one inertial frame to the other. The theory of special relativity thus tells us that there must be a single concept, an *electromagnetic field*, describing them both. Investigating the details, one finds that the electromagnetic field $\boldsymbol{F}$ surrounding charged bodies has to be described by an antisymmetric 4-*tensor*

$$\boldsymbol{F}^{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -E_x/c & -E_y/c & -E_z/c \\ E_x/c & 0 & -B_z & B_y \\ E_y/c & B_z & 0 & -B_x \\ E_z/c & -B_y & B_x & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } \boldsymbol{F}_{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & E_x/c & E_y/c & E_z/c \\ -E_x/c & 0 & -B_z & B_y \\ -E_y/c & B_z & 0 & -B_x \\ -E_z/c & -B_y & B_x & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{435}$$

Obviously, the electromagnetic field F, and thus every component of these matrices, depends on space and time. The matrices show that electricity and magnetism are two faces of the same effect.* In addition, since electric fields appear only in the topmost row and

* Actually, the expression for the field contains everywhere the expression $1/\sqrt{\mu_0\varepsilon_0}$ instead of the speed of light c. We will explain the reason for this substitution shortly.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

leftmost column, the expressions show that in everyday life, for small speeds, electricity and magnetism *can* be separated. (Why?) Challenge 1017 s

The total influence of electric and magnetic fields on fixed or moving charges is then given by the following expression for the relativistic force-acceleration relation $\boldsymbol{K} = m\boldsymbol{b}$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& m\boldsymbol{b} = q\boldsymbol{F}u \quad \text{or} \\
& mb^{\mu} = m\,\frac{\mathrm{d}u^{\mu}}{\mathrm{d}\tau} = q\boldsymbol{F}^{\mu}{}_{\nu}u^{\nu} \quad \text{or} \\
& m\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\tau}\begin{pmatrix} \gamma c \\ \gamma v_x \\ \gamma v_y \\ \gamma v_z \end{pmatrix} = q\begin{pmatrix} 0 & E_x/c & E_y/c & E_z/c \\ E_x/c & 0 & B_z & -B_y \\ E_y/c & -B_z & 0 & B_x \\ E_z/c & B_y & -B_x & 0 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \gamma c \\ \gamma v_x \\ \gamma v_y \\ \gamma v_z \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{or} \\
& W = q\boldsymbol{E}\boldsymbol{v} \quad \text{and} \quad d\boldsymbol{p}/\mathrm{d}t = q(\boldsymbol{E} + \boldsymbol{v} \times \boldsymbol{B})\,,
\end{aligned}
\tag{436}
$$

which show how the work W and the three-force $dp/\mathrm{d}t$ depend on the electric and magnetic fields. All four expressions describe the same content; the simplicity of the first one is the reason for the involved matrices (435) of the electromagnetic field. In fact, the extended *Lorentz relation* (436) is the *definition* of the electromagnetic field, since the field is defined as that 'stuff' which accelerates charges. In particular, all devices that put charges into motion, such as batteries and dynamos, as well as all devices that are put into motion by flowing charges, such as electric motors and muscles, are described by this relation. That is why this relation is usually studied, in simple form, already in school. The Lorentz relation describes all cases in which the motion of objects can be seen by the naked eye or felt by our senses, such as the movement of an electrical motor in a high speed train, in a lift and in a dental drill, the motion of the picture generating electron beam in a television tube, or the travelling of an electrical signal in a cable and in the nerves of the body. Ref. 574, Ref. 575

In summary, we found that the interaction between charges can be described in two statements: First, charges are affected by electric and magnetic fields; second, charges produce electric and magnetic fields.

Electromagnetic fields and Lagrangians

In the expression for the Lorentz acceleration (436) it is understood that one sums over indices that appear twice. The electromagnetic field tensor $\boldsymbol{F}$ is an *antisymmetric* 4-tensor. (Can you write down the relation between $\boldsymbol{F}^{\mu\nu}$, $\boldsymbol{F}_{\mu\nu}$ and $\boldsymbol{F}^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$?) Like any antisymmetric tensor, the electromagnetic field has two invariants, i.e., two deduced properties that are the same for every observer: the expression $B^2 - E^2/c^2 = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}\,\boldsymbol{F}^2$ and the product $4\boldsymbol{E}\boldsymbol{b} = -c\,\mathrm{tr}\,\boldsymbol{F}^*\boldsymbol{F}$. (Can you confirm this, using the definition of trace as the sum of the diagonal elements?) Challenge 1018 ny Challenge 1019 s

The first invariant expression, $B^2 - E^2/c^2 = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}\,\boldsymbol{F}^2$, turns out to be (proportional to) the Lagrangian of the electromagnetic field. It is a scalar. The first invariant implies that if E is larger, smaller or equal to cB for one observer, it also is for all other observers. The Lagrangian can be used to define the action, which can be used to describe the motion of the electromagnetic field using the principle of least action. You can check yourself that the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1020 e Lagrangian indeed allows describing the change due to evolving electromagnetic fields. This approach is another way to deduce Maxwell's field equations of electromagnetism.

The second invariant of the electromagnetic field tensor, $4\boldsymbol{EB} = -c \operatorname{tr} \boldsymbol{F}^* \boldsymbol{F}$, is a pseudoscalar; it describes whether the angle between the electric and the magnetic field is acute or obtuse for all observers.*

The application of electromagnetic effects to daily life has changed the world. For example, the installation of electric lighting in city streets has almost eliminated the previously so common night assaults. These and all other electrical devices exploit the fact that charges can flow in metals and, in particular, that electromagnetic energy can be transformed

— into mechanical energy – as used in loudspeakers, motors, piezo crystals;
— into light – as in lamps and lasers;
— into heat – as in electric ovens, blankets and tea pots;
— into chemical effects – as in hydrolysis, battery charging and electroplating;
— into coldness – as in refrigerators and Peltier elements;
— into radiation signals – as in radio and television;
— into stored information – as in magnetic records and in computers.

Electrical light, lasers, batteries, electric motors, radio, telephone, X-rays, television and computers have changed human life completely in less than one century.

How motors prove relativity to be right

> The only mathematical operation I performed in my life was to turn the handle of a calculator.
> Michael Faraday

All electric motors are based on the result that electric currents interact with magnetic fields. The simplest example is the attraction of two wires carrying parallel currents. This observation alone, made in 1820 by Ampère, is sufficient to make motion larger than a Ref. 577 certain maximal speed impossible.

The argument is beautifully simple. We change the original experiment and imagine two long, electrically charged rods of mass m, moving in the same direction with velocity v and separation d. An observer moving with the rods would see an electrostatic Challenge 1022 e repulsion between the rods given by

* There is in fact a third Lorentz invariant, much less known. It is specific to the electromagnetic field and is a combination of the field and its vector potential:

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_3 &= \frac{1}{2} A_\mu A^\mu \boldsymbol{F}_{\rho\nu} \boldsymbol{F}^{\nu\rho} - 2A_\rho \boldsymbol{F}^{\rho\nu} \boldsymbol{F}_{\nu\mu} A^\mu \\ &= (\boldsymbol{AE})^2 + (\boldsymbol{Ab})^2 - |\boldsymbol{A} \times \boldsymbol{E}|^2 - |\boldsymbol{A} \times \boldsymbol{B}|^2 + 4\frac{\varphi}{c}(\boldsymbol{AE} \times \boldsymbol{B}) - (\frac{\varphi}{c})^2 (E^2 + B^2) \,. \end{aligned} \tag{437}$$

Ref. 576 This expression is Lorentz (but not gauge) invariant; knowing it can help clarify unclear issues, such as the lack of existence of waves in which the electric and magnetic fields are parallel. Indeed, for plane monochromatic waves all three invariants *vanish* in the Lorentz gauge. Also the quantities $\partial_\mu J^\mu$, $J_\mu A^\mu$ and $\partial_\mu A^\mu$ are Challenge 1021 s Lorentz invariants. (Why?) The latter, the frame independence of the divergence of the four-potential, reflects the invariance of gauge choice. The gauge in which the expression is set to zero is called the *Lorentz gauge*.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 331 The relativistic aspect of magnetism

$$ma_e = -\frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0}\frac{2\lambda^2}{d} \tag{438}$$

where λ is the charge per length of the rods. A second, *resting* observer sees two effects: the electrostatic repulsion and the attraction discovered by Ampère. The second observer therefore observes

Challenge 1023 e

$$ma_{em} = -\frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0}\frac{2\lambda^2}{d} + \frac{\mu_0}{2\pi}\frac{\lambda^2 v^2}{d} \,. \tag{439}$$

This expression must be consistent with the observation of the first observer. This is the case only if both observers find repulsions. It is easy to check that the second observer sees a repulsion, as does the first one, only if

$$v^2 < \frac{1}{\varepsilon_0\mu_0} \,. \tag{440}$$

This maximum speed, with a value of 0.3 GM/s, is thus valid for any object carrying charges. But *all* everyday objects contain charges: there is thus a maximum speed for matter.

Challenge 1024 d

Are you able to extend the argument for a maximum speed to neutral particles as well? We will find out more on this limit velocity, which we know already, in a minute.

Another argument for magnetism as a relativistic effect is the following. In a wire with electrical current, the charge is zero for an observer at rest with respect to the wire. The reason is that the charges enter and exit the wire at the same time for that observer. Now imagine an observer who flies along the wire. The entrance and exit events do not occur simultaneously any more; the wire is charged for a moving observer. (The charge depends on the direction of the observer's motion.) In other words, if the observer himself were charged, he would experience a force. Moving charges experience forces from current-carrying wires. This is exactly why magnetic fields were introduced: they only produce forces on *moving* charges. In short, current carrying wires are surrounded by magnetic fields.

In summary, electric effects are due to flow of electric charges and to electric fields; magnetism is due to *moving* electric charges. It is *not* due to magnetic charges.* The strength of magnetism, used in any running electric motor, proves relativity right: there is a maximum speed in nature for all masses and charges. Both electric and magnetic fields carry energy and momentum. They are two faces of the same coin.

Page 773
Challenge 1025 d

* 'Electrons move in metal with a speed of about 1 μm/s; thus if I walk with the same speed along a cable carrying a constant current, I should not be able to sense any magnetic field.' What is wrong with this argument?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 68 Voltage values observed in nature

Observation	Voltage
Smallest measured voltage	*c.* 10 fV
Human nerves	70 mV
Volta cell	1 V
Voltaic cell ('battery')	1.5 V
Mains in households	230 V or 110 V
Electric eel	100 to 600 V
Tramway supply	500 V
Sparks when rubbing a polymer pullover	1 kV
Electric fence	0.7 to 10 kV
Train supply	15 kV
Ignition plug in cars	15 kV
Colour television tube	30 kV
X-ray tube	30 to 200 kV
Electron microscopes	0.5 kV to 3 MV
Stun gun	65 to 600 kV
Lightning stroke	10 to 100 MV
Record accelerator voltage	1 TV
Planck voltage, highest value possible in nature	$1.0 \cdot 10^{27}$ V

Curiosities and fun challenges about things electric and magnetic

> Et facta mirari et intellectua assequi.
> Augustine of Hippo

Before we study the motion of an electromagnetic field in detail, let's have some fun with electricity.

* *

Nowadays, having fun with sparks is straightforward. Tesla coils, named after Nikola Tesla * are the simplest devices that allow long sparks to be produced at home. Attention: this is dangerous; that is the reason that such devices cannot be bought (almost) anywhere. The basic diagram and an example is shown in Figure 332. Tesla coils look like large metal mushrooms (to avoid unwanted discharges) and plans for their construction can be found on numerous websites or from numerous enthusiast's clubs, such as www.stefan-kluge.de.

* Никола Тесла (1856 Smiljan–1943 New York City), Serbian engineer and inventor. He invented and promoted the polyphase alternating current system, the alternating current electric motor, wireless communication, fluorescent lighting and many other applications of electricity. He is also one of the inventors of radio. The SI unit of the magnetic field is named after him. A flamboyant character, his ideas were sometimes unrealistic; for example he imagined that Tesla coils could be used for wireless power transmission.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 332 The schematics, the realization and the operation of a Tesla coil, including spark and corona discharges (photographs © Robert Billon)

* *

In 1722, George Graham discovered, by watching a compass needle, that the magnetic field of the Earth shows daily variations. Can you imagine why these variations occur? Challenge 1026 s

* *

If even knocking on a wooden door is an electric effect, we should be able to detect fields when doing so. Can you devise an experiment to check this? Challenge 1027 d

* *

Birds come to no harm when they sit on unprotected electricity lines. Nevertheless, one almost never observes any birds on tall, high voltage lines of 100 kV or more, which transport power across longer distances. Why? Challenge 1028 s

* *

What happened in Figure 333? Why are most of such pictures taken in good weather and with blond children? Challenge 1029 d

* *

How can you distinguish a magnet from an unmagnetized metal bar of the same size and material, using no external means? Challenge 1030 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 333 A common playground effect (© Evan Keller)

* *

In the basement of a house there are three switches that control three light bulbs in the first floor. You are in the basement and are allowed to go to the first floor only once. How do you find out which switch controls which bulb?

Challenge 1031 e

* *

How do you wire up a light bulb to the mains and three switches so that the light can be switched on at any of the switches and off at any other switch? And for four switches? Nobody will take a physicist seriously who is able to write Maxwell's equations but cannot solve this little problem.

Challenge 1032 s

* *

The first appliances built to generate electric currents were large rubbing machines. Then, in 1799 the Italian scientist Alessandro Volta (1745–1827) invented a new device to generate electricity and called it a *pile*; today its basic element is called a *(voltaic) cell*, a *primary cell** or, less correctly, a *battery*. (Correctly speaking, a battery is a collection of cells, as the one found in a car.) Voltaic cells are based on chemical processes; they provide much more current and are smaller and easier to handle than electrostatic machines. The invention of the battery changed the investigation of electricity so profoundly that Volta became world famous. At last, a simple and reliable source of electricity was available for use in experiments; unlike rubbing machines, piles are compact, work in all weather conditions and make no noise.

An apple or a potato with a piece of copper and one of zinc inserted is one of the simplest possible voltaic cells. It provides a voltage of about 1 V and can be used to run digital clocks or to produce clicks in headphones. Volta was also the discoverer of the charge law $q = CU$ of capacitors (C being the capacity, and U the voltage) and the inven-

* A *secondary cell* is a rechargeable cell.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 334 A Gauss rifle, made with a few steel balls and four magnets attached to a ruler with scotch tape (© Simon Quellen Field)

tor of the high sensitivity capacitor electroscope. A modest man, nevertheless, the unit of electrical potential, or 'tension', as Volta used to call it, was deduced from his name. A 'battery' is a large number of voltaic cells; the term was taken from an earlier, almost purely military use.* A battery in a mobile phone is just an elaborated replacement for a number of apples or potatoes.

* *

A PC or a telephone can communicate without wires, by using radio waves. Why are these and other electrical appliances not able to obtain their *power* via radio waves, thus eliminating power cables?

Challenge 1034 s

* *

Magnets can be used to accelerate steel balls. The most famous example is the *Gauss rifle* shown in Figure 334. If the leftmost ball is gently rolled towards the first magnet, the third ball is strongly kicked away. Then the process repeats: the speed increases even more for the fifth, the seventh and the ninth ball. The experiment never fails to surprise whoever seees it for the first time. Where does the momentum of the final ball come from?

Challenge 1035 e

* *

Objects that are not right–left symmetric are called *chiral*, from the Greek word for 'hand'. Can you make a mirror that does not switch chirality (i.e., does not 'switch left and right')? In two different ways?

Challenge 1036 s

* *

A Scotch tape roll is a dangerous device. Pulling the roll quickly leads to light emission (through triboluminescence) and to small sparks. It is suspected that several explosions in mines were triggered when such a spark ignited a combustible gas mixture.

* A pile made of sets of a zinc plate, a sheet of blotting paper soaked with salt water and a copper coin is easily constructed at home and tested with a calculator or a digital watch.

Challenge 1033 e

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 335 Lifting a light object – covered with aluminium foil – using high a tension discharge (© Jean-Louis Naudin at www.jlnlabs.org)

* *

Take an envelope, wet it and seal it. After letting it dry for a day or more, open it in the dark. At the place where the two sides of paper are being separated from each other, the envelope glows with a blue colour. Why? Is it possible to speed up the test using a hair dryer?

Challenge 1037 s

* *

Electromagnetism is full of surprises and offers many effects that can be reproduced at home. The internet is full of descriptions of how to construct Tesla coils to produce sparks, coil guns or rail guns to shoot objects, electrostatic machines to make your hair stand on end, glass spheres with touch-sensitive discharges and much more. If you like experiments, just search for these terms.

* *

A high voltage can lead to current flow through air, because air becomes conductive in high electric fields. In such discharges, air molecules are put in motion. As a result, one can make objects that are attached to a pulsed high tension source lift up in the air, if one optimizes this air motion so that it points downwards everywhere. The high tension is thus effectively used to accelerate ionized air in one direction and, as a result, an object will move in the opposite direction, using the same principle as a rocket. An example is shown in Figure 335, using the power supply of a PC monitor. (Watch out: danger!) Numerous websites explain how to build these so-called lifters at home; in Figure 335, the bottle and the candle are used as high voltage insulator to keep one of the two thin high voltage wires (not visible in the photograph) high enough in the air, in order to avoid discharges to the environment or to interfere with the lifter's motion. Unfortunately, the majority of websites – not all – give incorrect or confused explanations of the phenomenon. These websites thus provide a good challenge for one to learn to distinguish fact from speculation.

Challenge 1038 e

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 336 The magnetic field due to the tides (© Stefan Maus)

* *

The electric effects produced by friction and by liquid flow are usually small. However, in the 1990s, a number oil tankers disappeared suddenly. The sailors had washed out the oil tanks by hosing sea water onto the tank walls. The spraying led to charging of the tank; a discharge then led to the oil fumes in the tank igniting. This led to an explosion and subsequently the tankers sank. Similar accidents also happen regularly when chemicals are moved from one tank to another.

* *

Rubbing a plastic spoon with a piece of wool charges it. Such a charged spoon can be used to extract pepper from a salt–pepper mixture by holding the spoon over the mixture. Why?

Challenge 1039 s

* *

When charges move, they produce a magnetic field. In particular, when ions inside the Earth move due to heat convection, they produce the Earth's magnetic field. When the ions high up in the atmosphere are moved by solar wind, a geomagnetic storm appears; its field strength can be as high as that of the Earth itself. In 2003, an additional mechanism was discovered. When the tides move the water of the oceans, the ions in the salt water produce a tiny magnetic field; it can be measured by highly sensitive magnetometers in satellites orbiting the Earth. After two years of measurements from a small satellite it was possible to make a beautiful film of the oceanic flows. Figure 336 gives an impression.

Ref. 580

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 337 A unipolar motor



FIGURE 338 The simplest motor (© Stefan Kluge)

* *

The names electrode, electrolyte, ion, anode and cathode were suggested by William Whewell (1794–1866) on demand of Michael Faraday; Faraday had no formal education and asked his friend Whewell to form two Greek words for him. For anode and cathode, Whewell took words that literally mean 'upward street' and 'downward street'. Faraday then popularized these terms, like the other words mentioned above.

* *

Challenge 1040 s The shortest light pulse produced so far had a length of 100 as. To how many wavelengths of green light would that correspond?

* *

Challenge 1041 s Why do we often see shadows of houses and shadows of trees, but never shadows of the electrical cables hanging over streets?

* *

Challenge 1042 s How would you measure the speed of the tip of a lightning bolt? What range of values do you expect?

* *

Ref. 581 One of the simplest possible electric motors was discovered by Faraday in 1831. A magnet suspended in mercury will start to turn around its axis if a current flows through it. (See Figure 337.) In addition, when the magnet is forced to turn, the device (often also called Barlow's wheel) also works as a current generator; people have even tried to generate Challenge 1043 s domestic current with such a system! Can you explain how it works?

The modern version of this motor makes use of a battery, a wire, a conductive samarium–cobalt magnet and a screw. The result is shown in Figure 338.

* *

Ref. 582 The magnetic field of the Earth has a dipole strength of $7.8 \cdot 10^{22}$ A m^2. It shields us, to-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 339 The correspondence of electronics and water flow

gether with the atmosphere, from lethal solar winds and cosmic radiation particles, by deflecting them to the poles. Today, a lack of magnetic field would lead to high radiation on sunny days; but in the past, its lack would have prevented the evolution of the human species. We owe our existence to the magnetic field.

* *

The ionosphere around the Earth has a resonant frequency of 7 Hz; for this reason any apparatus measuring low frequencies always gets a strong signal at this value. Can you
Challenge 1044 s give an explanation of the frequency?

* *

Challenge 1045 s The Sun is visible to the naked eye only up to a distance of 50 light years. Is this true?

* *

At home, electricity is mostly used as alternating current. In other words, no electrons actually flow through cables; as the drift speed of electrons in copper wires is of the order

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Page 773 of 1 µm/s, electrons just move back and forward by 20 nm. Nothing flows in or out of the cables! Why do the electricity companies require a real flow of money in return, instead Challenge 1046 e of being satisfied with a back and forth motion of money?

* *

Comparing electricity with water is a good way of understanding electronics. Figure 339 shows a few examples that even a teenager can use. Can you fill in the correspondence Challenge 1047 s for the coil, and thus for a transformer?

* *

Do electrons and protons have the same charge? Experiments show that the values are Challenge 1048 ny equal to within at least twenty digits. How would you check this?

* *

Challenge 1049 ny Charge is also velocity-independent. How would you check this?

* *

Magnets can be used, even by school children, to climb steel walls. Have a look at the www.physicslessons.com/TPNN.htm website.

* *

Extremely high magnetic fields have strange effects. At fields of 10^{10} T, vacuum becomes Page 728 effectively birefringent, photons can split and coalesce, and atoms get squeezed. Hydrogen atoms, for example, are estimated to get two hundred times narrower in one direction. Fortunately, these conditions exist only in specific neutron stars, called *magnetars*.

* *

A good way to make money is to produce electricity and sell it. In 1964, a completely new method was invented by Fletcher Osterle. The method was presented to a larger public in Ref. 583 a beautiful experiment in 2003. One can take a plate of glass, add a conducting layers on each side, and then etch a few hundred thousand tiny channels through the plate, each around 15 µm in diameter. When water is made to flow through the channels, a current is generated. The contacts at the two conducting plates can be used like battery contacts.

This simple device uses the effect that glass, like most insulators, is covered with a charged layer when it is immersed in a liquid. Can you imagine why a current is gener- Challenge 1050 s ated? Unfortunately, the efficiency of electricity generation is only about 1%, making the method much less interesting than a simple blade wheel powering a dynamo.

* *

For beautiful animations about magnetic and electric fields, see the website web.mit.edu/8.02t/www/802TEAL3D/visualizations.

* *

Gallium arsenide semiconductors can be patterned with so-called quantum dots and *point contacts*. These structures allow one to count single electrons. This is routinely done in several laboratories around the world.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 340 Can you deduce Van der Pauw's formula for the specific resistance of homogeneous layers of any shape (left) or its special case for a symmetrical shape (right)?

* *

Ohm's 'law', the observation that for almost all materials the current is proportional to the voltage, is due to a school teacher. Georg Simon Ohm* explored the question in great depth; in those days, such measurements were difficult to perform. This has changed now. Recently, even the electrical resistance of single atoms has been measured: in the case of xenon it turned out to be about $10^5\ \Omega$. It was also found that lead atoms are ten times more conductive than gold atoms. Can you imagine why?

Ref. 646

Challenge 1051 ny

* *

Ohm's 'law', so simple it seems, has many fascinating mathematical aspects. For example, in 1958, the Dutch physicist J.L. van der Pauw proved an astonishing formula and method that allows to measure the specific resistance ρ of material layers of *any* shape. One only needs to attach four gold wires to the layer anywhere on its border. The specific resistance is then given by the expression shown in Figure 340. Can you imagine how the formula is deduced? (This is not an easy problem.) The formula reduced the workload in laboratories across the world by a significant amount; before the formula had been discovered, in every experiment, researchers also had to produce separate samples that allowed to measure the specific resistance of the material they were investigating.

Challenge 1052 ny

* *

Ref. 647

The charges on two capacitors in series are not generally equal, as naive theory states. For perfect, leak-free capacitors the voltage ratio is given by the inverse capacity ratio $V_1/V_2 = C_2/C_1$, due to the equality of the electric charges stored. This is easily deduced from Figure 341. However, in practice this is only correct for times between a few and a few dozen minutes. Why?

Challenge 1053 s

* Georg Simon Ohm (b. 1789 Erlangen, d. 1854 München), Bavarian school teacher and physicist. His efforts were recognized only late in his life, and he eventually was promoted to professor at the University in München. Later the unit of *electrical resistance*, the proportionality factor between voltage and current, was named after him.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 341 Capacitors in series



FIGURE 342 A neon lamp hanging from on a high voltage line


THERE'S A CERTAIN TYPE OF BRAIN THAT'S EASILY DISABLED.
IF YOU SHOW IT AN INTERESTING PROBLEM, IT INVOLUNTARILY DROPS EVERYTHING ELSE TO WORK ON IT.
THIS HAS LED ME TO INVENT A NEW SPORT: NERD SNIPING.
SEE THAT PHYSICIST CROSSING THE ROAD?
HEY!
On this infinite grid of ideal one-ohm resistors, what's the equivalent resistance between the two marked nodes?
IT'S... HMM. INTERESTING. MAYBE IF YOU START WITH ... NO, WAIT. HMM...YOU COULD—
FOOOOM
I WILL HAVE NO PART IN THIS.
C'MON, MAKE A SIGN. IT'S FUN! PHYSICISTS ARE TWO POINTS, MATHEMATICIANS THREE.

FIGURE 343 An electrical problem that is not easy (© Randall Munroe)

On certain high voltage cables leading across the landscape, small neon lamps shine when the current flows, as shown in Figure 342. (You can see them from the train when riding from Paris to the Roissy airport.) How is this possible?

Challenge 1054 ny

* *

Electric polarizability is the property of matter responsible for the deviation of water flowing from a tap caused by a charged comb. It is defined as the strength of electric dipole induced by an applied electric field. The definition simply translates the observation that many objects acquire a charge when an electric field is applied. Incidentally, how precisely combs get charged when rubbed, a phenomenon called *electrification*, is still one of the mysteries of modern science.

Page 670

* *

A pure magnetic field cannot be transformed into a pure electric field by change of observation frame. The best that can be achieved is a state similar to an equal mixture of magnetic and electric fields. Can you provide an argument elucidating this relation?

Challenge 1055 ny

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

Challenge 1056 ny

Calculating resistance of infinite grids is one of the most captivating problems in electricity, as shown in Figure 343. Can you find the solution?

A SUMMARY: THREE BASIC FACTS ABOUT ELECTRICITY

The experiments we have described so far show three basic connections:

- ▷ Electric charges exert forces on other charges.
- ▷ Electric charges are conserved.
- ▷ Charges, like all matter, move slower than light.

From these three statements – the definition of charge, the conservation of charge, and the invariance of the speed of light – we can deduce every aspect of classical electrodynamics. (If one wants, the non-existence of magnetic charge can be taken as an additional assumption.) In particular, Maxwell's field equations of electrodynamics can be deduced from these three statements. The field equations describe the way that charges *produce* any electric, magnetic or electromagnetic field.

Ref. 578 Ref. 579

The proof of the connection between charge conservation and the field equations can be given mathematically; we do not present it here, because the algebra is somewhat involved. The essential connection is that all of electrodynamics follows from the properties of charges that we have discovered so far.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 24

THE DESCRIPTION OF ELECTROMAGNETIC FIELD EVOLUTION

In the years between 1861 and 1865, taking in the details of all the experiments known to him, James Clerk Maxwell produced a description of electromagnetism that forms one of the pillars of physics.* Maxwell took all the experimental results and extracted their common basic principles, as shown in Figures 344 and 345. Twenty years later, Heaviside and Hertz extracted the main points of Maxwell ideas, calling their summary *Maxwell's theory of the electromagnetic field*. Maxwell's equations are evolution equations of the electromagnetic field. In the relativistic description, the set consists of *two* equations (four in the non-relativistic case).

Page 883

The first equation is the precise statement that electromagnetic fields *originate at charges*, and nowhere else. The first of Maxwell's equations for electrodynamics can variously be written**

$$d\boldsymbol{F} = j\mu_0 \quad \text{or}$$

$$d_\mu \boldsymbol{F}^{\mu\nu} = j^\nu \mu_0 = (\rho c, \boldsymbol{j})\mu_0 = (\rho_0 \gamma c, \rho_0 \gamma \boldsymbol{v})\mu_0 \quad \text{or}$$

$$(\partial_t/c, \partial_x, \partial_y, \partial_z) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -E_x/c & -E_y/c & -E_z/c \\ E_x/c & 0 & -B_z & B_y \\ E_y/c & B_z & 0 & -B_x \\ E_z/c & -B_y & B_x & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \mu_0(\rho c, \boldsymbol{j}) \text{ or}$$

$$\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{E} = \frac{\rho}{\varepsilon_0} \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla \times \boldsymbol{B} - \frac{1}{c^2}\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{E}}{\partial t} = \mu_0 \boldsymbol{j} \,. \tag{441}$$

(442)

Each of these four equivalent ways to write the equation makes a simple statement: *electrical charges carry the electromagnetic field*; they carry it along with them.

* James Clerk Maxwell (b. 1831 Edinburgh, d. 1879 Cambridge), Scottish physicist. He founded electromagnetism by theoretically unifying electricity and magnetism, as described in this chapter. His work on thermodynamics forms the second pillar of his activity. In addition, he studied the theory of colours and developed the colour triangle; he was one of the first people to make a colour photograph. He is regarded by many as the greatest physicist ever. Both 'Clerk' and 'Maxwell' were his family names.

** There is a certain freedom in writing the equations, because different authors absorb different combinations of the constants c and μ_0 into the definitions of the quantities F, A and j.

The equations can be generalized to cases where the charges are not surrounded by vacuum, but located inside matter. We will not explore these situations in our walk because, as we will see during our mountain ascent, the apparently special case of vacuum in fact describes all of nature.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 344 The first of Maxwell's equations



FIGURE 345 The second of Maxwell's equations

In other words, if one knows how charges move, one can determine the electromagnetic field $\boldsymbol{F}$. Static charges, described by a density ρ, produce electrostatic fields, and moving charges, described by a 3-current density $\boldsymbol{j}$, produce a mix of electric and magnetic fields.

This first equation is equivalent to the three basic observations of Figure 344: it describes Coulomb's relation, Ampère's relation, and the way changing electrical fields induce magnetic effects, as you may want to check for yourself.

Challenge 1057 ny

The first equation also contains the right hand rule for magnetic fields around wires, through the vector product. The equation also states, most clearly in its last form, that changing electric fields induce magnetic fields. Due to the vector product, all induced magnetic field lines are closed lines. The effect is essential in the primary side of transformers. The factor $1/c^2$ implies that the effect is small; that is why coils with many windings or strong electric currents are needed to produce or detect the effect.

Challenge 1058 e

The second of Maxwell's equations expresses the observation that in nature there are no magnetic charges, i.e., that magnetic fields have no sources. As a result, the equation also gives a precise description of how changing magnetic fields create electric fields, and vice versa. The second of Maxwell's equations for electrodynamics can variously be

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

written

$$
\begin{aligned}
& d\,{}^*\boldsymbol{F} = 0 \quad \text{with} \quad {}^*\boldsymbol{F}^{\rho\sigma} = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{\rho\sigma\mu\nu}\boldsymbol{F}_{\mu\nu} \quad \text{or} \\
& d_\mu {}^*\boldsymbol{F}^{\mu\nu} = 0 \quad \text{or} \\
& (\partial_t/c, \partial_x, \partial_y, \partial_z)\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -B_x & -B_y & -B_z \\ B_x & 0 & E_z/c & -E_y/c \\ B_y & -E_z/c & 0 & E_x/c \\ B_z & E_y/c & -E_x/c & 0 \end{pmatrix} = (0,0,0,0) \quad \text{or} \\
& \varepsilon^{\sigma\mu\nu\rho}\partial_\mu \boldsymbol{F}_{\nu\rho} = 0 \quad \text{or} \\
& \partial_\mu \boldsymbol{F}_{\nu\rho} + \partial_\nu \boldsymbol{F}_{\rho\mu} + \partial_\rho \boldsymbol{F}_{\mu\nu} = 0 \quad \text{or} \\
& \nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{B} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla\times\boldsymbol{E} = -\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{B}}{\partial t}\,. \qquad (443)
\end{aligned}
$$

The relation expresses the *lack of sources for the dual field tensor* ${}^*\boldsymbol{F}$; in other words, in nature there are no magnetic charges, i.e., no magnetic monopoles and no sources for magnetic fields. The equation thus tells in complex terms that cutting a magnet with a north and a south pole in any way always produces pieces with *two* poles, never a piece with a single pole.

Since there are no magnetic charges, magnetic field lines are always closed; they never start or end. For example, field lines continue inside magnets. This is often expressed mathematically by stating that the *magnetic flux* through a *closed* surface S – such as a sphere or a cube – *always vanishes*: $\int_S \boldsymbol{B}\mathbf{d}A = 0$.

The second half in the last formulation of equation (443) is shown schematically in Figure 345. It expresses that changes in magnetic fields produce electric fields: this effect is used in the secondary side of transformers and in dynamos. The cross product in the expression implies that an electric field generated in this way – also called an *electromotive field* – has no start and end points. The electromotive field lines thus run in circles: in most practical cases they run along electric circuits. In short, an electric field can have vortices only when there is a changing magnetic field. The minus sign is essential to ensure energy conservation and has a special name: it is called *Lenz's rule*.

In practice, the second Maxwell equation is always needed together with the first. Can you see why? Challenge 1059 ny

We note that the dual tensor ${}^*\boldsymbol{F}$ follows form the field tensor F by substituting E/c by B and B by E/c. This is the so-called *duality transformation*.

Together with Lorentz' evolution equation (436), which describes how charges move given the motion of the fields, Maxwell's evolution equations (441) and (443) describe *all* electromagnetic phenomena occurring on everyday scales, from mobile phones, car batteries, to personal computers, lasers, lightning, holograms and rainbows. We now have a description of electromagnetic fields as organized as the expression $a = GM/r$ or as Einstein's field equations for gravitation.

Maxwell's equations seem very complex. But we should never forget that they contain only four basic ideas: first: electric charges follow Coulomb's rule, second: electric charges moves slower than light, third: electric charges are conserved, and fourth: magnetic charges do not exist. If one wants to be very simplistic, Maxwell's equations are the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 346 Charged particles after a collision

relativistic formulation of Coulomb's rule.

We will not study many applications of the field equations but will continue directly towards our aim to understand the connection between electromagnetic fields, everyday motion and the motion of light. In fact, the electromagnetic field has an important property that we mentioned right at the start: the field itself can move.

Colliding charged particles

A simple experiment clarifies the properties of electromagnetic fields defined above. When two charged particles collide, their total momentum is *not* conserved.

Imagine two particles of identical mass and identical charge just after a collision, when they are moving away from one another. Imagine also that the two masses are large, so that the acceleration due to their electrical repulsion is small. For an observer at the centre of gravity of the two, each particle feels an acceleration from the electric field of the other. The electric field E is given by the so-called *Heaviside formula*

Challenge 1060 ny

$$E = \frac{q(1 - v^2/c^2)}{4\pi e_0 r^2} \,. \tag{444}$$

In other words, the total system has a vanishing total momentum.

Take a second observer, moving with respect to the first with velocity v, so that the first charge will be at rest. Expression (444) leads to two *different* values for the electric fields, one at the position of each particle. In other words, the system of the two particles is not in inertial motion, as we would expect; the total momentum is not conserved. Where did it go?

Ref. 584

Challenge 1061 s

This at first surprising effect has been put in the form of a theorem by Van Dam and Wigner. They showed that for a system of particles interacting at a distance the total particle energy–momentum cannot remain constant in all inertial frames.

Ref. 585

The total momentum of the system is conserved only because the electromagnetic field itself also carries momentum. If electromagnetic fields have momentum, they are able to *strike* objects and to be struck by them. As we will show below, light is also an electromagnetic field. Thus we should be able to move objects by shining light on to them. We should even be able to suspend particles in mid air by shining light on to them from below. Both predictions are correct, and some experiments will be presented shortly.

We conclude that any sort of field leading to particle interactions must carry energy

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 347 Vector potentials for selected situations

and momentum, as the argument applies to all such cases. In particular, it applies to nuclear interactions. Indeed, in the quantum part of our mountain ascent we will even find an additional result: all fields are themselves composed of particles. The energy and momentum of fields then become an obvious state of affairs.

The gauge field – the electromagnetic vector potential

The study of moving fields is called *field theory* and electrodynamics is the prime example. (The other classical example is fluid dynamics; moving electromagnetic fields and moving fluids are very similar mathematically.) Field theory is a beautiful topic; field lines, equipotential lines and vortex lines are some of the concepts introduced in this domain. They fascinate many.* However, in this mountain ascent we keep the discussion focused on motion.

We have seen that fields force us to extend our concept of motion. Motion is not only the change in state of objects and of space-time, but also the *change in state of fields*. We therefore need, also for fields, a complete and precise description of their state. The observations with amber and magnets have shown us that *fields possess energy and momentum*. They can impart it to particles. The experiments with motors have shown that objects can add energy and momentum to fields. We therefore have to define a *state function* which allows us to define energy and momentum for electric and magnetic fields. Since electric and magnetic fields transport energy, their motion follows the speed limit in nature.

Maxwell defined the state function in two standard steps. The first step is the definition of the *(magnetic) vector potential*, which describes the momentum per charge that the field provides:

Ref. 586

$$\boldsymbol{A} = \frac{\boldsymbol{p}}{q} \,. \tag{445}$$

Challenge 1062 s

* What is the relation, for static fields, between field lines and (equi-) potential surfaces? Can a field line cross a potential surface twice? For more details on topics such as these, see the *free* textbook by Bo Thidé, *Electromagnetic Field Theory*, on his www.plasma.uu.se/CED/Book website. And of course, in English, have a look at the texts by Schwinger and by Jackson.

Ref. 557, Ref. 574

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

When a charged particle moves through a magnetic potential $\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{x})$, its momentum changes by $q\Delta\boldsymbol{A}$; it changes by the difference between the potential values at the start and end points, multiplied by its charge. Owing to this definition, the vector potential has the property that

$$\mathrm{B} = \nabla \times \boldsymbol{A} = \operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{A} \tag{446}$$

i.e., that the magnetic field is the *curl* of the magnetic potential. In most languages the curl is called the *rotation* and abbreviated rot. To visualize what the curl or rotation is, imagine that the field vectors are the velocity vectors of flowing air. Now put a tiny paddle-wheel at a point. If it turns, the curl is non-zero. The rotation speed of the paddle-wheel is maximal for some direction of the axis; this maximal speed defines both the magnitude and the direction of the curl at the point. (The right-hand rule is implied.) For example, the curl for the velocities of a rotating solid body is everywhere 2ω, or twice the angular velocity.

Challenge 1063 ny

Ref. 587

Challenge 1064 ny

The vector potential for a long straight current-carrying wire is parallel to the wire; it has the magnitude

$$A(r) = -\frac{\mu_0 I}{4\pi} \ln \frac{r}{r_0} \,, \tag{447}$$

which depends on the radial distance r from the wire and an integration constant r_0. This expression for the vector potential, pictured in Figure 347, shows how the moving current produces a linear momentum in the (electro-) magnetic field around it. In the case of a solenoid, the vector potential 'circulates' around the solenoid. The magnitude obeys

$$A(\mathrm{r}) = -\frac{\Phi}{4\pi} \frac{1}{r} \,, \tag{448}$$

where Φ is the magnetic flux inside the solenoid. We see that, in general, the vector potential is *dragged along* by moving charges. The dragging effect decreases for larger distances. This fits well with the image of the vector potential as the momentum of the electromagnetic field.

This behaviour of the vector potential around charges is reminiscent of the way honey is dragged along by a spoon moving in it. In both cases, the dragging effect decreases with distance. However, the vector potential, unlike the honey, does *not* produce any friction that slows down charge motion. The vector potential thus behaves like a frictionless liquid.

Inside the solenoid, the magnetic field is constant and uniform. For such a field B we find the vector potential

Challenge 1065 e

$$\boldsymbol{A}(\mathrm{r}) = -\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{B} \times \boldsymbol{r} \,. \tag{449}$$

In this case, the magnetic potential thus increases with increasing distance from the origin.* In the centre of the solenoid, the potential vanishes. The analogy of the dragged honey gives exactly the same behaviour.

* This is only possible as long as the field is constant; since all fields drop again at large distances – because the energy of a field is always finite – also the vector potential drops at large distances.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

However, there is a catch. The magnetic potential is *not* defined uniquely. If $\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{x})$ is a vector potential, then the different vector potential

$$\boldsymbol{A}'(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{x}) + \operatorname{grad}\Lambda \,, \tag{450}$$

where $\Lambda(t, \boldsymbol{x})$ is some scalar function, is *also* a vector potential for the same situation. (The magnetic field B stays the same, though.) Worse, can you confirm that the corresponding (absolute) momentum values also change? This unavoidable ambiguity, called *gauge invariance* or *gauge symmetry*, is a central property of the electromagnetic field. We will explore it in more detail below.

Challenge 1066 ny

Not only the momentum, but also the energy of the electromagnetic field is defined ambiguously. Indeed, the second step in the specification of a state for the electromagnetic field is the definition of the *electric potential* as the energy U per charge:

Ref. 586

$$\varphi = \frac{U}{q} \tag{451}$$

In other words, the potential $\varphi(\boldsymbol{x})$ at a point $\boldsymbol{x}$ is the energy needed to move a unit charge to the point $\boldsymbol{x}$ starting from a point where the potential vanishes. The potential energy is thus given by $q\varphi$. From this definition, the electric field $\boldsymbol{E}$ is simply the *change* of the potential with position corrected by the time dependence of momentum, i.e.,

$$\boldsymbol{E} = -\nabla\varphi - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\boldsymbol{A} \,, \tag{452}$$

Obviously, there is a freedom in the choice of the definition of the potential. If $\varphi(\boldsymbol{x})$ is a possible potential, then

$$\varphi'(\boldsymbol{x}) = \varphi(\boldsymbol{x}) - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Lambda \tag{453}$$

is also a potential function for the same situation. This freedom is the generalization of the freedom to define energy up to a constant. Nevertheless, the electric field $\boldsymbol{E}$ remains the same for all potentials.

Ref. 586

To be convinced that the potentials really are the energy and momentum of the electromagnetic field, we note that for a moving charge we have

Challenge 1067 ny

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{\mathrm{d}t}\left(\frac{1}{2}mv^2 + q\varphi\right) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} q\ (\varphi - \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{A}) \\ \frac{d}{\mathrm{d}t}\left(m\boldsymbol{v} + q\boldsymbol{A}\right) &= -\nabla q\left(\varphi - \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{A}\right) \,, \end{aligned} \tag{454}$$

which show that the changes of generalized energy and momentum of a particle (on the left-hand side) are due to the change of the energy and momentum of the electromagnetic field (on the right-hand side).*

* This connection also shows why the expression $P^\mu - qA^\mu$ appears so regularly in formulae; indeed, it plays a central role in the quantum theory of a particle in the electromagnetic field.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

In relativistic 4-vector notation, the energy and the momentum of the field appear together in one quantity. The state function of the electromagnetic field becomes

$$A^\mu = (\varphi/c, \boldsymbol{A}) \,. \tag{455}$$

It is easy to see that the description of the field is complete, since we have

$$\boldsymbol{F} = d\,A \quad \text{or} \quad \boldsymbol{F}^{\mu\nu} = \partial^\mu A^\nu - \partial^\nu A^\mu \quad (\text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{F}_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu) \,, \tag{456}$$

which means that the electromagnetic field F is completely specified by the 4-potential A.* But as just said, the 4-potential itself is *not* uniquely defined. Indeed, any other equivalent 4-potential A' is related to A by the *gauge transformation*

$$A'^\mu = A^\mu + \partial^\mu \Lambda \tag{457}$$

where $\Lambda = \Lambda(t, x)$ is any arbitrarily chosen scalar field. The new field A' leads to the *same* electromagnetic field, and to the same accelerations and evolutions. The 4-potential A is thus an *overdescription* of the physical situation as several *different* gauge choices correspond to the *same* physical situation.** Therefore we have to check that all measurement results are independent of gauge transformations, i.e., that all observables are gauge invariant quantities. Such gauge invariant quantities are, as we just saw, the fields $\boldsymbol{F}$ and $^*\boldsymbol{F}$, and in general all classical quantities. We add that many theoretical physicists use the term 'electromagnetic field' loosely for both the quantities $F^{\mu\nu}$ and A^μ.

There is a simple image, due to Maxwell, to help overcoming the conceptual difficulties of the vector potential. It turns out that the closed line integral over A_μ is gauge invariant, because

Challenge 1069 e

$$\oint A^\mu \mathrm{d}x_\mu = \oint (A^\mu + \partial^\mu \Lambda) \mathrm{d}x_\mu = \oint A'^\mu \mathrm{d}x_\mu \,. \tag{458}$$

In other words, if we picture the vector potential as a quantity allowing one to associate a number to a tiny ring at each point in space, we get a good, gauge invariant picture of the vector potential.***

Now that we have defined a state function that describes the energy and momentum of the electromagnetic field, let us look at what happens in more detail when electromagnetic fields move.

* The connection between A^μ and A^μ, the same as for every other 4-vector, was mentioned earlier on; can you restate it?

Challenge 1068 e

** Choosing a function Λ is often called *choosing a gauge*; the 4-potential A is also called the *gauge field*. This strange usage has historic reasons and is now common to all of physics.

*** In the part of the text on quantum theory we will see that the exponent of this expression, namely $\exp(iq \oint A_\mu \mathrm{d}x^\mu)/\hbar$, usually called the *phase factor*, can indeed be directly observed in experiments.

Ref. 588

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Energy and linear and angular momentum of the electromagnetic field

All moving entities have energy, momentum and angular momentum. This also applies to the electromagnetic field. Indeed, the description so far allows us to write the *total* energy E_{nergy} of the electromagnetic field as

$$E_{\text{nergy}} = \frac{1}{8\pi} \int \varepsilon_0 \boldsymbol{E}^2 + \frac{\boldsymbol{B}^2}{\mu_0} \, \mathrm{d}V \,. \tag{459}$$

Energy is thus quadratic in the fields.

For the total linear momentum we obtain

$$\boldsymbol{p} = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{4\pi} \int \boldsymbol{E} \times \boldsymbol{b} \, \mathrm{d}V \,. \tag{460}$$

The expression inside the integral, more specifically the vector $\boldsymbol{S} = \boldsymbol{E} \times \boldsymbol{b}/\mu_0$, is also called the *Poynting vector*.* The Poynting vector $\boldsymbol{S}$ is the *energy flow density*, and $c^2\boldsymbol{S}$ describes the *momentum density*, since special relativity implies that the momentum and the energy flow for electromagnetic fields are related by a factor c^2. The Poynting vector thus describes the energy flowing per area per time, in other words, the power per area. (As shown below, the Poynting vector is a part of the energy–momentum tensor.)

Page 715

For the total angular momentum we have

$$\boldsymbol{L} = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{4\pi} \int \boldsymbol{E} \times \boldsymbol{A} \, \mathrm{d}V = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{4\pi} \int \boldsymbol{r} \times (\boldsymbol{E} \times \boldsymbol{B}) \, \mathrm{d}V \,, \tag{461}$$

where $\boldsymbol{A}$ is the magnetic vector potential.

The Lagrangian of electromagnetism

The motion of a charged particle and the related motion of the electromagnetic field can also be described using a Lagrangian, instead of using the three equations given above. It is not hard to see that the action S_{CED} for a particle in classical electrodynamics can be symbolically defined by**

Challenge 1070 ny

$$S_{\text{CED}} = -mc^2 \int \mathrm{d}\tau - \tfrac{1}{4\mu_0} \int \boldsymbol{F} \wedge *\boldsymbol{F} - \int j \wedge A \,, \tag{462}$$

which in index notation becomes

$$S_{\text{CED}} = -mc \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \sqrt{\eta_{\mu\nu} \frac{\mathrm{d}x_n^\mu(s)}{\mathrm{d}s} \frac{\mathrm{d}x_n^\nu(s)}{\mathrm{d}s}} \, \mathrm{d}s - \int_{\mathbf{M}} \left(\tfrac{1}{4\mu_0} \boldsymbol{F}_{\mu\nu} \boldsymbol{F}^{\mu\nu} + j_\mu A^\mu \right) \mathrm{d}^4 x \,, \tag{463}$$

* John Henry Poynting (1852–1914) introduced the concept in 1884.

** The product described by the symbol $\wedge$, 'wedge' or 'hat', and the duality operator $*$ have a precise mathematical meaning. The background, the concept of *(mathematical) form*, carries us too far from our walk.

Ref. 589

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

or, in 3-vector notation

$$S_{\text{CED}} = -mc^2 \int \mathrm{d}\tau + \int qvA - q\varphi + \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}E^2 - \frac{1}{2\mu_0}B^2 \mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}V \,. \tag{464}$$

The new part is the measure of the change – or action – due to the electromagnetic field. The pure field change is given by the term $\boldsymbol{F} \wedge *\boldsymbol{F}$, and the change due to interaction with matter is given by the term $j \wedge A$.

The least action principle, as usual, states that the change in a system is always as small as possible. The action S_{CED} leads to the evolution equations by requiring that the action be stationary under variations δ and δ' of the positions and of the fields which vanish at infinity. In other terms, the principle of least action requires that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S = 0 \quad &\text{when} \quad x_\mu = x_\mu + \delta_\mu \quad \text{and} \quad A_\mu = A_\mu + \delta'_\mu \quad , \\ &\text{provided} \quad \delta x_\mu(\theta) \to 0 \quad \text{for} \quad |\theta| \to \infty \\ &\text{and} \quad \delta A_\mu(x_\nu) \to 0 \quad \text{for} \quad |x_\nu| \to \infty \,. \end{aligned} \tag{465}$$

Page 199
Challenge 1071 ny

In the same way as in the case of mechanics, using the variational method for the two variables A and x, we recover the evolution equations for particle position and fields

$$b^\mu = \frac{q}{m}\boldsymbol{F}^\mu_\nu \, u^\nu \quad , \quad \partial_\mu \boldsymbol{F}^{\mu\nu} = j^\nu \mu_0 \quad , \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \, \partial_\nu \boldsymbol{F}_{\rho\sigma} = 0 \,, \tag{466}$$

which we know already: they are the Lorentz relation and the two field equations. Obviously, they are equivalent to the variational principle based on S_{CED}. Both descriptions have to be completed by specifying *initial conditions* for the particles and the fields, as well as *boundary conditions* for the latter. We need the first and zeroth derivatives of the position of the particles, and the zeroth derivative for the electromagnetic field.

With the Lagrangian (462) all of classical electrodynamics can be described and understood. For the rest of our exploration of electrodynamics, we look at some specific topics from this vast field.

The energy–momentum tensor and its symmetries of motion

We know from classical mechanics that we get the definition of energy and momentum by using Noether's theorem. In particular, both the definition and the conservation of energy and momentum arise from the Lorentz symmetry of the Lagrangian. For example, we found that relativistic particles have an energy–momentum *vector*. At the point at which the particle is located, it describes its energy and momentum.

Since the electromagnetic field is not a localized entity, like a point particle, but an extended entity, a full description is more involved. In order to describe the energy–momentum of the electromagnetic field completely, we need to know the *flow* of energy and momentum at every point in space, separately *for each direction*. This makes a description with a *tensor* necessary, the so-called *energy–momentum tensor* $\boldsymbol{T}$ of the

Page 550
electromagnetic field.

The electric field times a charge is the force on that charge, or equivalently, its momen-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

tum increase per time. The generalization for the full electromagnetic field $\boldsymbol{F}$, and for the full power–force (4-force) vector K is

$$F^{\mu\nu} j_\mu = K^\nu = \partial_\mu \boldsymbol{T}^{\mu\nu} \quad . \tag{467}$$

This short equation, which can also be derived from the Lagrangian, contains a lot of information. In particular, it expresses that every change in energy of the field is the sum of the energy radiated away (via the energy flow described by the Poynting vector $\boldsymbol{S}$) and of changes in the kinetic energy of the charges. The equation also makes a similar statement on the momentum of the electromagnetic field.

The detailed parts of the energy–momentum tensor $\boldsymbol{T}$ are found to be

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{T}^{\mu\nu} &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \text{energy density} & \text{energy flow or momentum density} \\ \hline \text{energy flow or momentum density} & \text{momentum flow density} \end{array}\right) \\ &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c} u & \boldsymbol{S}/c = c\boldsymbol{p} \\ \hline c\boldsymbol{p} & T \end{array}\right) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} (\varepsilon_0 E^2 + B^2/\mu_0)/2 & \varepsilon_0 c \boldsymbol{E} \times \boldsymbol{B} \\ \hline \varepsilon_0 c \cdot & -\varepsilon_0 E_i E_j - B_i B_j/\mu_0 \\ \boldsymbol{E} \times \boldsymbol{B} & 1/2\delta_{ij}(\varepsilon_0 E^2 + B^2/\mu_0) \end{array}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{468}$$

where $\boldsymbol{S} = \boldsymbol{E} \times \boldsymbol{B}/\mu_0$ is the *Poynting vector* that describes the energy flow density of the electromagnetic field.

We can sum up by stating that in nature, energy and momentum are conserved, if we take into account the momentum and energy of the electromagnetic field. And the energy–momentum tensor shows again that electrodynamics is a gauge invariant description: the energy and momentum values do not depend on gauge choices.

Challenge 1072 e

The energy–momentum tensor, like the Lagrangian, shows that electrodynamics is invariant under *motion inversion*. If all charges change direction of motion – a situation often confusingly called 'time inversion' – they move backwards along the same paths they took when moving forward. Every example of motion due to electric or magnetic causes can also take place backwards.

Challenge 1073 s

On the other hand, everyday life shows many electric and magnetic effects which are not time invariant, such as the breaking of bodies or the burning of electric light bulbs. Can you explain how this fits together?

We also note that charges and mass destroy a symmetry of the vacuum that we mentioned in special relativity: only the vacuum is invariant under conformal transformations. In particular, only the vacuum is invariant under the spatial inversion $r \to 1/r$. Any other physical system does not obey conformal symmetry.

To sum up, electrodynamic motion, like all other examples of motion that we have encountered so far, is deterministic, slower than c, reversible and conserved. This is no big surprise. Nevertheless, two other symmetries of electromagnetism deserve special mention.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 348 Which one is the original landscape? (courtesy NOAA)

What is a mirror?

We will study the strange properties of mirrors several times during our walk. We start with the simplest one first. Everybody can observe, by painting each of their hands in a different colour, that a mirror does *not* exchange right and left, as little as it exchanges up and down; however, a mirror does exchange right and left *handedness*. In fact, it does so by exchanging front and back.

Challenge 1074 s

Electrodynamics give a second answer: a mirror is a device that switches magnetic north and south poles. Can you confirm this with a diagram?

But is it always possible to distinguish left from right? This seems easy: this text is quite different from a ɒɘɿoɿɿiʍ version, as are many other objects in our surroundings. But take a simple landscape. Are you able to say which of the two pictures of Figure 348 is the original?

Astonishingly, it is actually impossible to distinguish an original picture of nature from its mirror image if it does not contain any human traces. In other words, everyday nature is somehow left–right symmetric. This observation is so common that all candidate exceptions, from the jaw movement of ruminating cows to the helical growth of plants, such as hops, or the spiral direction of snail shells, have been extensively studied.*

Page 1287

Challenge 1075 s

Can you name a few more?

The left–right symmetry of nature appears because everyday nature is described by gravitation and, as we will see, by electromagnetism. Both interactions share an important property: substituting all coordinates in their equations by the negative of their values leaves the equations unchanged. This means that for any solution of these equations, i.e., for any naturally occurring system, a mirror image is a possibility that can also occur

* The most famous is the position of the heart. The mechanisms leading to this disposition are still being investigated. Recent research suggests that the oriented motion of the cilia on embryos, probably in the region called the *node*, determines the right–left asymmetry. The deep origin of this asymmetry is not yet elucidated, however.

Ref. 590

Most human bodies have more muscles on the right side for right-handers, such as Albert Einstein and Pablo Picasso, and correspondingly on the left side for left-handers, such as Charlie Chaplin and Peter Ustinov. This asymmetry reflects an asymmetry of the human brain, called lateralization, which is essential to human nature.

Another asymmetry of the human body is the hair whirl on the back of the head; the majority of humans have only one, and in 80 % of the cases it is left turning. But many people have more than one.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

naturally. Everyday nature thus cannot distinguish between right and left. Indeed, there are right *and* left handers, people with their heart on the left *and* others with their heart on the right side, etc.

To explore further this strange aspect of nature, try the following experiment: imagine you are exchanging radio messages with a Martian; are you able to explain to him what right and left are, so that when you meet, you are sure you are talking about the same thing?

Challenge 1076 s

Actually, the mirror symmetry of everyday nature – also called its *parity invariance* – is so pervasive that most animals cannot distinguish left from right in a deeper sense. Most animals react to mirror stimuli with mirror responses. It is hard to teach them different ways to react, and it is possible almost only for mammals. The many experiments performed in this area gave the result that animals have symmetrical nervous systems, and possibly only humans show *lateralization*, i.e., a preferred hand and different uses for the left and the right parts of the brain.

Ref. 591

To sum up this digression, classical electrodynamics is left–right symmetric, or parity invariant. Can you show this using its Lagrangian?

Challenge 1077 s

A concave mirror shows an inverted image; so does a plane mirror if it is partly folded along the horizontal. What happens if this mirror is rotated around the line of sight?

Challenge 1078 s

Why do metals provide good mirrors? Metals are strong absorbers of light. Any strong absorber has a metallic shine. This is true for metals, if they are thick enough, but also for dye or ink crystals. Any material that strongly absorbs a light wavelength also reflects it efficiently. The cause of the strong absorption of a metal is the electrons inside it; they can move almost freely and thus absorb most visible light frequencies.

What is the difference between electric and magnetic fields?

Obviously, the standard answer is that electric fields have sources, and magnetic fields do not; moreover, magnetic fields are small relativistic effects of importance only when charge velocities are high or when electrical fields cancel out.

For situations involving matter, this clear distinction is correct. Up to the present day, no particle with a magnetic charge, called a *magnetic monopole*, has ever been found, even though its existence is possible in several unified models of nature. If found, the action (462) would have to be modified by the addition of a fourth term, namely the magnetic current density. However, no such particle has yet been detected, despite intensive search efforts.

Page 1296

In empty space, when matter is not around, it is possible to take a completely different view. In empty space the electric and the magnetic fields can be seen as two faces of the same quantity, since a transformation such as

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{E} &\to c\,\boldsymbol{B} \\ \boldsymbol{B} &\to -\boldsymbol{E}/c \end{aligned} \tag{469}$$

called (electromagnetic) *duality* transformation, transforms each vacuum Maxwell equation into the other. The minus sign is necessary for this. (In fact, there are even more such transformations; can you spot them?) Alternatively, the duality transformation transforms $\boldsymbol{F}$ into ${}^*\boldsymbol{F}$. In other words, in empty space we *cannot* distinguish electric from

Challenge 1079 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

magnetic fields.

Matter would be symmetric under duality only if magnetic charges, also called magnetic monopoles, could exist. In that case the transformation (469) could be extended to

$$c\rho_e \to \rho_m \quad , \quad \rho_m \to -c\rho_e \,. \tag{470}$$

It was one of the great discoveries of theoretical physics that even though classical electrodynamics with matter is not symmetric under duality, nature is. In 1977, Claus Montonen and David Olive showed that quantum theory allows duality transformations even *with* the inclusion of matter. It has been known since the 1930s that quantum theory allows magnetic monopoles. We will discover the important ramifications of this result in the final part of the text. This duality turns out to be one of the essential stepping stones that leads to a unified description of motion. (A somewhat difficult question: extending this duality to quantum theory, can you deduce what transformation is found for the fine structure constant, and why the result is so interesting?)

Page 1299

Challenge 1080 d

Duality, by the way, is a symmetry that works *only* in Minkowski space-time, i.e., in space-times of 3 + 1 dimensions. Mathematically, duality is closely related to the existence of quaternions, to the possibility of interpreting Lorentz boosts as rotations in 3 + 1 dimensions, and last, but not least, to the possibility of defining other smooth mathematical structures than the standard one on the space R^4. These mathematical connections are mysterious for the time being; they somehow point to the special role that *four* space-time dimensions play in nature. More details will become apparent in the last part of our mountain ascent.

Could electrodynamics be different?

Any interaction such as Coulomb's rule (428), which acts, for one given observer, between two particles independently of 3-velocity, must depend on 3-velocity for other inertial observers.* It turns out that such an interaction cannot be independent of the 4-velocity either. Such an interaction, even though it would indeed be 3-velocity dependent, would change the rest mass, since the 4-acceleration would not be 4-orthogonal to the 4-velocity.

The next simplest case is the one in which the acceleration is proportional to the 4-velocity. Together with the request that the interaction leaves the rest mass constant, we then recover electrodynamics.

Ref. 592

In fact, the requirements of gauge symmetry and of relativity symmetry also make it impossible to modify electrodynamics. In short, it does not seem possible to have a behaviour different from $1/r^2$ for a classical interaction.

An inverse square dependence implies a vanishing mass of light and light particles, the photons. Is the mass really zero? The issue has been extensively studied. A massive photon would lead to a wavelength dependence of the speed of light in vacuum, to deviations from the inverse square 'law', to deviations from Ampère's 'law', to the existence of longitudinal electromagnetic waves and more. No evidence for these effects has ever

Ref. 593

* This can be deduced from special relativity from the reasoning of page 692 or from the formula in the footnote of page 452.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

been found. A summary of these studies shows that the photon mass is below 10^{-53} kg, or maybe 10^{-63} kg. Some arguments are not universally accepted, thus the limit varies somewhat from researcher to researcher.

A small non-vanishing mass for the photon would change electrodynamics somewhat. The inclusion of a tiny mass poses no special problems, and the corresponding Lagrangian, the so-called *Proca Lagrangian*, has already been studied, just in case.

Ref. 593

Strictly speaking, the photon mass cannot be said to vanish. In particular, a photon with a Compton wavelength of the radius of the visible universe cannot be distinguished from one with zero mass through any experiment. This gives a mass of 10^{-69} kg for the photon. One notes that the experimental limits are still much larger. Photons with such a small mass value would not invalidate electrodynamics as we know it.

Interestingly, a non-zero mass of the photon implies the lack of magnetic monopoles, as the symmetry between electric and magnetic fields is broken. It is therefore important on the one hand to try to improve the experimental mass limit, and on the other hand to explore whether the limit due to the universe's size has any implications for this issue. This question is still open.

The brain: the toughest challenge for electrodynamics

Classical electrodynamics still faces a fascinating experimental and theoretical issue: understanding the process of thought. Physics faces two challenges in this domain. First, physicists must find ways to *model* the thought process. Second, the technology to *measure* the currents in the brain must be extended. In both domains, recent progress has been spectacular.

Important research has been carried out on many levels of thought modelling. For example, research using computer tomography, PET scans and MRI imaging has shown that the distinction between the *conscious* and the *unconscious* can be measured: it has a biological basis. Psychological concepts, such as *repression* of unpleasant thoughts, can actually be observed in brain scans. Modellers of brain mechanisms are learning to take some of the concepts of psychology as descriptions for actual physical processes. This research approach is still in its infancy, but very promising.

On the more fundamental aspects of the working of the brain, such as learning, storage, recognition of shapes, location of sound sources or map formation, modern neurobiology and animal experimentation have allowed to deduce models that allow quantitative predictions. More on this will be told below.

Page ??

On the experimental side, research into magnetoencephalography devices is making rapid progress. The magnetic fields produced by brain currents are as low as 10 fT, which require sensors at liquid helium temperature and a good shielding of background noise. Improving the sensitivity and the spatial resolution of these systems is a central task. Also computer models and algorithms are making rapid progress.

The whole programme would be complete as soon as, in a distant future, a sensitive measuring apparatus could detect what is going on inside the brain and then could deduce or 'read' the thoughts of a person from these measurements. Thought reading might be the most complex of all challenges that science is facing. Clearly, such a feat will require involved and expensive machinery, so that there is no danger for a misuse of the technique. (There are also good reasons to believe that actual thought reading will never

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 349 Typing a letter and playing video tennis using thought alone (© Fraunhofer FIRST)

be possible in this way, due to the lack of localization of cognitive thought inside the brain and due to the variations in cognitive processing from one person to another.) But the understanding and modelling of the brain will be a useful technology in numerous aspects of daily life, especially for the disabled.

On the path towards thought reading, the small progress that has been achieved so far is already fascinating. Wearing a cap full of electric contacts (thus without any surgery on the brain) and looking at a computer screen, it is now possible to type letters using the power of thought alone. Such a system is shown in Figure 349. The user controls the computer simply by *imagining* that he turns the arrow on the screen with his right hand. The brain currents created by the imagination process are read out and translated into computer commands by an electronic device. The system, based on neural network algorithms, works after only 20 minutes of training with a particular person. In this way, the system allows people who are fully paralysed to communicate with others again. The system is so fast that it allows to play 'mental video tennis' on a computer screen.

Ref. 594

Typing with thought alone is possible because the brain region responsible for the hand is near the skull, so that signals for hand rotation can be read out with sufficient spatial resolution by the electrodes on the cap. Researchers know that resolution problems do not allow to read out the commands for single fingers in this way. For such high resolution tasks, electrodes still need to be *implanted* inside the relevant brain region. However, at present (2008) the functional lifetime for such electrodes is only a few months, so that the dream of controlling machines or even artificial limbs in this way is still distant.

Challenges and fun curiosities about electrodynamics

Not only animals, also plants can feel electric and magnetic fields. At least for magnetic fields, the sensors seem to use very similar mechanisms to those used by animals and bacteria.

* *

If you calculate the Poynting vector for a charged magnet – or simpler, a point charge near a magnet – you get a surprising result: the electromagnetic energy flows in circles around the magnet. How is this possible? Where does this angular momentum come from?

Challenge 1081 s

Worse, any atom is an example of such a system – actually of two such systems. Why

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 350 White light travelling through a glass prism (photograph by Susan Schwartzenberg, © Exploratorium www.exploratorium.edu)

Ref. 645 is this effect not taken into account in calculations in quantum theory?

* *

Perfectly spherical electromagnetic waves are impossible in nature. Can you show this
Challenge 1082 s using Maxwell's equation of electromagnetism, or even without them?

* *

Challenge 1083 ny What is the Poynting field along a double wire? Around a double wire with resistance?

* *

Challenge 1084 ny What is the Poynting field in a transformer?

* *

There is a famous ambiguity in the definition of electromagnetic energy. Richard Feynman talks about it in his *Lectures on Physics*, in section 27-4. Can you find an experiment
Challenge 1085 ny where this ambiguity plays a role?

* *

Any wall plug is a dipole driven by an alternating electric field. Why does a wall plug,
Challenge 1086 s delivering 230 V or 100 V at 50 Hz or 60 Hz, not radiate electromagnetic fields?



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 25

WHAT IS LIGHT?

The nature of light has fascinated explorers of nature since at least the time of the ancient Greeks. In 1865, Maxwell summarized all data collected in the 2500 years before him by deducing a basic consequence of the equations of electrodynamics. He found that in the case of empty space, the equations of the electrodynamic field could be written as

Ref. 595

$$\Box \boldsymbol{A} = 0 \quad \text{or, equivalently} \quad \varepsilon_0\mu_0 \frac{\partial^2\varphi}{\partial t^2} + \frac{\partial^2 A_x}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 A_y}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 A_z}{\partial z^2} = 0 \,. \tag{471}$$

This is called a *wave equation*, because it admits solutions of the type

Challenge 1087 e

$$\boldsymbol{A}(t, \boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{A}_0 \sin(\omega t - \boldsymbol{k}x + \delta) = \boldsymbol{A}_0 \sin(2\pi f t - 2\pi \boldsymbol{x}/\lambda + \delta) \,, \tag{472}$$

which are commonly called *plane waves*. Such a wave satisfies equation (471) for any value of *amplitude* A_0, of *phase* δ, and of *angular frequency* ω, provided the *wave vector* $\boldsymbol{k}$ satisfies the relation

$$\omega(\boldsymbol{k}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_0\mu_0}} k \quad \text{or} \quad \omega(\boldsymbol{k}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_0\mu_0}} \sqrt{\boldsymbol{k}^2} \,. \tag{473}$$

The relation $\omega(\boldsymbol{k})$ between the angular frequency and the wave vector, the so-called *dispersion relation*, is the main property of any type of wave, be it a sound wave, a water wave, an electromagnetic wave, or any other kind. Relation (473) specifically characterizes electromagnetic waves in empty space, and distinguishes them from all other types of waves.*

Equation (471) for the electromagnetic field is *linear* in the field; this means that the sum of two situations allowed by it is itself an allowed situation. Mathematically speaking, any *superposition* of two solutions is also a solution. For example, this means that two waves can cross each other without disturbing each other, and that waves can travel across static electromagnetic fields. Linearity also means that any electromagnetic wave can be described as a superposition of pure sine waves, each of which is described by expression (472). The simplest possible electromagnetic wave, a harmonic plane wave with linear polarization, is illustrated in Figure 351. Note that for this simplest type of waves, the electric and the magnetic field are *in phase*. (Can you prove this experimentally and by calculation?) The surfaces formed by all points of maximal field intensity are

Page 728

* For completeness, we remember that a *wave* in physics is any propagating imbalance.

Page 228

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 351 The general structure of a plane, monochromatic and linearly polarized electromagnetic wave at a specific instant of time



FIGURE 352 A plane, monochromatic and linearly polarized electromagnetic wave, showing the evolution of the electric field, the magnetic field, and again the electric field, in a further visualization (© Thomas Weiland)

FIGURE 353 Heinrich Hertz (1857–1894)

parallel planes, spaced by (half the) wavelength, which move along the direction of the propagation.

After Maxwell predicted the existence of electromagnetic waves, in the years between 1885 and 1889 Heinrich Hertz* discovered and studied them. He fabricated a very simple transmitter and receiver for 2 GHz waves. Waves around this frequency are used in the last generation of mobile phones. These waves are now called *radio waves*, since physicists tend to call all moving force fields *radiation*, recycling somewhat incorrectly a Greek term that originally meant 'light emission.'

* Heinrich Rudolf Hertz (b. 1857 Hamburg, d. 1894 Bonn), important Hamburger theoretical and experimental physicist. The unit of frequency is named after him. Despite his early death, Hertz was a central figure in the development of electromagnetism, in the explanation of Maxwell's theory and in the unfold-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 354 One of the first transmitting antennas (left) and complete receivers (right) of electromagnetic waves



FIGURE 355 The simplest transmitter possible, a gas lighter and a wire, together with the simplest receiver possible, built from a battery pack, a light emitting diode, and a simple coherer made from a ball pen housing, two screws and some metal powder (© Guido Pegna)

Today Hertz's experiment can be repeated in a much simpler way. As shown in Figure 355, a budget of a few euro is sufficient to remotely switch on an light emitting diode with a gas lighter. (After each activation, the coherer has to be gently tapped, in order to get ready for the next activation.) Attaching longer wires as antennas and ground allows this set-up to achieve transmission distances up to 30 m.

Hertz also measured the speed of these waves. In fact, you can also measure the speed at home, with a chocolate bar and a (older) kitchen microwave oven. A microwave oven emits radio waves at 2.5 GHz – not far from Hertz's value. Inside the oven, these waves form standing waves. Just put the chocolate bar (or a piece of cheese) in the oven and switch the power off as soon as melting begins. You will notice that the bar melts at regularly spaced spots. These spots are half a wavelength apart. From the measured wavelength value and the frequency, the speed of light and radio waves simply follows as the product of the two.

If you are not convinced, you can measure the speed directly, by telephoning a friend on another continent, if you can make sure of using a satellite line (choose a low cost

ing of radio communication technology. More about him on page 184.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 356 The primary and secondary rainbow, and the supernumerary bows below the primary bow (© Antonio Martos and Wolfgang Hinz)

provider). There is about half a second additional delay between the end of a sentence and the answer of the friend, compared with normal conversation. In this half second, the signal goes up to the geostationary satellite, down again and returns the same way. This half second gives a speed of $c \approx 4 \cdot 36\,000\,\mathrm{km}/0.5\,\mathrm{s} \approx 3 \cdot 10^5\,\mathrm{km/s}$, which is close to the precise value. Radio amateurs who reflect their signals from the Moon can perform the same experiment and achieve higher precision.

But Maxwell did more. He strengthened earlier predictions that *light* itself is a solution of equation (472) and therefore an electromagnetic wave, albeit with a much higher frequency. Let us see how we can check this.

It is easy to confirm the *wave* properties of light; indeed they were known already long before Maxwell. In fact, the first to suggest that light is a (kind of) wave was, around the year 1678, the important physicist Christiaan Huygens. You can confirm that light is a wave with your own fingers. Simply place your hand one or two centimetres in front of your eye, look towards the sky through the gap between the middle and the index finger and let the two fingers almost touch. You will see a number of dark lines crossing the gap. These lines are the interference pattern formed by the light behind the slit created by the fingers. *Interference* is the name given to the amplitude patterns that appear when several waves superpose.* The interference patterns depend on the spacing between the fingers. This experiment therefore allows you to estimate the wavelength of light, and thus, if you know its speed, its frequency. Can you do this?

Page 93

Challenge 1089 s

Historically, another effect was central in convincing everybody that light was a wave: supernumerary rainbows, the additional bows below the main or primary rainbow. If we look carefully at a rainbow, below the main red–yellow–green–blue–violet bow, we observe weaker, additional green, blue and violet bows. Depending on the intensity of the rainbow, several of these supernumerary rainbows can be observed. They are due to an interference effect, as Thomas Young showed around 1803.** Indeed, the repetition

Ref. 596

Challenge 1088 s

* Where does the energy go in an interference pattern?

** Thomas Young (1773 Milverton–1829), read the bible at two, spoke Latin at four; a doctor of medicine, he became a professor of physics. He introduced the concept of *interference* into optics, explaining Newtonian rings and supernumerary rainbows; he was the first person to determine light's *wavelength*, a concept that he also introduced, and its dependence on colour. He was the first to deduce the three-colour vision explanation of the eye and, after reading of the discovery of polarization, explained light as a transverse wave. In short, Young discovered most of what people learn at secondary school about light. He was a universal talent: he also worked on the deciphering of hieroglyphs, on ship building and on engineering problems.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 357 The light power transmitted through a slit as function of its width

FIGURE 358 Two Gaussian beams interfering at an angle (© Rüdiger Paschotta)

distance of the supernumerary bows depends on the radius of the average water droplets that form them. (Details about the normal rainbows are given below.) Supernumerary rainbows were central in convincing people that light is a wave. It seems that in those times scientists either did not trust their own fingers, or did not have any.

Page 748

There are many other ways in which the wave character of light can be made apparent. Maybe the most beautiful is an experiment carried out by a team of Dutch physicists in 1990. They simply measured the light transmitted through a *slit* in a metal plate. It turns out that the transmitted intensity depends on the width of the slit. Their surprising result is shown in Figure 357. Can you explain the origin of the unexpected intensity steps in the curve?

Ref. 597

Challenge 1090 ny

Numerous other experiments on the creation, detection and measurement of electromagnetic waves were performed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. For example, in 1800, William Herschel discovered *infrared light* using a prism and a thermometer. (Can you guess how?) In 1801, Johann Wilhelm Ritter (1776–1810) a more than colourful figure of natural Romanticism, discovered *ultraviolet light* using silver chloride, AgCl, and again a prism. The result of all these experiments is that electromagnetic waves

Challenge 1091 s

Young collaborated with Fraunhofer and Fresnel. In Britain his ideas on light were not accepted, since Newton's followers crushed all opposing views. Towards the end of his life, his results were finally made known to the physics community by Fresnel and Helmholtz.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 359 The same rainbow in the visible and in the infrared, showing how infrared comes before red (© Stefan Zeiger)

can be primarily distinguished by their wavelength or frequency. The main categories
Page 732 are listed in Table 69. For visible light, the wavelength lies between 0.4 µm (violet) and 0.8 µm (red).

At the end of the twentieth century the final confirmation of the wave character of light became possible. Using quite sophisticated experiments researchers, measured the
Ref. 598 oscillation frequency of light *directly*. The value, between 375 and 750 THz, is so high that its detection was impossible for a long time. But with these modern experiments the
Ref. 599 dispersion relation (473) of light has finally been confirmed in all its details.

Polarization and electromagnetism

We are left with one additional question about light. If light oscillates, in which direction does this occur? The answer is hidden in the parameter $\boldsymbol{A}_0$ in expression (472). Electromagnetic waves oscillate in directions *perpendicular* to their motion. Therefore, even for identical frequency and phase, waves can still differ: they can have different *polarization* directions. For example, the polarization of radio transmitters determines whether radio antennas of receivers have to be kept horizontal or vertical. Also for light, polarization is easily achieved, e.g. by shining it through a stretched plastic film. When the polarization of light was discovered in 1808 by the French physicist Louis Malus (1775–1812), it definitively established the wave nature of light. Malus discovered it when he looked at the strange double images produced by calcite, a transparent crystal found in many minerals. Calcite ($CaCO_3$) splits light beams into two – it is *birefringent* – and polarizes them differently. That is the reason that calcite is part of every crystal collection.

If you ever get hold of a piece of transparent calcite, do look through it at something

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 360 Birefringence in crystals: *calcite* lying on crossed lines (top left, crystal size around 4 cm), *rutile* lying on an ink spot, photographed along the optical axis (middle) and at an angle to it (top right, crystal size around 1 cm), and an octagonal sodium vanadate crystal doped with manganese, showing *three* different behaviours (bottom, crystal diameter 1.9 cm) (© Roger Weller/Cochise College, Brad Amos, Martin Pietralla)



FIGURE 361 Haidinger's brush and its origin in the human eye

written on paper. Figure 360 shows two examples. (Can you show that *trirefringence*, if defined as the appearance of three images, cannot exist?) Challenge 1092 d

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

By the way, the human eye is almost unable to detect polarization, in contrast to the eyes of many insects, spiders and certain birds. Honey bees use polarization to deduce the position of the Sun, even when it is hidden behind clouds, and use the effect for navigation. Some beetles of the genus *Scarabeus* even use the polarization of moonlight for navigation, and many insects use polarization of sunlight to distinguish water surfaces from mirages. (Can you find out how?) But in 1844, the Austrian mineralogist Wilhelm Haidinger discovered that the human eye has the same ability: there is a way to observe the polarization of light with the unaided human eye. The best way to observe the effect is by looking at a distance of about an arms's length on a white LCD screen and slowly tilt your head. You will note an *extremely faint* yellow or yellow-blue pattern, about two finger's wide, that is superimposed on the white background. This pattern is called *polarization brush* or *Haidinger's brush*. A rough illustration is given in Figure 361. The weak effect disappears after a few seconds if the head stops rotating along the line of sight. Haidinger's brush is due to the birefringence of the cornea and the lens of the human eye, together with the morphology of the macula lutea. The cornea acts as a radially oriented, colour-dependent polarizer, whereas the yellow spot acts as a radially oriented analyser. In short, the human eye is indeed able to see the directions in which the electric and magnetic field of light are oscillating.

Ref. 600 Challenge 1093 s Ref. 601 Ref. 602

Haidinger's brush, being yellow, is also visible in the blue sky, provided that the air is clear. (Indeed, it is easily drowned out by multiple scattering, and therefore provides a test of atmospheric transparency.) In the sky, Haidinger's brush is barely the size of a thumbnail at arm's length. (The angular size is the angular size of the macula.) The yellow arm of the cross points to the Sun, if you look about 90° away from it, high in the sky. To see it really clearly, hold a polaroid (or polaroid sunglasses) up to look through, and rotate it about the line of sight.

Note that all possible polarizations of light form a continuous set. However, a general plane wave can be seen as the superposition of two orthogonal, linearly polarized waves with different amplitudes and different phases. Most books show pictures of plane, linearized electrodynamic waves. Essentially, electric fields look like water waves generalized to three dimensions, the same for magnetic fields, and the two are perpendicular to each other. Can you confirm this?

Challenge 1094 ny

Interestingly, a generally polarized plane wave can also be seen as the superposition of right and left *circularly polarized waves*. An illustration of a circularly polarized wave is given in Figure 362.

So far it is clear that light is a wave. To confirm that light waves are indeed *electromagnetic* is more difficult. The first argument was given by Bernhard Riemann in 1858;* he deduced that any electromagnetic wave must propagate with a speed c given by

$$c = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_0 \mu_0}} \,. \tag{474}$$

Already ten years before him, in 1848, Kirchoff had noted that the measured values on

* Bernhard Riemann (b. 1826 Breselenz, d. 1866 Selasca), important German mathematician. A genial mathematician, he also studied curved space, providing several of the mathematical and conceptual foundations of general relativity, but then died at an early age.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 362 The electric field of a Gaussian, linearly polarized electromagnetic wave (a beam) next to a Gaussian, circularly polarized beam (© José Antonio Díaz Navas)

both sides agreed within measurement errors. A few years later, Maxwell gave a beautiful confirmation by deducing the expression from equation (473). You should be able to repeat the feat. Note that the right-hand side contains electric and magnetic quantities, and the left-hand side is an optical entity. Riemann's expression thus unifies electromagnetism and optics.

Challenge 1095 ny

Of course, people were not yet completely convinced. They looked for more ways to show that light is electromagnetic in nature. Now, since the evolution equations of the electrodynamic field are linear, additional electric or magnetic fields alone do not influence the motion of light. On the other hand, we know that electromagnetic waves are emitted only by accelerated charges, and that all light is emitted from matter. It thus follows that matter is full of electromagnetic fields and accelerated electric charges. This in turn implies that the influence of matter on light can be understood from its internal electromagnetic fields and, in particular, that subjecting matter to an *external* electromagnetic field should change the light it emits, the way matter interacts with light, or generally, the material properties as a whole.

Challenge 1096 e

Searching for effects of electricity and magnetism on matter has been a main effort

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

of physicists for over a hundred years. For example, electric fields influence the light transmission of oil, an effect discovered by John Kerr in 1875.* The discovery that certain gases change colour when subject to a field yielded several Nobel Prizes for physics. With time, many more influences on light-related properties by matter subjected to fields were found. An extensive list is given in the table on page 787. It turns out that apart from a few exceptions the effects can *all* be described by the electromagnetic Lagrangian (462), or equivalently, by Maxwell's equations (466). In summary, classical electrodynamics indeed unifies the description of electricity, magnetism and optics; all phenomena in these fields, from the rainbow to radio and from lightning to electric motors, are found to be different aspects of the evolution of the electromagnetic field.

Page 715

TABLE 69 The electromagnetic spectrum

FREQUENCY	WAVELENGTH	NAME	MAIN PROPERTIES	APPEARANCE	USE
$3 \cdot 10^{-18}$ Hz	10^{26} m	**lower frequency limit**		see the section on cosmology	
< 10 Hz	> 30 Mm	**quasistatic fields**		intergalactic, galactic, stellar and planetary fields, brain, electrical fish	power transmission, accelerating and deflecting cosmic radiation
		radio waves		electronic devices	
10 Hz–50 kHz	30 Mm–6 km	ELW	go round the globe, penetrate into water, penetrate metal	nerve cells, electromechanical devices	power transmission, communication through metal walls, communication with submarines www.vlf.it
50 – 500 kHz	6 km–0.6 km	LW	follow Earth's curvature, felt by nerves ('bad weather nerves')	emitted by thunderstorms	radio communications, telegraphy, inductive heating
500 – 1500 kHz	600 m–200 m	MW	reflected by night sky		radio
1.5 – 30 MHz	200 m–10 m	SW	circle world if reflected by the ionosphere, destroy hot air balloons	emitted by stars	radio transmissions, radio amateurs, spying
15 – 150 MHz	20 m–2 m	VHF	allow battery operated transmitters	emitted by Jupiter	remote controls, closed networks, tv, radio amateurs, radio navigation, military, police, taxi

* John Kerr (1824–1907), Scottish physicist, friend and collaborator of William Thomson.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Frequency	Wavelength	Name	Main properties	Appearance	Use
150 – 1500 MHz	2 m–0.2 m	UHF	*idem*, line of sight propagation		radio, walkie-talkies, tv, mobile phones, internet via cable, satellite communication, bicycle speedometers
		microwaves			
1.5 – 15 GHz	20 cm–2 cm	SHF	*idem*, absorbed by water	night sky, emitted by hydrogen atoms	radio astronomy, used for cooking (2.45 GHz), telecommunications, radar
15 – 150 GHz	20 mm– 2 mm	EHF	*idem*, absorbed by water		
		infrared	allows night vision	emitted by every warm object	satellite photography of Earth, astronomy
0.3 – 100 THz	1000 –3 μm	IRC or far infrared		sunlight, living beings	seeing through clothes, envelopes and teeth
100 – 210 THz	3 μm– 1.4 μm	IRB or medium infrared		sunlight	used for optical fibre communications for telephone and cable TV
210 – 384 THz	1400– 780 nm	IRA or near infrared	penetrates for several cm into human skin	sunlight, radiation from hot bodies	healing of wounds, rheumatism, sport physiotherapy, hidden illumination
375 – 750 THz	800– 400 nm	**light**	not (much) absorbed by air, detected by the eye (up to over 900 nm at sufficient power)	heat ('hot light'), lasers & chemical reactions e.g. phosphor oxidation, fireflies ('cold light')	definition of straightness, enhancing photosynthesis in agriculture, photodynamic therapy, hyperbilirubinaemia treatment
384 – 484 THz	780–620 nm	red	penetrate flesh	blood	alarm signal, used for breast imaging Ref. 603
	700 nm	laboratory primary red		filtered tungsten lamp	colour reference for printing, painting, illumination and displays

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Frequency	Wavelength	Name	Main properties	Appearance	Use
484 – 511 THz	620–587 nm	orange		various fruit	attracts birds and insects
511 – 525 THz	587–571 nm	yellow		majority of flowers	*idem*; best background for reading black text
525 – 614 THz	571–488 nm	green	maximum eye sensitivity	algae and plants	highest luminous efficiency response ('felt brightness') per light energy for the human eye
	546.1 nm	laboratory primary green		mercury lamp	colour reference
614 – 692 THz	488–433 nm	blue		sky, gems, water	
	435.8 nm	laboratory primary blue		mercury lamp	colour reference
692 – 789 THz	433–380 nm	indigo, violet		flowers, gems	
		ultraviolet			
789 – 952 THz	380–315 nm	UVA	penetrate 1 mm into skin, darken it, produce vitamin D, suppress immune system, cause skin cancer, destroy eye lens	emitted by Sun, stars and flames	seen by certain birds, integrated circuit fabrication
0.95 – 1.07 PHz	315–280 nm	UVB	*idem*, destroy DNA, cause skin cancer	*idem*	*idem*
1.07 – 3.0 PHz	280–100 nm	UVC	form oxygen radicals from air, kill bacteria, penetrate 10 μm into skin	emitted by Sun, stars and welding arcs	disinfection, water purification, waste disposal, integrated circuit fabrication
3 –24 PHz	100–13 nm	EUV			sky maps, silicon lithography
		X-rays	penetrate materials	emitted by stars, plasmas and black holes	imaging human tissue
24 – 240 PHz	13–1.3 nm	soft X-rays	*idem*	synchrotron radiation	*idem*
> 240 PHz or > 1 keV	< 1.2 nm	hard X-rays	*idem*	emitted when fast electrons hit matter	crystallography, structure determination

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Frequency	Wavelength	Name	Main properties	Appearance	Use
> 12 EHz or > 50 keV	< 24 pm	**γ-rays**	*idem*	radioactivity, cosmic rays	chemical analysis, disinfection, astronomy
$2 \cdot 10^{43}$ Hz	$\approx 10^{-35}$ m	**Planck limit**		see last part of this text	

The slowness of progress in physics

The well-known expression

$$c = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_0 \mu_0}} \tag{475}$$

for the speed of light is so strange that we should be intrigued when we see it. Something essential is missing. The expression states that the speed c is *independent* of the proper motion of the observer measuring the electromagnetic field. In other words, the speed of light is independent of the speed of the lamp and independent of the speed of the observer. All this is contained in expression (475). This is in complete contrast, for example, with the speed of water ejected from a water hose: that speed depends both on the speed of the hose and on the speed of the observer. Incredibly, for five decades, *nobody* explored this strange result, until Lorentz did so. In this way, the theory of relativity remained undiscovered for two generations. As in so many other cases, the progress of physics was much slower than necessary.

The invariance of the speed of light is the essential point that distinguishes special relativity from Galilean physics. In this sense, any electromagnetic device, making use of expression (475), is a working proof of special relativity.

Another look at electromagnetic radiation

Electromagnetic waves of lower frequency are commonly also used to transmit mobile phone signals, and television, radio and satellite programs. Like light, radio waves are due to moving electrons. In everyday life, light is (usually) generated by electrons accelerated inside atoms or molecules. Radio waves are generated by electrons that are accelerated in metals.

Radio waves can easily carry signals round the Earth. Indeed, it turns out that radio waves decay in field strength as $1/r$, where r is the distance from the source. They decay much more slowly than static fields, for which the field strength decays as $1/r^2$.

The slow $1/r$ dependence can be understood qualitatively from the drawing shown in Figure 363. It shows the electric field around a charged particle that undergoes the simplest possible accelerated motion: a bounce on a wall. In fact, the last diagram is sufficient to show that the transverse field decays as $1/r$. Can you deduce the dependence? Challenge 1097 d

If we perform the construction for a charge that undergoes repeated bounces, we get a diagram with regular kinks in the field lines that move out from the source. For a charge undergoing harmonic motion, we get the motion shown in Figure 364. It shows the mech-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009


radius is ct, where t is the time since the bounce took place
wall
particle position
particle position had it not bounced
electrical field lines

FIGURE 363 Constructing, in three steps, the electrical field around a particle bouncing from a wall



FIGURE 364 The electrical field around a particle oscillating in vertical direction (© Daniel Schroeder)

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

anism of the simplest antenna (or light source) one can imagine.

The magnitude of the transverse electric field can be used to deduce the relation between the acceleration a of a charge q and the radiated electromagnetic power P. First, the transverse electric field (calculated in the last exercise) has to be squared, to give the local electric energy density. Then it has to be doubled, to include magnetic energy. Finally, one has to integrate over all angles; this gives a factor of 2/3. In total one gets

$$P = \frac{q^2 a^2}{6\pi\varepsilon_0 c^3} \,. \tag{476}$$

The total radiated power P depends on the square of the acceleration and on the square of the charge that is being accelerated. This is the so-called *Larmor formula*. It shows why radio transmitters need power supplies.

How does the world look when riding on a light beam?

At the end of the nineteenth century, the teenager Albert Einstein read a book discussing the speed of light. The book asked what would happen if an observer moved at the same speed as light.* Einstein thought much about the issue, and in particular, asked himself what kind of electromagnetic field he would observe in that case. Einstein later explained that this Gedanken experiment convinced him already at that young age that *nothing* could travel at the speed of light, since the field observed would have a property not found in nature. Can you find out which one he meant?

Challenge 1098 s

Riding on a light beam situation would have strange consequences.

— You would have no mirror image, like a vampire.
— Light would not be oscillating, but would be a static field.
— Nothing would move, like in the tale of sleeping beauty.

But also at speeds *near* the velocity of light observations would be interesting. You would:

— see a lot of light coming towards you and almost no light from the sides or from behind; the sky would be blue/white in the front and red/black behind;
— observe that everything around happens very very slowly;
— experience the smallest dust particle as a deadly bullet.

Challenge 1099 s

Can you think of more strange consequences? It is rather reassuring that our planet moves rather slowly through its environment.

Does light always travel in a straight line?

Usually light moves in straight lines. Indeed, we even use light to *define* 'straightness.' However, there are a number of exceptions that every expert on motion should know.

Ref. 604

In diluted sugar syrup, light beams curve, as shown in Figure 365. The reason is that in such an experiment, the sugar concentration changes with depth. More detailed ob-

* This was the book series in twenty volumes by Aaron Bernstein, *Naturwissenschaftliche Volksbücher*, Duncker, 1873-1874. The young Einstein read them, between 1892 and 1894, with 'breathless attention', as he wrote later on.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 365 Diluted sugar syrup bends light



FIGURE 366 The real image produced by a converging lens (if used in the way shown) and the virtual image produced by a diverging lens

servation show that a light beam is bent at every material change it encounters on its path. This effect, called *refraction*, is quite common. Refraction changes the appearance of the shape of our feet when we are in the bath tub; refraction also makes aquaria seem less deep than they actually are. Refraction is a consequence of the change of light speed from material to material. Are you able to explain refraction, and thus explain the syrup effect?

Challenge 1100 s

Refraction is chiefly used in the design of lenses. Using glass instead of water, one can produce curved surfaces, so that light can be *focused*. Focusing devices can be used to produce images. The two main types of lenses, with their focal points and the images they produce, are shown in Figure 366. When an object is put between a converging lens and its focus, the lens works as a *magnifying glass*. The lens then produces a *real* image, i.e., an image that can be projected onto a screen. In all other cases lenses produce so-called *virtual images*: such images can be seen with the eye but not be projected onto a screen. Figure 366 also allows one to deduce the *thin lens formula* that connects the lengths d_o,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 367 Lens refraction as the basis of the telescope: above, the experiments with lenses that lead to the development of the telecope: the object to watch compared with the images produced by a single coonverging lens, by two equal lenses, by two different converging lenses in the astronomical telescope, and by a diverging and a converging lens in the Dutch telescope, at various distances from the eye; below, the explanation of the Dutch telescope (photographs © Eric Kirchner)

Challenge 1101 s d_o and f. What is it?

Even though glasses and lenses have been known since antiquity, the Middle Ages had to pass by before two lenses were combined to make more elaborate optical instruments.

Ref. 605 The various effects that can be observed with one or two lenses are shown in Figure 367. The *telescope* was invented in, or just before, 1608 by the German–Dutch lens grinder Johannes Lipperhey (*c.* 1570–1619), who made a fortune by selling it to the Dutch military. When Galileo heard about the discovery, he quickly took it over and improved it. Already in 1609, Galileo performed the first astronomical observations; they made him

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 368 The glory produced by the droplets in a cloud

world-famous. The *Dutch telescope* design has a short tube yielding a bright and upright image, and its magnification is the ratio of the focal distances of the two lenses. It is still used today in opera glasses. Over the years, many other ways of building telescopes have been developed; in particular, many modern high-performance telescopes use mirrors. Since mirrors are cheaper and easier to fabricate for high-precision imaging, most large telescopes have a mirror instead of the first lens.

Challenge 1102 e

Ref. 606

By the way, telescopes also exist in nature. Many spiders have two types of eyes. The large ones, made to see distant objects, have two lenses arranged in the same way as in the telescope.

Another way to combine two lenses leads to the *microscope*. Can you explain to a non-physicist how a microscope works?* Werner Heisenberg almost failed his Ph.D. exam because he could not. The problem is not difficult, though. Indeed, the inventor of the microscope was an autodidact of the seventeenth century: the Dutch technician Antoni van Leeuwenhoek (1632–1723) made a living by selling over five hundred of his microscopes to his contemporaries. (This is a somewhat nasty remark: Van Leeuwenhoek only used one lens, not two, as in the modern microscope.)

Challenge 1103 s

No ray tracing diagram, be it that of a simple lens, of a telescope or a microscope, is really complete if the eye, with its lens and retina, is missing. Can you add it and convince yourself that these devices really work?

Challenge 1104 ny

Refraction is usually colour-dependent. For that reason (and also in order to compensate the other lens imaging errors called *aberrations*) microscopes or photographic cameras have *several* lenses, made of different materials. They compensate the colour effects, which otherwise yield coloured image borders. The colour dependence of refraction in water droplets is also the basis of the rainbow, as shown below, and refraction in ice crys-

Page 748

* If not, read the beautiful text by Elizabeth M. Slater & Henry S. Slater, *Light and Electron Microscopy*, Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 369 Watching this graphic at higher magnification shows the dispersion of the human eye: the letters float at different depths

tals in the atmosphere is at the basis of the halos and the many other light patterns often seen around the Sun and the Moon. Ref. 607

Also the human eye has colour-dependent refraction. (It is well known that for the working of the eye, the curvature of the cornea is more important than the refractive power of the lens, because the lens is embedded in a medium with nearly the same index of refraction, thus limiting the effects of refraction.) The colour-dependent refraction is not corrected in the eye, but in the brain. Indeed, the dispersion of the eye lens can be noticed if this correction is made impossible, for example when red or blue letters are printed on a black background, as shown in Figure 369. One gets the impression that the red letters float in front of the blue letters. Can you show how dispersion leads to the floating effect? Challenge 1105 s

A second important observation is that light goes around corners. This effect was called *diffraction* by Francesco Grimaldi, in his text *Physico-mathesis de lumine*, published in 1665. Ref. 608 Grimaldi studied shadows very carefully. He found out what everybody now learns in high school: light goes around corners in the same way that sound does, and light diffraction is due to the wave nature of light. (Newton got interested in optics after he read Grimaldi; he then wrongly dismissed his conclusions.)

Because of diffraction, it is impossible to produce strictly parallel light beams. For example, every laser beam diverges by a certain minimum amount, called the *diffraction limit*. Maybe you know that the world's most expensive Cat's-eyes are on the Moon, where they have been deposited by the Lunokhod and the Apollo missions. Ref. 609 Can you determine how wide a laser beam with minimum divergence has become when it arrives at the Moon and returns back to Earth, assuming that it was 1 m wide when it left Earth? How wide would it be when it came back if it had been 1 mm wide at the start? Challenge 1106 s In short, diffraction and the impossibility of parallel beams confirms that light is a wave.

Diffraction implies that there are no perfectly sharp images: there exists a *limit on resolution*. This is true for every optical instrument, including the eye. The resolution of the eye is between one and two minutes of arc, i.e., between 0.3 and 0.6 mrad. The limit is partly due to the finite size of the pupil. (That is why squinting helps to see more sharply.) In practice, the resolution of the eye is often limited by chromatic aberrations and shape imperfections of the cornea and lens. (Can you check the numbers and their interpretation by calculation? Is it true that the number of cones in the eye is tuned exactly to its resolution?) Therefore, for example, there is a maximum distance at which humans can distinguish the two headlights of a car. Can you estimate it? Challenge 1107 d Challenge 1108 s

Resolution limits also make it impossible to see the Great Wall in northern China from the Moon, contrary to what is often claimed. In the few parts that are not yet in ruins, the wall is about 6 metres wide, and even if it casts a wide shadow during the morning

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 370 In certain materials, light beams can spiral around each other



FIGURE 371 Masses bend light



FIGURE 372 Shadows show that light is a wave: the naive expectation (left), neglecting the wave idea, and the actual observation (middle and right) of the shadow of a circular object (photo © Christopher Jones)

or the evening, the angle it subtends is way below a second of arc, so that it is completely invisible to the human eye. In fact, three different cosmonauts who travelled to the Moon performed careful searches and confirmed that the claim is absurd. The story is one of the most tenacious urban legends. (Is it possible to see the Wall from the space shuttle?) The largest human-made objects are the polders of reclaimed land in the Netherlands; they *are* visible from outer space. So are most large cities as well as the highways in Belgium at night; their bright illumination makes them stand out clearly from the dark side of the Earth.

Ref. 610

Challenge 1109 ny

Refraction also leads to a famous effect where light seems to go around corners: the *mirage*. Figure 373 shows photographs of a *superior* mirage, which relies an inversion or boundary layer in the atmosphere above the object and the observer, and a *inferior* mirage, due to a hot layer of air just above the ground. Inferior mirages are also regularly seen on hot highways. All mirage types are due to refraction; their detailed appearance depends on the given temperature profile in the air, and the relative heights of the observer, the inversion layer and the observed object.

Ref. 611

Diffraction has the consequence that behind a small disc illuminated along its axis, the centre of the shadow shows, against all expectations, a bright spot, as shown in Figure 372. This 'hole' in the shadow was predicted in 1819 by Denis Poisson (1781–1840) in order to show to what absurd consequences the wave theory of light would lead. He had just read the mathematical description of diffraction developed by Augustin Fresnel* on the

* Augustin Jean Fresnel (1788–1827), engineer and part time physicist; he published in 1818 his great paper on wave theory for which he got the prize of the French Academy of Sciences in 1819. (The 's' in his name is silent.) To improve his finances, he worked in the commission responsible for lighthouses, for which he developed the well-known Fresnel lens. He died prematurely, partly of exhaustion due to overwork.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 373 The basis of mirages is an effective reflection due to refraction in a hot air layer; it can lead to spectacular effects, such as the inverted superior mirage (top left and right), the inferior image (bottom left and right) right) (photographs © Thomas Hogan and Andy Barson)

basis of the wave description of light. But shortly afterwards, François Arago (1786–1853) actually observed Poisson's spot, converting Poisson, making Fresnel famous and starting the general acceptance of the wave properties of light.

Additional electromagnetic fields usually do not influence light directly, since light has no charge and since Maxwell's equations are linear. But in some materials the equations are non-linear, and the story changes. For example, in certain photorefractive materials, two nearby light beams can even *twist* around each other, as was shown by Segev and coworkers in 1997.

Ref. 612

A final way to bend light is gravity, as discussed already in the chapters on universal gravity and on general relativity. The effect of gravity between two light beams was also discussed there.

Page 602

A light ray that is reflected or scattered also changes direction, though it is debatable whether it is appropriate to call these processes examples of bending of light. In any case, both scattering and reflection are important: without them, we would not see almost anything around us. Seeing is detection of scattered light.

In summary, light travels straight only if it travels *far from matter*. In everyday life, 'far' simply means more than a few millimetres, because all gravitational and electromagnetic effects are negligible at these distances, mainly due to light's truly supersonic speed. However, as we have seen, in some cases larger distances from matter are necessary to ensure undisturbed motion of light.

The concentration of light

If one builds a large lens or a curved mirror, one can collect the light of the Sun and focus it on a single spot. Everybody has used a converging lens as a child to burn black spots on newspapers in this way. In Spain, wealthier researchers have even built a curved mirror as large as a house, in order to study solar energy use and material behaviour at

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 374 The last mirror of the solar furnace at Odeillo, in the French Pyrenees (© Gerhard Weinrebe)



FIGURE 375 Levitating a small glass bead with a laser

high temperature. Essentially, the mirror provides a cheap way to fire an oven in its focus. (And 'focus' is the Latin word for 'hearth').

Kids find out quite rapidly that large lenses allow them to burn things more easily than small ones. It is obvious that the Spanish site is the record holder in this game. However, building a larger mirror does not make sense. Whatever its size may be, such a set-up cannot reach a higher temperature than that of the original light source. The surface temperature of the Sun is about 5800 K; indeed, the highest temperature reached so far is about 4000 K. Are you able to show that this limitation follows from the second law of thermodynamics?

Ref. 654

Challenge 1110 ny

In short, nature provides a *limit* to the concentration of light energy. In fact, we will encounter additional limits in the course of our exploration.

Can one touch light?

If a little glass bead is put on top of a powerful laser, the bead remains suspended in mid-air, as shown in Figure 375.* This means that light has momentum. Therefore, contrary to what we said in the beginning of our mountain ascent, images *can* be touched! In fact, the ease with which objects can be pushed even has a special name. For stars, it is called the *albedo*, and for general objects it is called the *reflectivity*, abbreviated as r.

Like each type of electromagnetic field, and like every kind of wave, light carries energy; the energy flow T per surface and time is

Challenge 1111 e

* The heaviest object that has been levitated with a laser had a mass of 20 g; the laser used was enormous, and the method also made use of a few additional effects, such as shock waves, to keep the object in the air.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 376 A commercial light mill turns *against* the light

$$\boldsymbol{T} = \frac{1}{\mu_0}\boldsymbol{E} \times \boldsymbol{B} \quad \text{giving an average} \quad \langle T \rangle = \frac{1}{2\mu_0} E_{\max} B_{\max} \,. \tag{477}$$

Obviously, light also has a momentum P. It is related to the energy E by

$$P = \frac{E}{c} \,. \tag{478}$$

Challenge 1112 e As a result, the pressure p exerted by light on a body is given by

$$p = \frac{T}{c}(1 + r) \tag{479}$$

where for black bodies we have that a reflectivity $r = 0$ and for mirrors $r = 1$; other bodies have values in between. What is your guess for the amount of pressure due to sunlight on Challenge 1113 s a black surface of one square metre? Is this the reason that we feel more pressure during the day than during the night?

In fact, rather delicate equipment is needed to detect the momentum of light, in other words, its radiation pressure. Already in 1619, Johannes Kepler had suggested in *De cometis* that the tails of comets exist only because the light of the Sun hits the small dust particles that detach from it. For this reason, the tail always points *away* from the Challenge 1114 e Sun, as you might want to check at the next opportunity. Today, we know that Kepler was right; but proving the hypothesis is not easy.

In 1873, William Crookes* invented the *light mill radiometer*. He had the intention of demonstrating the radiation pressure of light. The light mill consists of four thin plates, black on one side and shiny on the other, that are mounted on a vertical axis, as shown

* William Crookes (b. 1832 London, d. 1919 London), English chemist and physicist, president of the Royal Society, discoverer of thallium, and believer in spiritualism.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 377 The tail of comet McNaught, photographed in Australia in 2007 (© Flagstaffotos)

in Figure 376. However, when Crookes finished building it – it was similar to those sold in shops today – he found, like everybody else, that it turned in the wrong direction, namely with the shiny side towards the light! (Why is it wrong?) You can check it by yourself by shining a laser pointer on to it. The behaviour has been a puzzle for quite some time. Explaining it involves the tiny amount of gas left over in the glass bulb and takes us too far from the topic of our mountain ascent. It was only in 1901, with the advent of much better pumps, that the Russian physicist Pyotr/Peter Lebedew managed to create a sufficiently good vacuum to allow him to measure the light pressure with such an improved, true radiometer. Lebedew also confirmed the predicted value of the light pressure and proved the correctness of Kepler's hypothesis about comet tails. Today it is even possible to build tiny propellers that start to turn when light shines on to them, in exactly the same way that the wind turns windmills.

Challenge 1115 s

Ref. 613

Ref. 614

Ref. 615

But light cannot only touch and be touched, it can also *grab*. In the 1980s, Arthur Ashkin and his research group developed actual *optical tweezers* that allow one to grab, suspend and move small transparent spheres of 1 to 20 μm diameter using laser beams. It is possible to do this through a microscope, so that one can also observe at the same time what is happening. This technique is now routinely used in biological research around the world, and has been used, for example, to measure the force of single muscle fibres, by chemically attaching their ends to glass or Teflon spheres and then pulling them apart with such optical tweezers.

Ref. 616

But that is not all. In the last decade of the twentieth century, several groups even managed to *rotate* objects, thus realizing actual *optical spanners*. They are able to rotate particles at will in one direction or the other, by changing the optical properties of the

Ref. 616

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 378 Light can rotate objects



FIGURE 379 Umbrellas decompose white light

laser beam used to trap the particle.

In fact, it does not take much to deduce that if light has linear momentum, circularly polarized light also has *angular* momentum. In fact, for such a wave the angular momentum $\boldsymbol{L}$ is given by

$$\boldsymbol{L} = \frac{E_{\text{nergy}}}{\omega} \,. \tag{480}$$

Challenge 1116 e
Ref. 617
Challenge 1117 ny

Equivalently, the angular momentum of a wave is $\lambda/2\pi$ times its linear momentum. For light, this result was already confirmed in the early twentieth century: a light beam can put certain materials (which ones?) into rotation, as shown in Figure 378. Of course, the whole thing works even better with a laser beam. In the 1960s, a beautiful demonstration was performed with microwaves. A circularly polarized microwave beam from a maser – the microwave equivalent of a laser – can put a metal piece absorbing it into rotation. Indeed, for a beam with cylindrical symmetry, depending on the sense of rotation, the angular momentum is either parallel or antiparallel to the direction of propagation. All these experiments confirm that light also carries angular momentum, an effect which will play an important role in the quantum part of our mountain ascent.

We note that not for all waves angular momentum is energy per angular frequency. This is only the case for waves made of what in quantum theory will be called spin 1 particles. For example, for gravity waves the angular momentum is *twice* this value, and they are therefore expected to be made of spin 2 particles.

Ref. 618

What does this mean for the comet tails mentioned above? The issue was settled definitely in 1986. A satellite was shot up to an altitude of 110 000 km and made to release a cloud of barium. The cloud was visible from the Earth, and it soon developed a tail that was visible from Earth: that was the first artificial comet. It turns out that comet tails shapes are partly due to hitting photons, partly due to the solar wind, and partly to magnetic fields.

Challenge 1118 s

In summary, light can touch and be touched. Obviously, if light can rotate bodies, it can also *be* rotated. Could you imagine how this can be achieved?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

War, light and lies

From the tiny effects of equation (479) for light pressure we deduce that light is not an efficient tool for hitting objects. On the other hand, light is able to heat up objects, as we can feel in the sun or when the skin is touched by a laser beam of about 100 mW or more. For the same reason even cheap laser pointers are dangerous to the eye.

In the 1980s, and again in 2001, a group of people who had read too many science fiction novels managed to persuade the military – who also indulge in this habit – that lasers could be used to shoot down missiles, and that a lot of tax money should be spent on developing such lasers. Using the definition of the Poynting vector and a hitting time of about 0.1 s, are you able to estimate the weight and size of the battery necessary for such a device to work? What would happen in cloudy or rainy weather?

Challenge 1119 ny

Other people tried to persuade NASA to study the possibility of propelling a rocket using emitted light instead of ejected gas. Are you able to estimate whether this is feasible?

Challenge 1120 ny

What is colour?

We saw that radio waves of certain frequencies are visible. Within that range, different frequencies correspond to different colours. (Are you able to convince a friend about this?) But the story does not finish here. Numerous colours can be produced either by a single wavelength, i.e., by *monochromatic* light, or by a *mixture* of several different colours. For example, standard yellow can be, if it is pure, an electromagnetic beam of 575 nm wavelength or it can be a mixture of standard green of 546.1 nm and standard red of 700 nm. The eye cannot distinguish between the two cases; only spectrometers can. In everyday life, all colours turn out to be mixed, with the exceptions of those of yellow street lamps, of laser beams and of the rainbow. You can check this for yourself, using an umbrella or a compact disc: they decompose light mixtures, but not pure colours.

Challenge 1121 s

Challenge 1122 e

In particular, white light is a mixture of a continuous range of colours with a given intensity per wavelength. To check that white light is a mixture of colours, simply hold the left-hand side of Figure 380 so near to your eye that you cannot focus the stripes any more. The unsharp borders of the white stripes have a pink or a green shade. These colours are due to the imperfections of the human eye, its so-called *chromatic aberrations*. Aberrations have the consequence that not all light frequencies follow the same path through the lens of the eye, and therefore they hit the retina at different spots. This is the same effect that occurs in prisms or in water drops showing a rainbow. By the way, the shape of the rainbow tells something about the shape of the water droplets. Can you deduce the connection?

Challenge 1123 s

The right side of Figure 380 explains how rainbows form. The main idea is that internal reflection inside the water droplets in the sky is responsible for throwing back the light coming from the Sun, whereas the wavelength-dependent refraction at the air–water surface is responsible for the different paths of each colour. The first two persons to verify this explanation were Theodoricus Teutonicus de Vriberg (*c.* 1240 to *c.* 1318), in the years from 1304 to 1310 and, at the same time, the Persian mathematician Kamal al-Din al-Farisi. To check the explanation, they did something smart and simple; anybody can repeat this at home. They built an enlarged water droplet by filling a thin spherical (or cylindrical) glass container with water; then they shone a beam of white light through it. Theodoricus and al-Farisi found exactly what is shown in Figure 380. With this ex-

Ref. 619

Challenge 1124 e

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 380 Three proofs that white light is a mixture of colours (with exaggerated angle differences): prism decomposition, rainbow formation and the coloured borders seen on a circular black and white pattern (photograph by Susan Schwartzenberg, © Exploratorium www.exploratorium.edu)

periment, each of them was able to reproduce the angle of the main or primary rainbow, its colour sequence, as well as the existence of a secondary rainbow, its observed angle and its inverted colour sequence.* All these bows are visible in Figure 356. Theodoricus's beautiful experiment is sometimes called the most important contribution of natural science in the Middle Ages.

Page 726

Incidentally, the explanation of Figure 380 is not complete. It is drawn with the light ray hitting the water droplet at a specific spot. If the light ray hits the droplet at other spots, the rainbows appear at other angles; however, all those rainbows wash out. Only

Challenge 1125 ny

* Can you guess where the tertiary and quaternary rainbows are to be seen? There are rare reported sightings of them. The hunt to observe the fifth-order rainbow is still open. (In the laboratory, bows around droplets up to the thirteenth order have been observed.) For more details, see the beautiful website at www.atoptics.co.uk. There are several formulae for the angles of the various orders of rainbows; they follow from straightforward geometric considerations, but are too involved to be given here.

Ref. 620

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 381 A green flash above the setting Sun and one above the Moon, showing also the colour change of the Moon rim (© Andrew Young and Laurent Laveder/PixHeaven.net)

FIGURE 382 Milk and water simulate the evening sky (© Antonio Martos)

the visible rainbow remains, because its deflection angles are extremal.

Incidentally, at sunset the atmosphere itself also acts as a prism, or more precisely, as a cylindrical lens affected by spherochromatism. That means that the Sun is split into different images, one for each colour, which are slightly shifted with respect to each other; the total shift is about 1% of the diameter. As a result, the rim of the Sun is coloured. If the weather is favourable, if the air is clear up to and beyond the horizon, and if the correct temperature profile is present in the atmosphere, a colour-dependent mirage will appear. As a result, for about a second it will be possible to see, after or near the red, orange and yellow images of the setting Sun, the green–blue image, sometimes even detached. This is the famous *green flash* described by Jules Verne in his novel *Le Rayon-vert*. It is often seen on tropical beaches, for example in Hawaii, and from the decks of ships in warm waters.

Ref. 621

Ref. 622

Ref. 621, Ref. 623

Even pure air splits white light. However, this is not done by dispersion, but by scattering. Wavelength-dependent scattering is the reason that the sky and far away mountains

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

look blue or that the Sun looks red at sunset and at sunrise. (The sky looks black even during the day from the Moon.) You can repeat this effect by looking through water at a black surface or at a lamp. Adding a few drops of milk to the water makes the lamp yellow and then red, and makes the black surface blue (like the sky seen from the Earth as compared to the sky seen from the Moon) as shown in Figure 382. More milk increases the effect. For the same reason, sunsets are especially red after volcanic eruptions.

To clarify the difference between colours in physics and colour in human perception and language, a famous linguistic discovery deserves to be mentioned: colours in human language have a natural *order*. Colours are ordered by all peoples of the world, whether they come from the sea, the desert or the mountains, in the following order: 1. black and white, 2. red, 3. green and yellow, 4. blue, 5. brown, 6. mauve, pink, orange, grey and sometimes a twelfth term that differs from language to language. (Colours that refer to objects, such as aubergine or sepia, or colours that are not generally applicable, such as blond, are excluded in this discussion.) The precise discovery is the following: if a particular language has a word for any of these colours, then it also has a word for all the preceding ones. The result also implies that people use these basic colour classes even if their language does *not* have a word for each of them. These strong statements have been confirmed for over 100 languages.

Ref. 624

Fun with rainbows

The width of the usual, primary rainbow is 2.25°, for the secondary rainbow it is about twice that value (which is one reason why it is less bright). The width is larger than the dispersion angle difference given in Figure 380 because the angular size of the sun, about 0.5°, has (roughly) to be added on top of the angle difference.

If the droplets are very fine, the rainbow become white; it is then called a *fogbow*. Such bows are also often seen from aeroplanes. If the droplets are not round, for example due to strong wind, one can get a so-called *irregular* or *twinned rainbow*. An example is shown in Figure 383.

Light from the rainbow is tangentially polarized. You can check that easily with polarizing sunglasses. During the internal reflection in the water droplets, as the reflection angle is very near to the angle at which total reflection sets in, light gets polarized. (Why is does this lead to polarization?) More on polarization will be told in the next section.

Challenge 1126 e

Challenge 1127 ny

If the air is full of ice crystals instead of droplets, the situation changes again. One can then get additional images of the sun in the direction of the sun. They are called *parhelia* (or sundogs). This happens most clearly with no wind, if the crystals are all oriented in the same direction. In that case one can take photographs such as the one shown in Figure 384.

What is the speed of light? – Again

Physics talks about motion. Talking is the exchange of sound; and sound is an example of a signal. A *(physical) signal* is the transport of information using the transport of energy. There are no signals without a motion of energy. Indeed, there is no way to store information without storing energy. To any signal we can thus ascribe a propagation speed. The highest possible signal speed is also the maximal velocity of the general influences, or, to use sloppy language, the maximal velocity with which effects spread causes.

Page 237

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 383 Four rare types of rainbows: a fogbow (top left), an irregular, split rainbow in a windy situation due to non-spherical rain drops (top right, shown with increased colour saturation), a six-fold rainbow (bottom left) and a red rainbow at sunset (© Michel Tournay, Eva Seidenfaden, Terje Nordvik and Zhu XiaoJin)

FIGURE 384 A composite photograph showing the parhelia, the light pillars, the halo and the upper tangent arc formed by ice crystals in the air, if all oriented in the same direction (© Phil Appleton)

If the signal is carried by matter, such as by the written text in a letter, the signal velocity is then the velocity of the material carrier, and experiments show that it is limited by the speed of light.

For a wave carrier, such as water waves, sound, light or radio waves, the situation is less evident. What is the speed of a wave? The first answer that comes to mind is the speed with which wave crests of a sine wave move. This already introduced *phase velocity* is

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 385 The definition of important velocities in wave phenomena

given by the ratio between the frequency and the wavelength of a monochromatic wave, i.e., by

$$v_{\text{ph}} = \frac{\omega}{k} \,. \tag{481}$$

For example, the phase velocity determines interference phenomena. Light in a vacuum has the same phase velocity $v_{\text{ph}} = c$ for all frequencies. Are you able to imagine an experiment to test this to high precision?

Challenge 1128 s

On the other hand, there are cases where the phase velocity is greater than c, most notably when light travels through an absorbing substance, and when at the same time the frequency is near to an absorption maximum. In these cases, experiments show that the phase velocity is *not* the signal velocity. For such situations, a better approximation to the signal speed is the *group velocity*, i.e., the velocity at which a group maximum will travel. This velocity is given by

Ref. 625

$$v_{\text{gr}} = \left.\frac{\mathrm{d}\omega}{\mathrm{d}k}\right|_{k_0} \,, \tag{482}$$

where k_0 is the central wavelength of the wave packet. We observe that $\omega = c(k)k = 2\pi v_{\text{ph}}/\lambda$ implies the relation

$$v_{\text{gr}} = \left.\frac{\mathrm{d}\omega}{\mathrm{d}k}\right|_{k_0} = v_{\text{ph}} - \lambda \frac{\mathrm{d}v_{\text{ph}}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda} \,. \tag{483}$$

This means that the sign of the last term determines whether the group velocity is larger or smaller than the phase velocity. For a travelling group, as shown by the dashed line in Figure 385, this means that new maxima appear either at the end or at the front of the group. Experiments show that this is only the case for light passing *through matter*; for light *in vacuum*, the group velocity has the same value $v_{\text{gr}} = c$ for all values of the wave vector k.

You should be warned that many publications are still propagating the incorrect statement that the group velocity *in a material* is never greater than c, the speed of light in vacuum. Actually, the group velocity in a material can be zero, infinite or even negative; this happens when the light pulse is very narrow, i.e., when it includes a wide range of

Challenge 1129 ny

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

frequencies, or again when the frequency is near an absorption transition. In many (but not all) cases the group is found to widen substantially or even to split, making it difficult to define precisely the group maximum and thus its velocity. Many experiments have confirmed these predictions. For example, the group velocity in certain materials has been measured to be *ten times* that of light. The refractive index then is smaller than 1. However, in all these cases the group velocity is *not* the same as the signal speed.*

Ref. 626

What then is the best velocity describing signal propagation? The German physicist Arnold Sommerfeld** almost solved the main problem in the beginning of the twentieth century. He defined the signal velocity as the velocity v_{So} of the front slope of the pulse, as shown in Figure 385. The definition cannot be summarized in a formula, but it does have the property that it describes signal propagation for almost all experiments, in particular those in which the group and phase velocity are larger than the speed of light. When studying its properties, it was found that for no material is Sommerfeld's signal velocity greater than the speed of light in vacuum.

Ref. 625

Sometimes it is conceptually easier to describe signal propagation with the help of the energy velocity. As previously mentioned, every signal transports energy. The *energy velocity* v_{en} is defined as the ratio between the power flow density $\boldsymbol{P}$, i.e., the Poynting vector, and the energy density W, both taken in the direction of propagation. For electromagnetic fields – the only ones fast enough to be interesting for eventual superluminal signals – this ratio is

$$\boldsymbol{v}_{en} = \frac{\mathrm{Re}(\boldsymbol{P})}{W} = \frac{2c^2\, \boldsymbol{E} \times \boldsymbol{B}}{\boldsymbol{E}^2 + c^2 \boldsymbol{B}^2} \,. \tag{484}$$

However, as in the case of the front velocity, in the case of the energy velocity we have to specify if we mean the energy transported by the main pulse or by the front of it. In vacuum, neither is ever greater than the speed of light.*** (In general, the velocity of energy in matter has a value slightly different from Sommerfeld's signal velocity.)

Ref. 625

In recent years, the progress in light detector technology, allowing one to detect even the tiniest energies, has forced scientists to take the fastest of all these energy velocities to describe signal velocity. Using detectors with the highest possible sensitivity we can use as signal the first point of the wave train whose amplitude is different from zero, i.e., the first tiny amount of energy arriving. This point's velocity, conceptually similar to Sommerfeld's signal velocity, is commonly called the *front velocity* or, to distinguish it even more clearly from Sommerfeld's case, the *forerunner velocity*. It is simply given by

Challenge 1130 s

* In quantum mechanics, Schrödinger proved that the velocity of an electron is given by the group velocity of its wave function. Therefore the same discussion reappeared in quantum theory, as we will find out in the next part of our mountain ascent.

** Arnold Sommerfeld (b. 1868 Königsberg, d. 1951 München) was a central figure in the spread of special and general relativity, of quantum theory, and of their applications. A professor in Munich, an excellent teacher and text book writer, he worked on atomic theory, on the theory of metals and on electrodynamics, and was the first to understand the importance and the mystery around 'Sommerfeld's famous fine structure constant.'

*** Signals not only carry energy, they also carry negative entropy ('information'). The entropy of a transmitter increases during transmission. The receiver decreases in entropy (but less than the increase at the transmitter, of course).

Ref. 627

Note that the negative group velocity implies energy transport against the propagation velocity of light. This is possible only in *energy loaded* materials.

Ref. 628

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 386 Positive and negative indices of refraction

$$v_{\mathrm{fr}} = \lim_{\omega\to\infty} \frac{\omega}{k} \,. \tag{485}$$

The forerunner velocity is *never* greater than the speed of light in a vacuum, even in materials. In fact it is precisely c because, for extremely high frequencies, the ratio ω/k is independent of the material, and vacuum properties take over. The forerunner velocity is the true signal velocity or the *true velocity of light*. Using it, all discussions on light speed become clear and unambiguous.

Challenge 1131 s To end this section, here are two challenges for you. Which of all the velocities of light is measured in experiments determining the velocity of light, e.g. when light is sent to the Moon and reflected back? And now a more difficult one: why is the signal speed of Challenge 1132 s light less inside matter, as all experiments show?

200 YEARS TOO LATE – NEGATIVE REFRACTION INDICES

In 1968 the Soviet physicist Victor Veselago made a strange prediction: the index of refraction could have *negative* values without invalidating any known law of physics. A negative index means that a beam is refracted to the same side of the vertical, as shown in Figure 386. As a result, concave lenses made of such materials focus and convex lenses disperse parallel beams, in contrast to usual lens materials.

In 1996, John Pendry and his group proposed ways of realizing such materials. In 2000, a first experimental confirmation for microwave refraction was published, but it Ref. 629 met with strong disbelief. In 2002 the debate was in full swing. It was argued that negative refraction indices imply speeds greater than that of light and are only possible for either phase velocity or group velocity, but not for the energy or true signal velocity. The conceptual problems would arise only because in some physical systems the refraction angle for phase motion and for energy motion differ.

In the meantime, negative indices of refraction have indeed been frequently observed; Ref. 630 the corresponding systems are being extensively explored all over the world. Systems with negative index of refraction do exist. The materials showing this property are called *left-handed*. The reason is that the vectors of the electric field, the magnetic field and the wave vector form a left-handed triplet, in contrast to vacuum and most usual materials, where the triplet is right-handed. Such materials consistently have *negative* magnetic Ref. 631 permeability and *negative* dielectric coefficient (permittivity).

Apart the unusual refraction properties, left-handed materials have negative phase

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 387 An example of an isotropic metamaterial (M. Zedler et al., © 2007 IEEE)

velocities, i.e., a phase velocity opposed to the energy velocity; they also show reversed Doppler effect and yield obtuse angles in the Vavilov–Çerenkov effect (emitting Vavilov–Çerenkov radiation in the backward instead of the forward direction).

But, most intriguing, negative refraction materials are predicted to allow the construc-
Ref. 632 tion of lenses that are completely flat. In addition, in the year 2000, John Pendry gained the attention of the whole physics community world-wide by predicting that lenses made with such materials, in particular for $n = -1$, would be *perfect*, thus beating the usual diffraction limit. This would happen because such a lens also images the evanescent parts of the waves, by amplifying them accordingly. First experiments seem to confirm the
Ref. 631 prediction. Exploration of the topic is still in full swing.

Challenge 1133 ny Can you explain how negative refraction differs from diffraction?

Metamaterials

The simplest realization of left-handed systems are metamaterials. (Left-handed) *metamaterials* are engineered metal-insulator structures that are left-handed for a certain wavelength range, usually in the radio or microwave domain.

Ref. 633 Currently, there are two basic approaches to realize metamaterials. The first is to build a metamaterial from a large array of resonant inductor-capacitor (LC-) circuits. The sec-
Ref. 634 ond approach is to build them from resonant transmission lines. The latter approach has lower losses and a wider spectral range. An example is shown in Figure 387.

Most metamaterials are conceived for the microwave range. Crystals that act as left-handed materials in the optical range, though for certain frequencies only, and only in one dimension, have been identified recently.

Research on the topic is presently in full swing. Industrial applications of left handed (meta-)materials are expected for antenna design; for example, the antenna dipole could be located just above a metamaterial, allowing flat directional antennas. The most unrealistic people are those who claim that *invisibility cloaks* can be realized with metamaterials. While this is a good marketing slogan to attract funding, it is not realistic, due inevitable signal losses in the materials, dispersion, finite cell size etc. So far, all aeroplanes that were claimed to be invisible for certain (radar) frequencies have turned out to be visible. But sources of military funding are known to have only a distant relation to reality.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 70 Experimental properties of (flat) vacuum and of the 'aether'

Physical property	Experimental value
permeability	μ_0 =1.3 μH/m
permittivity	ε_0 =8.9 pF/m
wave impedance/resistance	Z_0 = 376.7 Ω
conformal invariance	applies
spatial dimensionality	3
topology	R^3
mass and energy content	not detectable
friction on moving bodies	not detectable
motion relative to space-time	not detectable

Signals and predictions

When one person reads a text over the phone to a neighbour who listens to it and maybe repeats it, we speak of communication. For any third person, the speed of communication is always less than the speed of light. But if the neighbour already knows the text, he can recite it without having heard the readers' voice. To the third observer such a situation appears to imply motion that is faster than light. Prediction can thus *mimic* communication and, in particular, it can mimic faster-than-light (superluminal) communication. Such a situation was demonstrated most spectacularly in 1994 by Günter Nimtz, who seemingly transported music – all music is predictable for short time scales – through a 'faster-than-light' system. To distinguish between the two situations, we note that in the case of prediction, no transport of energy takes place, in contrast to the case of communication. In other words, the definition of a signal as a transporter of information is not as useful and clear-cut as the definition of a signal as a *transporter of energy*. In the above-mentioned experiment, no energy was transported faster than light. The same distinction between prediction on the one hand and signal or energy propagation on the other will be used later to clarify some famous experiments in quantum mechanics.

Ref. 635

> If the rate at which physics papers are being published continues to increase, physics journals will soon be filling library shelves faster than the speed of light. This does not violate relativity since no useful information is being transmitted.
>
> David Mermin

Does the aether exist?

Gamma rays, light and radio waves are moving electromagnetic waves. All exist in empty space. What is oscillating when light travels? Maxwell himself called the 'medium' in which this happens the *aether*. The properties of the aether measured in experiments are listed in Table 70.

Of course, the values of the permeability and the permittivity of the vacuum are related to the definition of the units henry and farad. The last item of the table is the most impor-

Page 910

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Ref. 636 tant: despite intensive efforts, nobody has been able to detect any *motion* of the aether. In other words, even though the aether supposedly oscillates, it does not move. Together with the other data, all these results can be summed up in one sentence: there is no way Challenge 1134 s to distinguish the aether from the vacuum: they are one and the same.

Sometimes one hears that certain experiments or even the theory of relativity show that the aether does not exist. This is not strictly correct. In fact, experiments show something more important. All the data show that the aether is indistinguishable from the vacuum. Of course, if we use the change of curvature as the definition for motion of the vacuum, the vacuum *can* move, as we found out in the section on general relativity; but the aether still remains indistinguishable from it.*

Later we will even find out that the ability of the vacuum to allow the propagation of light and its ability to allow the propagation of particles are equivalent: both require the same properties. Therefore the aether remains *indistinguishable* from a vacuum in Ref. 637 the rest of our walk. In other words, the aether is a superfluous concept; we will drop it from our walk from now on. Despite this result, we have not yet finished the study of the vacuum; vacuum will keep us busy for a long time, starting with the following part of our ascent. Moreover, quite a few of the aspects in Table 70 will require some amendments later.

Challenges and fun curiosities about light

Since light is a wave, something must happen if it is directed to a hole less than its wave-Challenge 1135 s length in diameter. What exactly happens?

* *

Electrodynamics shows that light beams always push; they never pull. Can you confirm Challenge 1136 e that 'tractor beams' are impossible in nature?

* *

It is well known that the glowing material in light bulbs is tungsten wire in an inert gas. This was the result of a series of experiments that began with the grandmother of all lamps, namely the cucumber. The older generation knows that a pickled cucumber, when attached to the 230 V of the mains, glows with a bright green light. (Be careful; the experiment is dirty and somewhat dangerous.)

* *

If the light emitted by the headlights of cars were polarized from the bottom left to the upper right (as seen from the car's driver) one could vastly improve the quality of driving at night: one could add a polarizer to the wind shield oriented in the same direction. As a result, a driver would see the reflection of his own light, but the light from cars coming Challenge 1137 ny towards him would be considerably dampened. Why is this not done in modern cars?

Ref. 637 * In fact, the term 'aether' has been used as an expression for several different ideas, depending on the author. First of all it was used for the idea that a vacuum is not empty, but *full*; secondly, that this fullness can be described by *mechanical models*, such as gears, little spheres, vortices, etc.; thirdly, it was imagined that a vacuum is *similar to matter*, being made of the same substrate. Interestingly, these issues will reappear in the last part of our mountain ascent.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 26

IMAGES AND THE EYE – OPTICS

How to prove you're holy

Light reflection and refraction are responsible for many effects. The originally Indian symbol of holiness, now used throughout most of the world, is the *aureole*, also called *halo* or *Heiligenschein*, a ring of light surrounding the head. You can easily observe it around your own head. You need only to get up early in the morning and look into the wet grass while turning your back to the Sun. You will see an aureole around your shadow. The effect is due to the morning dew on the grass, which reflects the light back predominantly in the direction of the light source, as shown in Figure 388. The fun part is that if you do this in a group, you will see the aureole around only *your own* head.

Ref. 638

Retroreflective paint works in the same way: it contains tiny glass spheres that play the role of the dew. A large surface of retroreflective paint, a traffic sign for example, can also show your halo if the light source is sufficiently far away. Also the so-called 'glow' of the eyes of a cat at night is due to the same effect; it is visible only if you look at the cat with a light source behind you. By the way, do Cat's-eyes work like a cat's eyes?

Ref. 639

Challenge 1138 s

Do we see what exists?

Sometimes we see *less* than there is. Close your left eye, look at the white spot in Figure 389, bring the page slowly towards your eye, and pay attention to the middle lines. At a distance of about 15 to 20 cm the middle line will seem uninterrupted. Why?

Challenge 1139 s

On the other hand, sometimes we see *more* than there is, as Figures 390 and 391 show. The first shows that parallel lines can look skewed, and the second show a so-called *Hermann lattice*, named after its discoverer.* The Hermann lattice of Figure 391, discovered by Elke Lingelbach in 1995, is especially striking. Variations of these lattices are now used to understand the mechanisms at the basis of human vision. For example, they can be used to determine how many light sensitive cells in the retina are united to one signal pathway towards the brain. The illusions are angle dependent because this number is also angle dependent.

Ref. 640

Our eyes also 'see' things *differently:* the retina sees an *inverted* image of the world. There is a simple method to show this, due to Helmholtz.** You need only a needle and

* Ludimar Hermann (1838–1914), Swiss physiologist. The lattices are often falsely called 'Hering lattices' after the man who made Hermann's discovery famous.

** See Hermann von Helmholtz, *Handbuch der physiologischen Optik*, 1867. This famous classic is available in English as *Handbook of Physiological Optics*, Dover, 1962. The Prussian physician, physicist and science politician born as Hermann Helmholtz (b. 1821 Potsdam, d. 1894 Charlottenburg) was famous for

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 388 The path of light for the dew on grass that is responsible for the aureole

FIGURE 389 A limitation of the eye



FIGURE 390 What is the angle between adjacent green lines?

his works on optics, acoustics, electrodynamics, thermodynamics, epistemology and geometry. He founded several physics institutions across Germany. He was one of the first to propagate the idea of conservation of energy. His other important book, *Die Lehre von den Tonempfindungen*, published in 1863, describes the basis of acoustics and, like the Handbook, is still worth reading.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 391 The Lingelbach lattice: do you see white, grey, or black dots?

FIGURE 392 An example of an infrared photograph, slightly mixed with a colour image (© Serge Augustin)

a piece of paper, e.g. this page of text. Use the needle to make two holes inside the two letters 'oo'. Then keep the page as close to your eye as possible, look through the two holes towards the wall, keeping the needle vertical, a few centimetres behind the paper. You will see two images of the needle. If you now cover the *left* hole with your finger, the *right* needle will disappear, and vice versa. This shows that the image inside the eye, on the retina, is inverted. Are you able to complete the proof?

Challenge 1140 ny

Two other experiments can show the same result. If you push very lightly on the *inside* of your eye (careful!), you will see a dark spot appear on the *outside* of your vision field. And if you stand in a dark room and ask a friend to look at a burning candle, explore his eye: you will see three reflections: two upright ones, reflected from the cornea and from

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 393 How the appearance of a sunflower changes with wavelength: how it looks to the human eye, how it might look to a bird, and how it looks in the ultraviolet (© Andrew Davidhazy)

the lens, and a dim third one, *upside-down*, reflected from the retina.

Another reason that we do not see the complete image of nature is that our eyes have a limited sensitivity. This sensitivity peaks around 560 nm; outside the red and the violet, the eye does not detect radiation. We thus see only part of nature. For example, infrared photographs of nature, such as the one shown in Figure 392, are interesting because they show us something different from what we see usually.

Every expert of motion should also know that the sensitivity of the eye does *not* correspond to the brightest part of sunlight. This myth has been spread around the world by the numerous textbooks that have copied from each other. Depending on whether frequency or wavelength or wavelength logarithm is used, the solar spectrum peaks at 500 nm, 880 nm or 720 nm. The human eye's spectral sensitivity, like the completely different sensitivity of birds or frogs, is due to the chemicals used for detection. In short, the human eye can only be understood by a careful analysis of its particular evolutionary history.

Ref. 641

An urban legend, spread by many medical doctors and midwives to this day, pretends that newborn babies see everything upside down. Can you explain why this idea is wrong?

Challenge 1141 s

In summary, we have to be careful when maintaining that seeing means observing. Examples such as these lead to ask whether there are other limitations of our senses which are less evident. And our walk will indeed uncover several of them.

How does one make pictures of the inside of the eye?

The most beautiful pictures so far of a *living* human retina, such as that of Figure 394, were made by the group of David Williams and Austin Roorda at the University at Rochester in New York. They used adaptive optics, a technique that changes the shape of the imaging lens in order to compensate for the shape variations of the lens in the human eye.*

Ref. 642

* Nature uses another trick to get maximum resolution: the eye continuously performs small movements, called *micronystagmus*. The eye continuously oscillates around the direction of vision with around 40 to 50 Hz. In addition, this motion is also used to allow the cells in the retina to recharge.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 394 A high quality photograph of a live human retina, including a measured (false colour) indication of the sensitivity of each cone cell (© Austin Roorda)

The eyes see colour by averaging the intensity arriving at the red, blue and green sensi-
Page 748 tive cones. This explains the possibility, mentioned above, of getting the same impression of colour, e.g. yellow, either by a pure yellow laser beam, or by a suitable mixture of red and green light.

But if the light is focused on to one cone only, the eye makes mistakes. If, using this adaptive optics, a red laser beam is focused such that it hits a green cone only, a strange thing happens: even though the light is *red*, the eye sees a *green* colour!

Incidentally, Figure 394 is quite puzzling. In the human eye, the blood vessels are located *in front* of the cones. Why don't they appear in the picture? And why don't they
Challenge 1142 s disturb us in everyday life? (The picture does not show the other type of sensitive light cells, the *rods*, because the subject was in daylight; rods come to the front of the retina only in the dark, and then produce black and white pictures.)

Of all the mammals, only primates can see *colours*. Bulls for example, don't; they cannot distinguish red from blue. On the other hand, the best colour seers overall are the birds. They have cone receptors for red, blue, green, UV and, depending on the bird, for up to three more sets of colours. A number of birds (but not many) also have a better eye resolution than humans. Several birds also have a faster temporal resolution: humans see continuous motion when the images follow with 30 to 70 Hz (depending on the image content); some insects can distinguish images up to 300 Hz.

How does one make holograms and other three-dimensional images?

Our sense of sight gives us the impression of depth mainly due to three effects. First, the two eyes see different images. Second, the images formed in the eyes are position dependent. Third, our eye needs to focus differently for different distances.

A simple photograph does not capture any of the three effects. A photograph corresponds to the picture taken by one eye, from one particular spot and at one particular
Challenge 1143 e focus. In fact, all photographic cameras are essentially copies of a single static eye.

Any system wanting to produce the perception of depth must include at least one of

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 395 The recording and the observation of a hologram

the three effects just mentioned. In all systems so far, the third and weakest effect, varying focus with distance, is never used, as it is too weak. Stereo photography and virtual reality systems extensively use the first effect by sending two different images to the eyes. Also certain post cards and computer screens are covered by thin cylindrical lenses that allow one to send two different images to the two eyes, thus generating the same impression of depth.

But obviously the most spectacular effect is obtained whenever position dependent images can be created. Some virtual reality systems mimic this effect using a sensor attached to the head, and creating computer–generated images that depend on this position. However, such systems are not able to reproduce actual situations and thus pale when compared with the impression produced by holograms.

Holograms reproduce all that is seen from any point of a region of space. A *hologram* is thus a stored set of position dependent pictures of an object. It is produced by storing amplitude *and phase* of the light emitted by an object. To achieve this, the object is illuminated by a *coherent* light source, such as a laser, and the interference pattern is stored. Illuminating the developed photographic film by a coherent light source then allows one to see a full three-dimensional image. In particular, due to the reproduction of the situation, the image appears to float in free space. Holograms were developed in 1947 by the Hungarian physicist Dennis Gabor (1900–1979), who received the 1971 Nobel Prize for physics for this work.

Holograms can be made to work in reflection or transmission. The simplest holograms use only one wavelength. Most coloured holograms are rainbow holograms, showing false colours that are unrelated to the original objects. Real colour holograms, made with three different lasers, are rare but possible.

Is it possible to make *moving* holograms? Yes; however, the technical set-ups are still extremely expensive. So far, they exist only in a few laboratories and cost millions of euro. By the way, can you describe how you would distinguish a moving hologram from a real body, if you ever came across one, without touching it?

Challenge 1144 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 396 An X-ray image of a ten-year old boy with polydactyly (© Drgnu23 at Wikimedia)

Optical imaging

Producing images is an important part of modern society. The quality of images depends on the smart use of optics, electronics, computers and materials science. Despite long experience in this domain, there are still new results in the field. Images, i.e., two or three-dimensional reproductions, can be taken by at least six groups of techniques:

— *Photography* uses a light source, lenses and film – or another large area detector. Photography can be used in reflection, in transmission, with phase-dependence, with various illuminations, with detectors sensitive to various wavelengths, and in many other ways.
— *Optical microscopy* uses a light source, lenses and film (or another large area detector). If the illumination is through the sample, in transmission, one speaks of *bright-field microscopy*. (Variations use coloured or polarizing filters.) If the illumination is from the side, one speaks of *oblique microscopy*. If the illumination is confined to an outer ring of light, one speaks of *dark-field microscopy*. An even more elaborate illumination system, using plane waves, allows *phase-contrast microscopy*. (It was invented by Frits Zernike in the 1930s and earned him the Nobel Prize in Physics in 1953.) If one splits a polarized illumination beam into two components that pass the sample at close (but not identical) locations, and then recombines them afterwards, one speaks of *differential interference contrast microscopy*. If a sample is treated with a fluorescent dye, the illuminating light is filtered out, and only the fluorescence is observed, one speaks of *fluorescence microscopy*. The image quality of expensive microscopes can be further improved with the help of a computer, with deconvolution techniques.
— *Holography* uses lasers and large area detectors, as explained in the previous section. Holography allows to take three-dimensional images of objects. It is usually used in reflection, but can also be used in transmission.
— *Scanning techniques* construct images point by point through the motion of the detector, the light source or both. There are also several scanning microscopy techniques: *confocal laser scanning microscopy*, the fibre-based *near-field scanning optical*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 397 Sub-wavelength optical microscopy using stimulated emission depletion (right) compared to conventional confocal microscopy (left) (© MPI für biophysikalische Chemie/Stefan Hell)

microscopy, and combinations of them with fluorescence techniques or various deconvolution techniques. Many of these scanning microscopy techniques allow resolutions much lower than the wavelength of light, which is impossible with usual optical microscopy.

— *Tomography*, usually performed in transmission, uses a source and a line detector that are rotated together around an object. This allows to image cross sections of materials.

— *Telescopy* is used most of all in geodesy and astronomy. The most advanced astronomical telescopes can compensate star images for the effects of the turbulence of the atmosphere; they can also take images at various wavelengths, ranging from radio frequencies, infrared, visible, ultraviolet to X-rays. X-ray telescopes have to be operated outside the atmosphere, to avoid absorption by air, for example on rockets, satellites or high-altitude balloons.

In all methods, the race is for images with the highest resolution possible. The techniques of producing images with resolutions *less* than the wavelength of light have made great progress in recent years.

A recent technique, called *stimulated emission depletion microscopy*, allows spot sizes of molecular size. The conventional diffraction limit for microscopes is

$$d \geqslant \frac{\lambda}{2n \sin\alpha} \,, \tag{486}$$

where λ is the wavelength, n the index of refraction and α is the angle of observation. The new technique, a special type of fluorescence microscopy developed by Stefan Hell, modifies this expression to

$$d \geqslant \frac{\lambda}{2n \sin\alpha \sqrt{I/I_{\text{sat}}}} \,, \tag{487}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

so that a properly chosen saturation intensity allows one to reduce the diffraction limit to arbitrary low values. So far, light microscopy with a resolution of 16 nm has been performed, as shown in Figure 397. This and similar techniques should become commonplace in the near future.

Ref. 643

Why can we see each other?

Physicists have a strange use of the term 'black'. Most bodies at temperatures at which they are red hot or even hotter are excellent approximations of black bodies. For example, the tungsten in incandescent light bulbs, at around 2000 K, emits almost pure black body radiation; however, the glass then absorbs much of the ultraviolet and infrared components. Black bodies are also used to define the colour *white*. What we commonly call pure white is the colour emitted by a black body of 6500 K, namely the Sun. This definition is used throughout the world, e.g. by the Commission Internationale d'Eclairage. Hotter black bodies are bluish, colder ones are yellow, orange or red.* The stars in the sky are classified in this way, as summarized on page 205.

Ref. 696

Let us make a quick summary of black body radiation. Black body radiation has two important properties: first, the emitted light power increases with the fourth power of the temperature. With this relation alone you can check the temperature of the Sun, mentioned above, simply by comparing the size of the Sun with the width of your thumb when your arm is stretched out in front of you. Are you able to do this? (Hint: use the excellent approximation that the Earth's average temperature of about 14.0 °C is due to the Sun's irradiation.)

Challenge 1145 d

Ref. 697

The precise expression for the emitted energy density u per frequency ν can be deduced from the radiation law for black bodies discovered by Max Planck**

$$u(\nu, T) = \frac{8\pi h}{c^3} \frac{\nu^3}{e^{h\nu/kT} - 1} \,. \tag{488}$$

He made this important discovery, which we will discuss in more detail in the quantum part of our mountain ascent, simply by comparing this curve with experiment. The new constant h, *quantum of action* or *Planck's constant*, turns out to have the value $6.6 \cdot 10^{-34}$ Js, and is central to all quantum theory, as we will see. The other constant Planck introduced, the Boltzmann constant k, appears as a prefactor of temperature all over thermodynamics, as it acts as a conversion unit from temperature to energy.

Page 977

The radiation law gives for the total emitted energy density the expression

Challenge 1146 ny

* Most bodies are not black, because colour is not only determined by emission, but also by absorption of light.

** Max Planck (1858–1947), professor of physics in Berlin, was a central figure in thermostatics. He discovered and named *Boltzmann's constant k* and the *quantum of action h*, often called Planck's constant. His introduction of the quantum hypothesis gave birth to quantum theory. He also made the works of Einstein known in the physical community, and later organized a job for him in Berlin. He received the Nobel Prize for physics in 1918. He was an important figure in the German scientific establishment; he also was one of the very few who had the courage to tell Adolf Hitler *face to face* that it was a bad idea to fire Jewish professors. (He got an outburst of anger as answer.) Famously modest, with many tragedies in his personal life, he was esteemed by everybody who knew him.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

$$u(T) = T^4 \frac{8\pi^5 k^4}{15c^3 h^3} \tag{489}$$

Challenge 1147 ny from which equation (497) is deduced using $I = uc/4$. (Why?)

The second property of black body radiation is the value of the peak wavelength, i.e., the wavelength emitted with the highest intensity. This wavelength determines their Challenge 1148 ny colour; it is deduced from equation (488) to be

$$\lambda_{\max} = \frac{hc}{4.956\,k}\frac{1}{T} = \frac{2.90\,\mathrm{mm\,K}}{T} \quad \text{but} \quad \hbar\nu_{\max} = 2.82\,kT/h = (5.9 \cdot 10^{10}\,\mathrm{Hz/K}) \cdot T\,. \tag{490}$$

Either of these expressions is called *Wien's colour displacement rule* after its discoverer.* The colour change with temperature is used in optical thermometers; this is also the way the temperatures of stars are measured. For 37 °C, human body temperature, it gives a peak wavelength of 9.3 µm or 115 THz, which is therefore the colour of the bulk of the radiation emitted by every human being. (The peak wavelength does not correspond to Challenge 1149 s the peak frequency. Why?) On the other hand, following the telecommunication laws of many countries, any radiation emitter needs a licence to operate; it follows that strictly in Germany only dead people are legal, and only if their bodies are at absolute zero temperature.

Note that a black body or a star can be blue, white, yellow, orange or red. It is never Challenge 1150 ny green. Can you explain why?

Above, we predicted that any material made of charges emits radiation. Are you able to find a simple argument showing whether heat radiation is or is not this classically Challenge 1151 ny predicted radiation?

But let us come back to the question in the section title. The existence of thermal radiation implies that any hot body will cool, even if it is left in the most insulating medium there is, namely in vacuum. More precisely, if the vacuum is surrounded by a wall, the temperature of a body in the vacuum will gradually approach that of the wall.

Interestingly, when the temperature of the wall and of the body inside have become the same, something strange happens. The effect is difficult to check at home, but impres- Ref. 698 sive photographs exist in the literature.

One arrangement in which walls and the objects inside them are at the same temperature is an *oven*. It turns out that it is *impossible* to see objects in an oven using the light coming from thermal radiation. For example, if an oven and all its contents are red hot, taking a picture of the inside of the oven (without a flash!) does not reveal anything; no contrast nor brightness changes exist that allow one to distinguish the objects from the Challenge 1152 s walls or their surroundings. Can you explain the finding?

In short, we are able to see each other only because the light sources we use are at a *different* temperature from us. We can see each other only because we do *not* live in thermal equilibrium with our environment.

* Wilhelm Wien (b. 1864 Gaffken, d. 1928 München), East-Prussian physicist; he received the Nobel Prize for physics in 1911 for the discovery of this relation.

Note that the value appearing in Wien's rule can be uniquely calculated from equation (488), but cannot be expressed as a formula. Indeed, Wien's constant contains the solution of the equation $x = 5(1 - \mathrm{e}^{(} - x))$.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009





FIGURE 398 Bodies inside an oven at room temperature differ in colour, in contrast to bodies at high temperature (photo © Wolfgang Rueckner)

Light as weapon?

In many countries, there is more money to study assault weapons than to increase the education and wealth of their citizen. Several types of assault weapons using electromagnetic radiation are being researched. Two are particularly advanced.

The first weapon is a truck with a movable parabolic antenna on its roof, about 1 m in size, that emits a high power (a few kW) microwave (95 GHz) beam. The beam, like all microwave beams, is invisible; depending on power and beam shape, it is painful or lethal, up to a distance of a 100 m. This terrible device, with which the operator can make many many victims without even noticing, was ready in 2006. (Who expects that a parabolic antenna is dangerous?) Efforts to ban it across the world are slowly gathering momentum.

The second weapon under development is the so-called *pulsed impulse kill laser*. The idea is to take a laser that emits radiation that is not absorbed by air, steam or similar obstacles. An example is a pulsed deuterium fluoride laser that emits at 3.5 μm. This laser burns every material it hits; in addition, the evaporation of the plasma produced by the burn produces a strong hit, so that people hit by such a laser are hurt and hit at the same time. Fortunately, it is still difficult to make such a device rugged enough for practical use. Nevertheless, experts expect battle lasers to appear soon. In short, it is probable that radiation weapons will appear in the coming years.*

Challenges and fun curiosities about the eye and images

Ref. 648
Challenge 1153 s

Grass is usually greener on the other side of the fence. Can you give an explanation based on observations for this statement?

* What a man working on such developments tells his children when he comes home in the evening is not clear.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 399 How natural colours (top) change for three types of colour blind: deutan, protan and tritan (© Michael Douma)

* *

It is said that astronomers have telescopes so powerful that they could see whether somebody would be lighting a match on the Moon. Can this be true? Challenge 1154 s

* *

When two laser beams cross at a small angle, they can form light pulses that seem to move faster than light. Does this contradict special relativity? Ref. 651 Challenge 1155 s

* *

Colour blindness was discovered by the great English scientist John Dalton (1766–1844) – on himself. Can you imagine how he found out? It affects, in all its forms, one in 20 men. In many languages, a man who is colour blind is called *daltonic*. Women are almost never daltonic, as the property is linked to defects on the X chromosome. If you are colour blind, you can check to which type you belong with the help of Figure 399. Challenge 1156 ny Ref. 653

* *

Light beams, such as those emitted from lasers, are usually thought of as lines. However, light beams can also be *tubes*. Tubular laser beams, or Bessel beams of high order, are used in modern research to guide plasma channels.

* *

Is it really possible to see stars from the bottom of a deep pit or of a well, even during the day, as is often stated? Challenge 1157 s

* *

Imaging is an important part of modern industry. Without laser printers, photocopying machines, CD players, DVD players, microscopes, digital photographic cameras, film

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

and video cameras, lithography machines for integrated circuit production, telescopes, film projectors, our world would look much more boring. And there are not enough experts in the world on this fascinating field. Ref. 654

* *

The simplest imaging system are eye glasses. A child that has no proper glasses might miss an important experience: seeing the stars. That is a great loss: such a child will not understand the statement by Immanuel Kant that was quote above: 'Two things fill the mind with ever new and increasing admiration and awe, the more often and persistently thought considers them: the starred sky above me and the moral law inside me.' Page 564



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 27

CHARGES ARE DISCRETE – THE LIMITS OF CLASSICAL ELECTRODYNAMICS

One of the most important results of physics has already been mentioned a number of times: *electric charge is discrete*. Charge does not vary continuously, but changes in fixed steps. Not only does nature show a smallest value of entropy and smallest amounts of matter; nature also shows a smallest charge. Electric charge is quantized.

In metals, the quantization of charge is noticeable in the flow of electrons. In electrolytes, i.e. electrically conducting liquids, the quantization of charge appears in the flow of charged atoms, usually called *ions*. All batteries have electrolytes inside; also water is an electrolyte, though a poorly conducting one. In plasmas, like fire or fluorescent lamps, both ions and electrons move and show the discreteness of charge. Also in radiation – from the electron beams inside TVs, channel rays formed in special glass tubes, and cosmic radiation, up to radioactivity – charges are quantized.

From all known experiments, the same smallest value for charge change has been found. The result is

$$\Delta q \geqslant e = 1.6 \times 10^{-19}\,\mathrm{C}\,. \tag{491}$$

In short, like all flows in nature, the flow of electricity is due to a flow of discrete particles.

A smallest charge change has a simple implication: classical electrodynamics is *wrong*. A smallest charge implies that no infinitely small test charges exist. But such infinitely small test charges are necessary to define electric and magnetic fields. The limit on charge size also implies that there is no correct way of defining an instantaneous electric current and, as a consequence, that the values of electric and magnetic field are always somewhat fuzzy. Maxwell's evolution equations are thus only approximate.

We will study the main effects of the discreteness of charge in the part on quantum theory. Only a few effects of the quantization of charge can be treated in classical physics. An instructive example follows.

Page 1041

How fast do charges move?

In vacuum, such as inside a colour television, charged particles accelerated by a voltage of 30 kV move with a third of the speed of light. In modern particle accelerators charges move so rapidly that their speed is indistinguishable from that of light for all practical purposes.

Challenge 1158 s

Inside a metal, electric signals move with speeds of the order of the speed of light. The precise value depends on the capacity and impedance of the cable and is usually in the range $0.3c$ to $0.5c$. This high speed is due to the ability of metals to easily take in arriving

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

charges and to let others depart. The ability for rapid reaction is due to the high mobility of the charges inside metals, which in turn is due to the small mass and size of these charges, the electrons.

The high signal speed in metals appears to contradict another determination. The drift speed of the electrons in a metal wire obviously obeys

$$v = \frac{I}{Ane} \,, \tag{492}$$

where I is the current, A the cross-section of the wire, e the charge of a single electron and n the number density of electrons. The electron density in copper is $8.5 \cdot 10^{28}\ \mathrm{m}^{-3}$. Using a typical current of 0.5 A and a typical cross-section of a square millimetre, we get a drift speed of 0.37 μm/s. In other words, electrons move a thousand times slower than ketchup inside its bottle. Worse, if a room lamp used direct current instead of alternate current, the electrons would take several days to get from the switch to the bulb! Nevertheless, the lamp goes on or off almost immediately after the switch is activated. Similarly, the electrons from an email transported with direct current would arrive much later than a paper letter sent at the same time; nevertheless, the email arrives quickly. Are you able to explain the apparent contradiction between drift velocity and signal velocity?

Challenge 1159 s

Inside liquids, charges move with a different speed from that inside metals, and their charge to mass ratio is also different. We all know this from direct experience. Our *nerves* work by using electric signals and take (only) a few milliseconds to respond to a stimulus, even though they are metres long. A similar speed is observed inside semiconductors and inside batteries. In all these systems, moving charge is transported by *ions*; they are charged atoms. Ions, like atoms, are large and composed entities, in contrast to the tiny electrons.

In other matter systems, charges move both as electrons and as ions. Examples are neon lamps, fire, plasmas and the Sun. Inside atoms, electrons behave even more strangely. One tends to think that they orbit the nucleus (as we will see later) at a rather high speed, as the orbital radius is so small. However, it turns out that in most atoms many electrons do not orbit the nucleus at all. The strange story behind atoms and their structure will be told in the quantum part of our mountain ascent.

Page 1042

Challenges and curiosities about charge discreteness

Challenge 1160 s How would you show experimentally that electrical charge comes in smallest chunks?

* *

The discreteness of charge implies that one can estimate the size of atoms by observing galvanic deposition. How?

Challenge 1161 ny

* *

Cosmic radiation consists of charged particles hitting the Earth. (We will discuss this in more detail later.) Astrophysicists explain that these particles are accelerated by the magnetic fields around the Galaxy. However, the expression of the Lorentz acceleration shows that magnetic fields can only change the direction of the velocity of a charge, not

Page 1222
Ref. 644

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1162 ny its magnitude. How can nature get acceleration nevertheless?

* *

What would be the potential of the Earth in volt if we could take away all the electrons
Challenge 1163 s of a drop of water?

* *

When a voltage is applied to a resistor, how long does it take until the end value of the current, given by Ohm's 'law', is reached? The first to answer this question was Paul Drude.* in the years around 1900. He reasoned that when the current is switched on, the speed v of an electron increases as $v = (eE/m)t$, where E is the electrical field, e the charge and m the mass of the electron. Drude's model assumes that the increase of electron speed stops when the electron hits an atom, loses its energy and begins to be accelerated again. Drude deduced that the average time τ up to the collision is related to the specific resistance by

$$\rho = \frac{E}{j} = \frac{E}{envv} = \frac{2m}{\tau e^2 n} \,, \tag{493}$$

with n being the electron number density. The right side does not depend on E any more; it is a constant. Drude had thus explained *Ohm's relation* $U = RI$ (or $E = j\rho$) from material properties, by assuming that resistance is due to moving electrons that continuously collide and speed up again. Inserting numbers for copper ($n = 10.3 \cdot 10^{28}\,/\mathrm{m}^{-3}$ and $\rho = 0.16 \cdot 10^{-7}\,\Omega\mathrm{m}$), one gets a time $\tau = 42\,\mathrm{ps}$. This time is so short that the switch-on process can usually be neglected.

* *

Does it make sense to write Maxwell's equations in vacuum? Both electrical and magnetic fields require charges in order to be measured. But in vacuum there are no charges at all. Worse, fields are defined by using infinitesimally small test charges. But such charges do not exist. In fact, only quantum theory solves this apparent contradiction. Are you able
Challenge 1164 d to imagine how?



* Paul Karl Ludwig Drude (1863–1906), German physicist. A result of his electron gas model of metals was the prediction, roughly correct, that the ratio between the thermal conductivity and the electric conductivity at a given temperature should be the same for all metals. Drude also introduced c as the symbol for the speed of light.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 28

ELECTROMAGNETIC EFFECTS

Is lightning a discharge? – Electricity in the atmosphere

Looking carefully, the atmosphere is full of electrical effects. The most impressive electrical phenomenon we observe, lightning, is now reasonably well understood. Inside a thunderstorm cloud, especially inside tall *cumulonimbus* clouds,* charges are separated by collision between the large 'graupel' ice crystals falling due to their weight and the small 'hail' ice crystallites rising due to thermal upwinds. Since the collision takes part in an electric field, charges are separated in a way similar to the mechanism in the Kelvin generator. Discharge takes place when the electric field becomes too high, taking a strange path influenced by ions created in the air by cosmic rays. It seems that cosmic rays are at least partly responsible for the zigzag shape of lightning.

Ref. 655 Ref. 657 Page 673

Lightning flashes have strange properties. First, they appear at fields around 200 kV/m (at low altitude) instead of the 2 MV/m of normal sparks. Second, lightning emits radio pulses. Third, they emit gamma rays. Russian researchers, from 1992 onwards explained all three effects by a newly discovered discharge mechanism. At length scales of 50 m and more, cosmic rays can trigger the appearance of lightning; the relativistic energy of these rays allows for a discharge mechanism that does not exist for low energy electrons. At relativistic energy, so-called runaway breakdown leads to discharges at much lower fields than usual laboratory sparks. The multiplication of these relativistic electrons also leads to the observed radio and gamma ray emissions.

Ref. 658

Incidentally, you have a 75 % chance of survival after being hit by lightning, especially if you are completely wet, as in that case the current will flow outside the skin. Usually, wet people who are hit lose all their clothes, as the evaporating water tears them off. Rapid resuscitation is essential to help somebody to recover after a hit.**

* Clouds have Latin names. They were introduced in 1802 by the English explorer Luke Howard (1772–1864), who found that all clouds could be seen as variations of three types, which he called *cirrus*, *cumulus* and *stratus*. He called the combination of all three, the rain cloud, *nimbus* (from the Latin 'big cloud'). Today's internationally agreed system has been slightly adjusted and distinguishes clouds by the height of their lower edge. The clouds starting above a height of 6 km are the cirrus, the cirrocumulus and the cirrostratus; those starting at heights of between 2 and 4 km are the altocumulus, the altostratus and the nimbostratus; clouds starting below a height of 2 km are the stratocumulus, the stratus and the cumulus. The rain or thunder cloud, which crosses all heights, is today called *cumulonimbus*. For beautiful views of clouds, see the www.goes.noaa.gov and www.osei.noaa.gov websites.

Ref. 656

** If you are ever hit by lightning and survive, go to the hospital! Many people died three days later having failed to do so. A lightning strike often leads to coagulation effects in the blood. These substances block the kidneys, and one can die three days later because of kidney failure. The remedy is to have dialysis treatment.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 400 Cumulonimbus clouds from ground and from space (NASA)

As a note, you might know how to measure the distance of a lightning by counting the seconds between the lightning and the thunder and multiplying this by the speed of sound, 330 m/s; it is less well known that one can estimate the *length* of the lightning bolt by measuring the *duration* of the thunder, and multiplying it by the same factor.

In the 1990s more electrical details about thunderstorms became known. Airline pilots and passengers sometime see weak and coloured light emissions spreading from the top of thunderclouds. There are various types of such emissions: blue *jets* and mostly red *sprites* and *elves*, which are somehow due to electric fields between the cloud top and the ionosphere. The details are still under investigation, and the mechanisms are not yet clear.*

All these details are part of the electrical circuit around the Earth. This fascinating part of geophysics would lead us too far from the aim of our mountain ascent. But every physicist should know that there is a vertical electric field of between 100 and 300 V/m on a clear day, as discovered already in 1752. (Can you guess why it is not noticeable in everyday life? And why despite its value it cannot be used to extract large amounts of energy?) The field is directed from the ionosphere down towards the ground; in fact the Earth is permanently negatively charged, and in clear weather current flows downwards through the clear atmosphere, trying to *discharge* our planet. The current of about 1 kA is spread over the whole planet; it is possible due to the ions formed by cosmic radiation. (The resistance between the ground and the ionosphere is about 200 Ω, so the total voltage drop is about 200 kV.) At the same time, the Earth is constantly being *charged* by several effects: there is a dynamo effect due to the tides of the atmosphere and there are currents induced by the magnetosphere. But the most important effect is lightning. In other words, contrary to what one may think, lightning does not discharge the ground, it actually charges it up!** Of course, lightning does discharge the cloud to ground potential difference; but by doing so, it actually sends a negative charge down to the Earth as a whole. Thunderclouds are batteries; the energy from the batteries comes from the thermal uplifts mentioned above, which transport charge *against* the global ambient electrical field.

Challenge 1165 s

Ref. 659

* For images, have a look at the interesting sprite.gi.alaska.edu/html/sprites.htm, www.fma-research.com/spriteres.htm and paesko.ee.psu.edu/Nature websites.

Challenge 1166 s ** The Earth is thus charged to about −1 MC. Can you confirm this?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Using a few electrical measurement stations that measure the variations of the electrical field of the Earth it is possible to locate the position of all the lightning that comes down towards the Earth at a given moment. Present research also aims at measuring the activity of the related electrical sprites and elves in this way. Ref. 660

The ions in air play a role in the charging of thunderclouds via the charging of ice crystals and rain drops. In general, all small particles in the air are electrically charged. When aeroplanes and helicopters fly, they usually hit more particles of one charge than of the other. As a result, aeroplanes and helicopters are charged up during flight. When a helicopter is used to rescue people from a raft in high seas, the rope pulling the people upwards must first be earthed by hanging it in the water; if this is not done, the people on the raft could die from an electrical shock when they touch the rope, as has happened a few times in the past.

The charges in the atmosphere have many other effects. Recent experiments have confirmed what was predicted back in the early twentieth century: lightning emits X-rays. The confirmation is not easy though; it is necessary to put a detector near the lightning flash. To achieve this, the lightning has to be directed into a given region. This is possible using a missile pulling a metal wire, the other end of which is attached to the ground. These experimental results are now being collated into a new description of lightning which also explains the red-blue sprites above thunderclouds. In particular, the processes also imply that inside clouds, electrons can be accelerated up to energies of a few MeV. Ref. 661 Ref. 662

Why are sparks and lightning blue? This turns out to be a material property: the colour comes from the material that happens to be excited by the energy of the discharge, usually air. This excitation is due to the temperature of 30 kK inside the channel of a typical lightning flash. For everyday sparks, the temperature is much lower. Depending on the situation, the colour may arise from the gas between the two electrodes, such as oxygen or nitrogen, or it may due to the material evaporated from the electrodes by the discharge. For an explanation of such colours, as for the explanation of all colours due to materials, we need to wait for the next part of our walk, on quantum theory.

But not only electric fields are dangerous. Also time-varying electromagnetic fields can be. In 1997, in beautiful calm weather, a Dutch hot air balloon approached the powerful radio transmitter in Hilversum. After travelling for a few minutes near to the antenna, the gondola suddenly detached from the balloon, killing all the passengers inside.

An investigation team reconstructed the facts a few weeks later. In modern gas balloons the gondola is suspended by high quality nylon ropes. To avoid damage by lightning and in order to avoid electrostatic charging problems all these nylon ropes contain thin metal wires which form a large equipotential surface around the whole balloon. Unfortunately, in the face of the radio transmitter, these thin metal wires absorbed radio energy from the transmitter, became red hot, and melted the nylon wires. It was the first time that this had ever been observed.

Does ball lightning exist?

For hundreds of years, people have reported sightings of so-called *ball lightning*. Usually they were noticed during thunderstorms, often after a lightning had struck. With a few exceptions, nobody took these reports seriously, because no reproducible data existed. Ref. 663

When microwave ovens become popular, several methods to produce ball-shaped dis-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 401 A floating plasma cloud produced in the laboratory (© Sergei Emelin and Alexei Pirozerski)

charges became known. To observe one, just stick a toothpick into a candle, light the toothpick, and put it into (somebody else's) microwave oven at maximum power. This set-up produces a beautiful ball-like discharge. However, humans do not live in a microwave oven.

Ref. 664 The experimental situation changed completely in the years 1999 to 2001. In those years the Russian physicists Anton Egorov and Gennady Shabanov discovered a way to produce plasma clouds, or *plasmoids*, floating in air, using three main ingredients: water, metal and high voltage. If high voltage is applied to submerged metal electrodes of the proper shape and make, plasma clouds emerge from the water, about 10 to 20 cm in size, float above the surface, and disappear after about half a second. Two examples can be seen in Figure 401.

The phenomenon of floating plasmoids is still being studied. There are variations in shape, colour, size and lifetime. The spectrum of observations and techniques will surely evolve in the coming years.

Ref. 665 An even more astonishing effect was published in 2007. A Brazilian research team found a way to make golf-ball sized discharges that seem to roll along the floor for as long as 8 s. Their method was beautifully simple: with the help of a 25 V power supply, they passed a current of 140 A through an arc at the surface of a silicon wafer. They discovered that small silicon particles detach and move away, while being surrounded by a luminous glow. These luminous clouds can wander around the table and floor of the laboratory, until they extinguish.

It seems that these phenomena could explain a number of ball lightning observations.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Does gravity make charges radiate?

We learned in the section on general relativity that gravitation has the same effects as acceleration. This means that a charge kept fixed at a certain height is equivalent to a charge accelerated by $9.8\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$, which would imply that it radiates electromagnetically, since all accelerated charges radiate. However, the world around us is full of charges at fixed heights, and there is no such radiation. How is this possible?

Ref. 666 The question has been a pet topic for many years. Generally speaking, the concept of radiation is not observer invariant: If one observer detects radiation, a second one does not necessarily do so as well. The exact way a radiation field changes from one observer to the other depends on the type of relative motion and on the field itself.

A precise solution of the problem shows that for a uniformly accelerated charge, an observer undergoing the same acceleration only detects an electrostatic field. In contrast, an Ref. 667 inertial observer detects a radiation field. Since gravity is (to a high precision) equivalent to uniform acceleration, we get a simple result: gravity does not make electrical charges radiate for an observer at rest with respect to the charge, as is observed. The results holds true also in the quantum theoretical description.

Research questions

The classical description of electrodynamics is coherent and complete; nevertheless there are still many subjects of research. Here are a few of them.

The origin of the magnetic field of the Earth, the other planets, the Sun and even of the galaxy is a fascinating topic. The way that the convection of fluids inside the planets generates magnetic fields, an intrinsically three-dimensional problem, the influence of turbulence, of nonlinearities and of chaos makes it a surprisingly complex question.

The details of the generation of the magnetic field of the Earth, usually called the *geodynamo*, began to appear only in the second half of the twentieth century, when the knowl- Ref. 582 edge of the Earth's interior reached a sufficient level. The Earth's interior starts below the Earth's crust. The *crust* is typically 30 to 40 km thick (under the continents), though it is thicker under high mountains and thinner near volcanoes or under the oceans. As already mentioned, the crust consists of large segments, the *plates*, that move with respect to one other. The Earth's interior is divided into the *mantle* – the first 2900 km from the surface – and the *core*. The core is made up of a liquid *outer* core, 2210 km thick, and a solid *inner* core of 1280 km radius. (The temperature of the core is not well known; it is Challenge 1167 d believed to be 6 to 7 kK. Can you find a way to determine it? The temperature might have decreased a few hundred kelvin during the last 3000 million years.)

The Earth's core consists mainly of iron that has been collected from the asteroids that collided with the Earth during its youth. It seems that the liquid and electrically conducting outer core acts as a dynamo that keeps the magnetic field going. The magnetic energy comes from the kinetic energy of the outer core, which rotates with respect to the Earth's surface; the fluid can act as a dynamo because, apart from rotating, it also *convects* from deep inside the Earth to more shallow depths, driven by the temperature gradients between the hot inner core and the cooler mantle. Huge electric currents flow in complex ways through these liquid layers, maintained by friction, and create the magnetic field. Why this field switches orientation at irregular intervals of between a few tens of thousands and a few million years, is one of the central questions. The answers are difficult;

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 402 The structure of our planet (© MPI-Chemie, Mainz/GEO)

experiments are not yet possible, 150 years of measurements is a short time when compared with the last transition – about 730 000 years ago – and computer simulations are extremely involved. Since the field measurements started, the dipole moment of the magnetic field has steadily diminished, presently by 5% a year, and the quadrupole moment has steadily increased. Maybe we are heading towards a surprise.* (By the way, the study of *galactic* magnetic fields is even more complex, and still in its infancy.)

Another important puzzle about electricity results from the equivalence of mass and energy. It is known from experiments that the size d of electrons is surely smaller than Ref. 669 10^{-22} m. This means that the electric field surrounding it has an energy content E given Challenge 1168 e by at least

$$E_{\text{nergy}} = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_0 \int E^2_{\text{lectric field}}\, \mathrm{d}V = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_0 \int_d^\infty \left(\frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_o}\frac{q}{r^2}\right)^2 4\pi r^2 \mathrm{d}r$$
$$= \frac{q^2}{8\pi\varepsilon_o}\frac{1}{d} > 1.2\,\mu\mathrm{J}\,. \qquad (494)$$

On the other hand, the *mass* of an electron, usually given as $511\,\mathrm{keV/c^2}$, corresponds to

* In 2005, it has been reported that the inner core of the Earth seems to rotate faster than the Earth's crust Ref. 668 by up to half a degree per year.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

an energy of only 82 fJ, ten million times *less* than the value just calculated. In other words, classical electrodynamics has considerable difficulty describing electrons. In fact, a consistent description of charged point particles within classical electrodynamics is impossible. This pretty topic receives only a rare – but then often passionate – interest nowadays, because the puzzle is solved in a different way in the upcoming, quantum part of our mountain ascent.

Ref. 670

Even though the golden days of materials science are over, the various electromagnetic properties of matter and their applications in devices do not seem to be completely explored yet. About once a year a new effect is discovered that merits inclusion in the list of electromagnetic matter properties of Table 71. Among others, some newer semiconductor technologies will still have an impact on electronics, such as the recent introduction of low cost light detecting integrated circuits built in CMOS (complementary metal oxide silicon) technology.

Page 787

The building of light sources of high quality has been a challenge for many centuries and remains one for the future. Light sources that are intense, tunable and with large coherence length or sources that emit extreme wavelengths are central to many research pursuits. As one example of many, the first X-ray lasers have recently been built; however, they are several hundred metres in size and use modified particle accelerators. The construction of compact X-ray lasers is still many years off – if it is possible at all.

Electrodynamics and general relativity interact in many ways. Only a few cases have been studied up to now. They are important for black holes and for empty space. For example, it seems that magnetic fields increase the stiffness of empty space. Many such topics will appear in the future.

Ref. 671

But maybe the biggest challenge imaginable in classical electrodynamics is to decode the currents inside the brain. Will it be possible to read our thoughts with an apparatus placed outside the head? One could start with a simpler challenge: Would it be possible to distinguish the thought 'yes' from the thought 'no' by measuring electrical or magnetic fields around the head? In other words, is mind-reading possible? Maybe the twenty-first century will come up with a positive answer. If so, the team performing the feat will be instantly famous.

Challenge 1169 r

Levitation

We have seen that it is possible to move certain objects without touching them, using a magnetic or electric field or, of course, using gravity. Is it also possible, without touching an object, to keep it fixed, floating in mid-air? Does this type of rest exist?

It turns out that there are several methods of levitating objects. These are commonly divided into two groups: those that consume energy and those who do not. Among the methods that consume energy is the floating of objects on a jet of air or of water, the floating of objects through sound waves, e.g. on top of a siren, or through a laser beam coming from below, and the floating of conducting material, even of liquids, in strong radio-frequency fields. Levitation of liquids or solids by strong ultrasound waves is presently becoming popular in laboratories. All these methods give *stationary* levitation. Another group of energy consuming methods sense the way a body is falling and kick it up again in the right way via a feedback loop; these methods are *non-stationary* and usually use magnetic fields to keep the objects from falling. The magnetic train being built in Shang-

Ref. 672

Ref. 673

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Ref. 674 hai by a German consortium is levitated this way. The whole train, including the passengers, is levitated and then moved forward using electromagnets. It is thus possible, using magnets, to levitate many tens of tonnes of material.

For levitation methods that do *not* consume energy – all such methods are necessarily stationary – a well-known limitation can be found by studying Coulomb's 'law' of electrostatics: no static arrangement of electric fields can levitate a *charged* object in free space or in air. The same result is valid for gravitational fields and *massive* objects;* in other words, we cannot produce a local minimum of potential energy in the middle of a Ref. 675 box using electric or gravitational fields. This impossibility is called *Earnshaw's theorem*. Speaking mathematically, the solutions of the Laplace equation $\Delta\varphi = 0$, the so-called *harmonic functions*, have minima or maxima only at the border, and never inside the domain of definition. (You proved this yourself on page 149.) The theorem can also be proved by noting that given a potential minimum in free space, Gauss' theorem for a sphere around that minimum requires that a source of the field be present inside, which is in contradiction with the original assumption.

We can deduce that it is also impossible to use electric fields to levitate an electrically *neutral* body in air: the potential energy U of such a body, with volume V and dielectric constant ε, in an environment of dielectric constant ε_0, is given by

$$\frac{U}{V} = -\frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_0) E^2 \quad . \tag{495}$$

Challenge 1170 ny Since the electric field E never has a maximum in the absence of space charge, and since for all materials $\varepsilon > \varepsilon_0$, there cannot be a minimum of potential energy in free space for a neutral body.**

To sum up, using static electric or static gravitational fields it is impossible to keep an object from falling; neither quantum mechanics, which incorporates phenomena such as antimatter, nor general relativity, including phenomena such as black holes, change this basic result.

For static *magnetic* fields, the argument is analogous to electrical fields: the potential energy U of a magnetizable body of volume V and permeability μ in a medium with Challenge 1172 ny permeability μ_0 containing no current is given by

$$\frac{U}{V} = -\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{\mu} - \frac{1}{\mu_0}\right) B^2 \tag{496}$$

and due to the inequality $\Delta B^2 \geqslant 0$, isolated maxima of a static magnetic field are not possible, only isolated minima. Therefore, it is impossible to levitate paramagnetic ($\mu > \mu_0$) or ferromagnetic ($\mu \gg \mu_0$) materials such as steel, including bar magnets, which are Challenge 1173 e all attracted, and not repelled to magnetic field maxima.

Page 95 * To the disappointment of many science-fiction addicts, this would even be true if a negative mass existed. And even though gravity is not really due to a field, but to space-time curvature, the result still holds in general relativity.

Ref. 676 ** It is possible, however, to 'levitate' gas bubbles in liquids – 'trap' them to prevent them from rising would be a better expression – because in such a case the dielectric constant of the environment is higher than that Challenge 1171 ny of the gas. Can you find a liquid–gas combination where bubbles fall instead of rise?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 403 Stable diamagnetic levitation of a graphite bar over rectangular permanent magnets (above) and of two graphite plates, one seen from above and another from the side (center); below, levitation of a 4 mm diamater NdFeB permanent magnet, above a graphite plate and between two graphite plates, near a large ring magnet (not shown) (© Joachim Schlichting from Ref. 678)

There are thus two ways to realize magnetic levitation: levitating a diamagnet or using a time-dependent field. Diamagnetic materials ($\mu < \mu_0$, or $\mu_r = \mu/\mu_0 < 1$) were discovered shortly after Earnshaw published his theorem, and allow to circumvent it. Indeed, diamagnetic materials, such as graphite or water, can be levitated by static magnetic fields because they are attracted to magnetic field minima. In fact, it is possible to levitate magnets if one uses a combination containing diamagnets. A few cases that can easily be replicated on a kitchen table are shown in Figure 403.

Page 688
Ref. 677
Ref. 678

Another well-known example of diamagnetic levitation is the levitation of superconductors. Indeed, superconductors, at least those of type I, are perfects diamagnets ($\mu = 0$). In some cases, superconductors can even be *suspended* in mid-air, below a magnet. Also

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 404 Trapping a metal sphere using a variable speed drill and a plastic saddle



FIGURE 405 Floating 'magic' nowadays available in toy shops, left, with a spinning top and, right, with a spinning magnetic sphere levitating above a large ring magnet (© Kay Kublenz)

single atoms with a magnetic moment are diamagnets; they are routinely levitated this way and have also been photographed in this state. Single neutrons, which have a magnetic dipole moment, have been kept in magnetic bottles through magnetic levitation, until they decay.

Ref. 679

Diamagnets levitate if $\nabla B^2 > 2\mu_0\rho g/\chi$, where ρ is the mass density of the object and $\chi = 1 - \mu/\mu_0$ its magnetic susceptibility. Since χ is typically about 10^{-5} and ρ of order $1000\,\mathrm{kg/m^3}$, field gradients of about $1000\,\mathrm{T^2/m}$ are needed. In other words, levitation requires fields changes of 10 T over 10 cm, which is nowadays common for high field laboratory magnets.

Challenge 1174 ny

Recently, scientists have levitated pieces of wood and of plastic, strawberries, water droplets, liquid helium droplets as large as 2 cm, grasshoppers, fish and frogs (all alive and without any harm) using magnetic levitation. Indeed, animals, like humans, are all made of diamagnetic material. Humans themselves have not yet been levitated, but the feat, expected to require 40 T and large amounts of electrical power, is being planned and worked on. In fact, a similar feat has already been achieved: diamagetic levitation is being explored for the levitation of passenger trains, especially in Japan, though with little commercial success.

Ref. 680

Ref. 674

Time-dependent electrical or magnetic fields, e.g. periodic fields, can lead to levitation

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Ref. 672 in many different ways without any consumption of energy. This is one of the methods used in the magnetic bearings of turbomolecular vacuum pumps. Also single charged particles, such as ions and electrons, are now regularly levitated with Paul traps and Pen-
Ref. 672 ning traps. The mechanical analogy is shown in Figure 404.

Ref. 681 Figure 405 shows a toy that allows you to personally levitate a spinning top or a spinning magnetic sphere in mid-air above a ring magnet, a quite impressive demonstration of levitation for anybody looking at it. The photo shows that is not hard to build such a
Ref. 682 device yourself.

Even free electrons can be levitated, letting them float above the surface of fluid he-
Ref. 683 lium. In the most recent twist of the science of levitation, in 1995 Stephen Haley predicted that the suspension height of small magnetic particles above a superconducting ring should be quantized. However, the prediction has not been verified by experiment yet.

For the sake of completeness we mention that nuclear forces cannot be used for levitation in everyday life, as their range is limited to a few femtometres. However, we will
Page 1250 see later that the surface matter of the Sun is prevented from falling into the centre by these interactions; we could thus say that it is indeed levitated by nuclear interactions.

Matter, levitation and electromagnetic effects

The levitation used by magicians mostly falls into another class. When David Copperfield, a magician performing for the MTV generation at the end of the twentieth century, 'flies' during his performances, he does so by being suspended on thin fishing lines that are
Challenge 1175 s rendered invisible by clever lighting arrangements. (How could one check this?) In fact, if we want to be precise, we should count fishing lines, plastic bags, as well as every table and chair as levitation devices. (Tabloid journalists would even call them 'anti-gravity' devices.) Contrary to our impression, a hanging or lying object is not really in contact with the suspension, if we look at the critical points with a microscope.* More about this in the quantum part of our walk.

But if this is the case, why don't we fall through a table or through the floor? We started the study of mechanics by stating that a key property of matter its *solidity*, i.e., the impossibility of having more than one body at the same place at the same time. But what is the origin of solidity? Again, we will be able to answer the question only in the
Page 1152 upcoming, quantum part of our adventure, but we can already collect the first clues at this point.

Solidity is due to electricity. Many experiments show that matter is constituted of charged particles; indeed, matter can be moved and influenced by electromagnetic fields
Ref. 684 in many ways. Over the years, material scientists have produced a long list of such effects, all of which are based on the existence of charged constituents. Can you find or imagine
Challenge 1177 r a new one? For example, can electric charge change the colour of objects?

Challenge 1176 ny * The issue is far from simple: which one of the levitation methods described above is used by tables or chairs?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 71 Selected matter properties related to electromagnetism, showing among other things the role it plays in the constitution of matter; at the same time a short overview of atomic, solid state, fluid and business physics

Property	Example	Definition
thermal radiation or heat radiation or incandescence	every object	temperature-dependent radiation emitted by any macroscopic amount of matter
Interactions with charges and currents		
electrification	separating metals from insulators	spontaneous charging
triboelectricity	glass rubbed on cat fur	charging through rubbing
barometer light	mercury slipping along glass	gas discharge due to triboelectricity Ref. 685
insulation	air	no current flow below critical voltage drop
semiconductivity	diamond, silicon or gallium arsenide	current flows only when material is impure ('doped')
conductivity	copper, metals	current flows easily
superconductivity	niobium	current flows indefinitely
ionization	fire flames	current flows easily
localization (weak, Anderson)	disordered solids	resistance of disordered solids
resistivity, Joule effect	graphite	heating due to current flow
thermoelectric effects: Peltier effect, Seebeck effect, Thomson effect	ZnSb, PbTe, PbSe, BiSeTe, Bi_2Te_3, etc.	cooling due to current flow, current flow due to temperature difference, or due to temperature gradients
acoustoelectric effect	CdS	sound generation by currents, and vice versa
magnetoresistance	iron, metal multilayers	resistance changes with applied magnetic field Ref. 686
recombination	fire alarms	charge carriers combine to make neutral atoms or molecules
annihilation	positron tomography	particle and antiparticle, e.g. electron and positron, disappear into photons
Penning effect	Ne, Ar	ionization through collision with metastable atoms
Richardson effect, thermal emission	BaO_2, W, Mo, used in tv and electron microscopes	emission of electrons from hot metals
skin effect	Cu	high current density on exterior of wire
pinch effect	InSb, plasmas	high current density on interior of wire
Josephson effect	Nb-Oxide-Nb	tunnel current flows through insulator between two superconductors
Sasaki–Shibuya effect	n-Ge, n-Si	anisotropy of conductivity due to applied electric field
switchable magnetism	InAs:Mn	voltage switchable magnetization Ref. 687

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

PROPERTY	EXAMPLE	DEFINITION
Interactions with magnetic fields		
Hall effect	silicon; used for magnetic field measurements	voltage perpendicular to current flow in applied magnetic field
Zeeman effect	Cd	change of emission frequency with magnetic field
Paschen–Back effect	atomic gases	change of emission frequency in strong magnetic fields
ferromagnetism	Fe, Ni, Co, Gd	spontaneous magnetization; material strongly attracted by magnetic fields
paramagnetism	Fe, Al, Mg, Mn, Cr	induced magnetization parallel to applied field; attracted by magnetic fields
diamagnetism	water, Au, graphite, NaCl	induced magnetization opposed to applied field; repelled by magnetic fields
magnetostriction	CeB_6, $CePd_2Al_3$	change of shape or volume by applied magnetic field
magnetoelastic effect	Fe, Ni	change of magnetization by tension or pressure
acoustomagnetic effect	metal alloys, anti-theft stickers	excitation of mechanical oscillations through magnetic field
spin valve effect	metal multilayers	electrical resistance depends on spin direction of electrons with respect to applied magnetic field
magneto-optical activity or Faraday effect or Faraday rotation	flint glass	polarization angle is rotated with magnetic field; different refraction index for right and left circularly polarized light, as in magneto-optic (MO) recording
magnetic circular dichroism	gases	different absorption for right- and left-circularly polarized light; essentially the same as the previous one
Majorana effect	colloids	specific magneto-optic effect
photoelectromagnetic effect	InSb	current flow due to light irradiation of semiconductor in a magnetic field
Voigt effect	vapours	birefringence induced by applied magnetic field
Cotton–Mouton effect	liquids	birefringence induced by applied magnetic field
Hanle effect	Hg	change of polarization of fluorescence with magnetic field
Shubnikov–de Haas effect	Bi	periodic change of resistance with applied magnetic field

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

PROPERTY	EXAMPLE	DEFINITION
thermomagnetic effects: Ettinghausen effect, Righi–Leduc effect, Nernst effect, magneto–Seebeck effect	BiSb alloys	relation between temperature, applied fields and electric current
Ettinghausen–Nernst effect	Bi	appearance of electric field in materials with temperature gradients in magnetic fields
photonic Hall effect	CeF_3	transverse light intensity depends on the applied magnetic field Ref. 688
magnetocaloric effect	gadolinium, GdSiGe alloys	material cools when magnetic field is switched off Ref. 689
cyclotron resonance	semiconductors, metals	selective absorption of radio waves in magnetic fields
magnetoacoustic effect	semiconductors, metals	selective absorption of sound waves in magnetic fields
magnetic resonance	most materials, used for imaging in medicine for structure determination of molecules	selective absorption of radio waves in magnetic fields
magnetorheologic effect	liquids, used in advanced car suspensions	change of viscosity with applied magnetic fields
Meissner effect	type 1 superconductors, used for levitation	expulsion of magnetic field from superconductors
Interactions with electric fields		
polarizability	all matter	polarization changes with applied electric field
ionization, field emission, Schottky effect	all matter, tv	charges are extracted at high fields
paraelectricity	$BaTiO_3$	applied field leads to polarization in same direction
dielectricity	water	in opposite direction
ferroelectricity	$BaTiO_3$	spontaneous polarization below critical temperature
piezoelectricity	the quartz lighter used in the kitchen, human bones	polarization appears with tension, stress, or pressure
electrostriction	platinum sponges in acids	shape change with applied voltage Ref. 690

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

PROPERTY	EXAMPLE	DEFINITION
pyroelectricity	$CsNO_3$, tourmaline, crystals with polar axes; used for infrared detection	change of temperature produces charge separation
electro-osmosis or electrokinetic effect	many ionic liquids	liquid moves under applied electric field Ref. 691
electrowetting	salt solutions on gold	wetting of surface depends on applied voltage
electrolytic activity	sulphuric acid	charge transport through liquid
liquid crystal effect	watch displays	molecules turn with applied electric field
electro-optical activity: Kerr effect, Pockels effect	liquids (e.g. oil), crystalline solids	material in electric field rotates light polarization, i.e., produces birefringence
Freederichsz effect, Schadt–Helfrichs effect	nematic liquid crystals	electrically induced birefringence
Stark effect	hydrogen, mercury	colour change of emitted light in electric field
field ionization	helium near tungsten tips in field ion microscope	ionization of gas atoms in strong electric fields
Zener effect	Si	energy-free transfer of electrons into conduction band at high fields
field evaporation	W	evaporation under strong applied electric fields
Interactions with light		
absorption	coal, graphite	transformation of light into heat or other energy forms (which ones?)Challenge 1178 s
blackness	coal, graphite	complete absorption in visible range
colour, metallic shine	ruby	absorption depending on light frequency
photostriction	PbLaZrTi	light induced piezoelectricity
photography	AgBr, AgI	light precipitates metallic silver
photoelectricity, photoeffect	Cs	current flows into vacuum due to light irradiation
internal photoelectric effect	Si p–n junctions, solar cells	voltage generation and current flow due to light irradiation
photon drag effect	p-Ge	current induced by photon momentum
emissivity	all bodies	ability to emit light
transparency	glass, quartz, diamond	low reflection, low absorption, low scattering
reflectivity	metals	light bounces on surface
polarization	pulled polymer sheets	light transmission depending on polarization angle
optical activity	sugar dissolved in water, quartz	rotation of polarization

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Property	Example	Definition
birefringence	calcite,cornea	refraction index depends on polarization direction, light beams are split into two beams
dichroism	aminoacids, andalusite	absorption depends on circular polarization
optically induced anisotropy, Weigert effect	AgCl	optically induced birefringence and dichroism
second harmonic generation	$LiNbO_3$, KPO_4	light partially transformed to double frequency
luminescence: general term for opposite of incandescence	GaAs, tv	cold light emission
fluorescence	CaF_2, X-ray production, light tubes, cathode ray tubes	light emission during and after light absorption or other energy input
phosphorescence	$TbCl_3$	light emission due to light, electrical or chemical energy input, continuing *long after* stimulation
electroluminescence	ZnS	emission of light due to alternating electrical field
photoluminescence	ZnS : Cu, $SrAlO_4$: Eu, Dy, hyamine	light emission triggered by UV light, used in safety signs
chemoluminescence	H_2O_2, phenyl oxalate ester, dye	cold light emission used in light sticks for divers and fun
bioluminescence	glow-worm, deep sea fish	cold light emission in animals
triboluminescence	sugar	light emission during friction or crushing
thermoluminescence	quartz, feldspar	light emission during heating, used e.g. for archaeological dating of pottery Ref. 692
bremsstrahlung	X-ray generation	radiation emission through fast deceleration of electrons
Compton effect	momentum measurements	change of wavelength of light, esp. X-rays and gamma radiation, colliding with matter
Čerenkov effect	water, polymer particle detectors	light emission in a medium due to particles, e.g. emitted by radioactive processes, moving faster than the speed of light in that medium
transition radiation	any material	light emission due to fast particles moving from one medium to a second with different refractive index
electrochromicity	wolframates	colour change with applied electric field
scattering	gases, liquids	light changes direction

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

PROPERTY	EXAMPLE	DEFINITION
Mie scattering	dust in gases	light changes direction
Raleigh scattering	sky	light changes direction, sky is blue
Raman effect or Smekal–Raman effect	molecular gases	scattered light changes frequency
laser activity, superradiation	beer, ruby, He–Ne	emission of stimulated radiation
sonoluminescence	air in water	light emission during cavitation
gravitoluminescence	does not exist; Challenge 1179 s why?	
switchable mirror	LaH	voltage controlled change from reflection to transparency Ref. 693
radiometer effect	bi-coloured windmills	irradiation turns mill (see page 745)
luminous pressure	*idem*	irradiation turns mill directly
solar sail effect	future satellites	motion due to solar wind
acoustooptic effect	$LiNbO_3$	diffraction of light by sound in transparent materials
photorefractive materials	$LiNbO_3$, GaAs, InP	light irradiation changes refractive index
Auger effect	Auger electron spectroscopy	electron emission due to atomic reorganization after ionization by X-rays
Bragg reflection	crystal structure determination	X-ray diffraction by atomic planes
Mößbauer effect	Fe, used for spectroscopy	recoil-free resonant absorption of gamma radiation
pair creation	Pb	transformation of a photon in a charged particle–antiparticle pair
photoconductivity	Se, CdS	change of resistivity with light irradiation
optoacoustic affect, photoacoustic effect	gases, solids	creation of sound due to absorption of pulsed light
optogalvanic effect	plasmas	change of discharge current due to light irradiation
optical nonlinear effects: parametric amplification, frequency mixing, saturable absorption, *n*-th harmonic generation, optical Kerr effect, etc.		
phase conjugated mirror activity	gases	reflection of light with opposite phase
Material properties		
solidity, impenetrability	floors, columns, ropes, buckets	at most one object per place at a given time
Interactions with vacuum		
Casimir effect	metals	attraction of uncharged, conducting bodies

All matter properties in the list can be influenced by electric or magnetic fields or

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

directly depend on them. This shows that the nature of all these material properties is electromagnetic. In other words, charges and their interactions are an essential and fundamental part of the structure of objects. The table shows so many different electromagnetic properties that the motion of charges inside each material must be complex indeed. Most effects are the topic of solid state physics,* fluid and plasma physics.

Solid state physics is by far the most important part of physics, when measured by the impact it has on society. Almost all effects have applications in technical products, and give employment to many people. Can you name a product or business application for any randomly chosen effect from the table?

Challenge 1180 e

In our mountain ascent however, we look at only one example from the above list: thermal radiation, the emission of light by hot bodies.

Earnshaw's theorem about the impossibility of a stable equilibrium for charged particles at rest implies that the charges inside matter must be *moving*. For any charged particle in motion, Maxwell's equations for the electromagnetic field show that it radiates energy by emitting electromagnetic waves. In short, classical mechanics thus predicts that matter must radiate electromagnetic energy.

Interestingly, everybody knows from experience that this is indeed the case. Hot bodies light up depending on their temperature; the working of light bulbs thus proves that metals are made of charged particles. *Incandescence*, as it is called, requires charges. Actually, *every* body emits radiation, even at room temperature. This radiation is called *thermal radiation*; at room temperature it lies in the infrared. Its intensity is rather weak in everyday life; it is given by the general expression

Ref. 694

$$I(T) = f\,T^4\,\frac{2\pi^5 k^4}{15c^2h^3} \quad \text{or} \quad I(T) = f\sigma T^4 \quad \text{with} \quad \sigma = 56.7\,\text{nW/K}^4\text{m}^2\,, \tag{497}$$

where f is a material-, shape- and temperature-dependent factor, with a value between zero and one, and is called the *emissivity*. The constant σ is called the *Stefan–Boltzmann black body radiation constant* or *black body radiation constant*. A body whose emissivity is given by the ideal case $f = 1$ is called a *black body*, because at room temperature such a body also has an ideal absorption coefficient and thus appears black. (Can you see why?) The heat radiation such a body emits is called *black body radiation*.

Challenge 1181 s

Ref. 695

By the way, which object radiates more energy: a human body or an average piece of the Sun of the same mass? Guess first!

Challenge 1182 s

Challenges and fun curiosities about electromagnetic effects

'Inside a conductor there is no electric field.' This statement is often found. In fact the truth is not that simple. First, a *static* field or a *static* charge on the metal surface of a body does not influence fields and charges inside it. A closed metal surface thus forms a shield against an electric field. Can you give an explanation? In fact, a tight metal layer is not required to get the effect; a cage is sufficient. One speaks of a *Faraday cage*.

Challenge 1183 s

The detailed mechanism allows you to answer the following question: do Faraday cages for gravity exist? Why?

* Probably the best and surely the most entertaining introductory English language book on the topic is the one by Neil Ashcroft & David Mermin, *Solid State Physics*, Holt Rinehart & Winston, 1976.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

For *moving* external fields or charges, the issue is more complex. Fields due to accelerated charges – radiation fields – decay exponentially through a shield. Fields due to charges moving at constant speed are strongly reduced, but do not disappear. The reduction depends on the thickness and the resistivity of the metal enclosure used. For sheet metal, the field suppression is very high; it is not necessarily high for metal sprayed plastic. Such a device will not necessarily survive a close lightning stroke. Ref. 649

In practice, there is no danger if lightning hits an aeroplane or a car, as long they are made of metal. (There is one film on the internet of a car hit by lightning; the driver does not even notice.) However, if your car is hit by lightning in dry weather, you should wait a few minutes before getting out of it. Can you imagine why?

Faraday cages also work the other way round. (Slowly) changing electric fields that are inside a Faraday cage are not felt outside. For this reason, radios, mobile phones and computers are surrounded by boxes made of metal or metal-sprayed plastics. The metal keeps the so-called *electromagnetic smog* to a minimum.

There are thus three reasons to surround electric appliances by a grounded shield: to protect the appliance from outside fields, to protect people and other machines from electromagnetic smog, and to protect people against the mains voltage accidentally being fed into the box (for example, when the insulation fails). In high precision experiments, these three functions can be realized by three separate cages.

For purely magnetic fields, the situation is more complex. It is quite difficult to shield the inside of a machine from outside magnetic fields. How would you do it? In practice one often uses layers of so-called *mu-metal*; can you guess what this material does? Challenge 1184 ny

* *

Researchers are trying to detect tooth decay with the help of electric currents, using the observation that healthy teeth are bad conductors, in contrast to teeth with decay. How would you make use of this effect in this case? (By the way, it might be that the totally unrelated technique of imaging with terahertz waves could yield similar results.) Ref. 650 Challenge 1185 ny

* *

Human bone is piezoelectric: it produces electric signals when stressed. When we move and grow, the electric signals are used by the body to reinforce the bones in the regions that are in need. The piezoelectricity of the bones thus controls and guides their growth. This connection is also used to make fractured bones heal more rapidly: by applying *pulsed* magnetic fields to a broken bone, the healing is stimulated and accelerated. (Static magnetic fields obviously do not work for this aim.) Also teeth are piezoelectric, and the effect plays a role in their growth.

* *

In shops, one can buy piezoelectric devices – similar to a gas lighter – that are applied to mosquito bites and are said to reduce itching and even swelling. (Some product names are 'zanza click' and 'skeeter click') Can this be true? Challenge 1186 e

* *

A team of camera men in the middle of the Sahara were using battery-driven electrical equipment to make sound recordings. Whenever the microphone cable was a few tens

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

of metres long, they also heard a 50 Hz power supply noise, even though the next power supply was thousands of kilometres away. An investigation revealed that the high voltage lines in Europe lose a considerable amount of power by irradiation; these 50 Hz waves are reflected by the ionosphere around the Earth and thus can disturb recording in the middle of the desert. Can you estimate whether this observation implies that living directly near a high voltage line is dangerous? Challenge 1187 s

* *

When solar plasma storms are seen on the Sun, astronomers first phone the electricity company. They know that about 24 to 48 hours later, the charged particles ejected by the storms will arrive on Earth, making the magnetic field on the surface fluctuate. Since power grids often have closed loops of several thousands of kilometres, additional electric currents are induced, which can make transformers in the grid overheat and then switch off. Other transformers then have to take over the additional power, which can lead to their overheating, etc. On several occasions in the past, millions of people have been left without electrical power due to solar storms. Today, the electricity companies avoid the problems by disconnecting the various grid sections, by avoiding large loops, by reducing the supply voltage to avoid saturation of the transformers and by disallowing load transfer from failed circuits to others.

* *

If the electric field is described as a sum of components of different frequencies, its so-called *Fourier components*, the amplitudes are given by Ref. 652

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{E}}(k,t) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3/2} \int \boldsymbol{E}(x,t) \mathrm{e}^{-i\boldsymbol{k}x} \, \mathrm{d}^3x \tag{498}$$

and similarly for the magnetic field. It then turns out that a Lorentz invariant quantity N, describing the energy per circular frequency ω, can be defined:

$$N = \frac{1}{8\pi} \int \frac{|\boldsymbol{E}(k,t)|^2 + |\boldsymbol{B}(k,t)|^2}{c|\boldsymbol{k}|} \, \mathrm{d}^3k \,. \tag{499}$$

Can you guess what N is physically? (Hint: think about quantum theory.) Challenge 1188 s

* *

Faraday discovered how to change magnetism into electricity, knowing that electricity could be transformed into magnetism. (The issue is subtle. Faraday's law is not the dual of Ampère's, as that would imply the use of magnetic monopoles; neither is it the reciprocal, as that would imply the displacement current. But he was looking for a link and he found a way to relate the two observations – in a novel way, as it turned out.) Faraday also discovered how to transform electricity into light and into chemistry. He then tried to change gravitation into electricity. But he was not successful. Why not? Challenge 1189 ny

* *

At high altitudes above the Earth, gases are completely ionized; no atom is neutral. One

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

speaks of the *ionosphere*, as space is full of positive ions and free electrons. Even though both charges appear in exactly the same number, a satellite moving through the ionosphere acquires a negative charge. Why? How does the charging stop?

Challenge 1190 s

* *

A capacitor of capacity C is charged with a voltage U. The stored electrostatic energy is $E = CU^2/2$. The capacitor is then detached from the power supply and branched on to an empty capacitor of the same capacity. After a while, the voltage obviously drops to $U/2$. However, the stored energy now is $C(U/2)^2$, which is half the original value. Where did the energy go?

Challenge 1191 s

* *

The maximum force in nature limits the maximum charge that a black hole can carry. Can you find the relation?

Challenge 1192 ny

* *

Challenge 1193 s How can you give somebody an electrical shock using a 4.5 V battery and some wire?

A summary of classical electrodynamics and of its limits

All of classical electrodynamics can be summarized in three principles:

▷ Electric charges exert forces on other charges; for charges at rest, the force falls off as the inverse square of the distance.*
▷ Electric charges are conserved.
▷ Charges, like all matter, move slower than light.

From these principles we can deduce all of electrodynamics. Electrodynamics is thus built on the definition of charge, the conservation of charge, and the invariance of the speed of light. In particular, we can deduce the following basic statements.

Ref. 578

— The electromagnetic field is a physical observable, as shown e.g. by compass needles.
— The field sources are the (moving) charges, as shown by amber, lodestone or remote controls.
— The electromagnetic field changes the motion of electrically charged objects via the Lorentz expression as, for example, shown by electric motors.
— The field can exist in empty space and moves in it as a wave, as shown, for example, by the stars.
— The field behaves like a continuous quantity and is described by Maxwell's evolution equations, as shown, for example, by mobile phones and electric toothbrushes.

As usual, the motion of the sources and the field is reversible, continuous, conserved and deterministic. However, there is quite some fun in the offing; even though this description is correct in everyday life, during the rest of our mountain ascent we will find that the last bullet point must be wrong. A simple example shows this.

* Quantum theory will show that the first principle can be rephrased as: electric charges at rest emit virtual photons with a constant average rate.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

At a temperature of zero kelvin, when matter does not radiate thermally, we have the paradoxical situation that the charges inside matter cannot be moving, since no emitted radiation is observed, but they cannot be at rest either, due to Earnshaw's theorem. In short, the simple existence of matter – with its discrete charge values – shows that classical electrodynamics is wrong.

Page 787

In fact, the overview of material properties of Table 71 makes the same point even more strongly; classical electrodynamics can describe many of the effects listed, *but it cannot explain the origin of any of them*. Even though few of the effects will be studied in our walk – they are not essential for our adventure – the general concepts necessary for their description will be the topic of the upcoming part of this mountain ascent, that on quantum theory.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 29

CLASSICAL PHYSICS IN A NUTSHELL

With the description of mechanics, thermodynamics, general relativity and classical electrodynamics, our walk through classical physics is complete. Let summarize what we have found out and what we did not.

In nature, we learned to distinguish and to characterize objects, radiation and spacetime. All three can move. In all motion we distinguish the fixed, intrinsic properties from the varying state. All motion happens in such a way as to minimize change.

Looking for all the *fixed, intrinsic* aspects of objects, we find that all sufficiently small objects or particles are described completely by their mass and their electric charge. There is no magnetic charge. Mass and electric charge are thus the only localized intrinsic properties of classical, everyday objects. Both mass and electric charge are defined by the accelerations they produce around them. Both quantities are conserved; thus they can be added (with certain precautions). Mass, in contrast to charge, is always positive. Mass describes the interaction of objects with their environment, charge the interaction with radiation.

All *varying* aspects of objects, i.e., their state, can be described using momentum and position, as well as angular momentum and orientation. All four quantities can vary continuously in amount and direction. Therefore the set of all possible states forms a space, the so-called *phase space*. The state of extended objects is given by the states of all its constituent particles. These particles make up all objects and somehow interact electromagnetically.

The state of a particle depends on the observer. The state is useful to calculate the change that occurs in motion. For a given particle, the change is independent of the observer, but the states are not. The states found by different observers are related: the relations are called the 'laws' of motion. For example, for different times they are called *evolution equations*, for different places and orientations they are called *transformation relations*, and for different gauges they are called *gauge transformations*. All can be condensed in the principle of least action.

We also observe the motion of a massless entity: *radiation*. Everyday types of radiation, such as light, radio waves and their related forms, are travelling electromagnetic waves. They are described by same equations that describe the interaction of charged or magnetic objects. The speed of massless entities is the maximum possible speed in nature and is the same for all observers. The *intrinsic properties* of radiation are its dispersion relation and its energy–angular momentum relation. The *state* of radiation is described by its electromagnetic field strength, its phase, its polarization and its coupling to matter. The motion of radiation describes the motion of images.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The space-time *environment* is described by space and time coordinates. Space-time is also able to move, by changing its curvature. The intrinsic properties of space-time are the number of dimensions, its signature and its topology. The state is given by the metric, which describes distances and thus the local warpedness. The warpedness can oscillate and propagate, so that empty space can move like a wave.

Our environment is finite in age. It has a long history, and on large scales, all matter in the universe moves away from all other matter. The large scale topology of our environment is unclear, as is unclear what happens at its spatial and temporal limits.

Motion follows a simple rule: change is always as small as possible. This applies to matter, radiation and space-time. All energy moves in the way space-time dictates it, and space moves the way energy dictates it. This relation describes the motion of the stars, of thrown stones, of light beams and of the tides. Rest and free fall are the same, and gravity is curved space-time. Mass breaks conformal symmetry and thus distinguishes space from time.

Energy and mass speed is bound from above by a universal constant c, and energy change per time is bound from above by a universal constant $c^5/4G$. The speed value c is realized for the motion of massless particles. It also relates space to time. The power value $c^5/4G$ is realized by horizons. They are found around black holes and at the border of the universe. The value also relates space-time curvature to energy flow and thus describes the elasticity of space-time.

No two objects can be at the same spot at the same time. This is the first statement that humans encounter about electromagnetism. More detailed investigation shows that electric charge accelerates other charges, that charge is necessary to define length and time intervals, and that charges are the source of electromagnetic fields. Also light is such a field. Light travels at the maximum possible velocity. In contrast to objects, light can interpenetrate. In summary, we learned that of the two naive types of object motion, namely motion due to gravity – or space-time curvature – and motion due to the electromagnetic field, only the latter is genuine.

Above all, classical physics showed us that motion, be it linear or rotational, be it that of matter, radiation or space-time, is conserved. Motion is continuous. More than that, motion is similar to a continuous substance: it is never destroyed, never created, but always redistributed. Owing to conservation, all motion, that of objects, images and empty space, is predictable and reversible. Owing to conservation of motion, time and space can be defined. In addition, we found that classical motion is also right–left symmetric. Classical physics showed us that motion is predictable: there are *no* surprises in nature.

The future of planet Earth

Maybe nature shows no surprises, but it still provides many adventures. On the 8th of March 2002, a 100 m sized body almost hit the Earth. It passed at a distance of only 450 000 km from our planet. On impact, it would have destroyed a region the size of London. A few months earlier, a 300 m sized body missed the Earth by 800 000 km; the record for closeness so far was in 1994, when the distance was only 100 000 km.* Several other adventures can be predicted by classical physics, as shown in Table 72. Many are

* The web pages around cfa-www.harvard.edu/iau/lists/Closest.html provide more information on such events.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

problems facing humanity in the distant future, but some, such as volcanic eruptions or asteroid impacts, could happen at any time. All are research topics. Ref. 699

TABLE 72 Examples of disastrous motion of possible future importance

CRITICAL SITUATION	YEARS FROM NOW
End of fundamental physics	*c.* 30 (around year 2030)
Giant tsunami from volcanic eruption at Canary islands	*c.* 10-200
Major nuclear material accident or weapon use	unknown
Ozone shield reduction	*c.* 100
Mini ice age due to collapse of gulf stream	unknown
Rising ocean levels due to greenhouse warming	*c.* 100-1 000
End of applied physics	> 200
Explosion of volcano in Greenland, leading to long darkening of sky	unknown
Earth's mantle instability leading to massive volcanic activity	unknown
Several magnetic north and south poles appear, allowing solar storms to disturb radio and telecommunications, to interrupt electricity supplies, to increase animal mutations and to disorient migrating animals such as wales, birds and tortoises	*c.* 800
Our interstellar gas cloud detaches from the solar systems, changing the size of the heliosphere, and thus expose us more to aurorae and solar magnetic fields	*c.* 3 000
Reversal of Earth's magnetic field, implying a time with almost no magnetic field, with increased cosmic radiation levels and thus more skin cancers and miscarriages	unknown
Atmospheric oxygen depletion due to forest reduction and exaggerated fuel consumption	> 1000
Upcoming ice age	*c.* 15 000
Possible collision with interstellar gas cloud assumed to be crossed by the Earth every 60 million years, maybe causing mass extinctions	*c.* 50 000
Explosion of Yellowstone or other giant volcano leading to year-long volcanic winter	0 to 100 000
Possible genetic degeneration of homo sapiens due to Y chromosome reduction	*c.* 200 000
Africa collides with Europe, transforming the Mediterranean into a lake that starts evaporating	around $3 \cdot 10^6$
Gamma ray burst from within our own galaxy, causing radiation damage to many living beings	between 0 and $5 \cdot 10^6$
Asteroid hitting the Earth, generating tsunamis, storms, darkening sunlight, etc.	between 0 and $50 \cdot 10^6$
Neighbouring star approaching, starting comet shower through destabilization of Oort cloud and thus risk for life on Earth	$> 10^6$
American continent collides with Asia	$> 100 \cdot 10^6$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

CRITICAL SITUATION	YEARS FROM NOW
Molecular cloud engulfs the solar system	unknown
Instability of solar system	$> 100 \cdot 10^6$
Low atmospheric CO_2 content stops photosynthesis	$> 100 \cdot 10^6$
Collision of Milky Way with star cluster or other galaxy	$> 150 \cdot 10^6$
Sun ages and gets hotter, evaporating seas	$> 250 \cdot 10^6$
Ocean level increase due to Earth rotation slowing/stopping (if not evaporated before)	$> 10^9$
Temperature rise/fall (depending on location) due to Earth rotation stop	$> 10^9$
Sun runs out of fuel, becomes red giant, engulfs Earth	$5.0 \cdot 10^9$
Sun stops burning, becomes white dwarf	$5.2 \cdot 10^9$
Earth core solidifies, removing magnetic field and thus Earth's cosmic radiation shield	$10.0 \cdot 10^9$
Nearby nova (e.g. Betelgeuse) bathes Earth in annihilation radiation	unknown
Nearby supernova (e.g. Eta Carinae) blasts over solar system	unknown
Galaxy centre destabilizes rest of galaxy	unknown
Universe recollapses – if ever (see page 498)	$> 20 \cdot 10^9$
Matter decays into radiation – if ever (see Appendix E)	$> 10^{33}$
Problems with naked singularities	unknown, controversial
Vacuum becomes unstable	unknown, controversial

Despite the fascination of the predictions, we leave aside these literally tremendous issues and continue on our adventure.

THE ESSENCE OF CLASSICAL PHYSICS – THE INFINITELY SMALL AND THE LACK OF SURPRISES

We can summarize classical physics with two simple statements: First, *classical physics is the description of motion using the concept of the infinitely small*. Secondly, *nature lack surprises*.

All concepts used so far, be they for motion, space, time or observables, assume that the infinitely small exists. Special relativity, despite the speed limit, still allows infinitely small velocities; general relativity, despite its black hole limit, still allows infinitely small force and power values. Similarly, in the description of electrodynamics and gravitation, both integrals and derivatives are abbreviations of mathematical processes that use infinitely small distances and time intervals. In other words, the classical description of nature introduces the infinitely small in the description of motion.

Using the infinitely small as a research tool, the classical description of motion discovers that energy, momentum, angular momentum and charge are conserved. They are conserved also for infinitely small dimensions or time intervals. In other words, there are no surprises in motion.

The detailed study of conservation lead us to a strong conclusion: exploring the infinitely small shows that motion is deterministic. Surprises would contradict determin-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

ism.*

On the other hand, this result leaves us with some open questions. Both special and general relativity have eliminated the existence of the infinitely large. There is no infinitely large force, power, size, age or speed. Why should the infinitely small exist, but the infinitely large not?

In fact, there are more open questions.

Why have we not yet reached the top of the mountain?

> The more important fundamental laws and facts of physical science have all been discovered, and these are now so firmly established that the possibility of their ever being supplanted in consequence of new discoveries is exceedingly remote... Our future discoveries must be looked for in the sixth place of decimals.
>
> Albert Michelson.**

We might think that we know nature now, as did Albert Michelson at the end of the nineteenth century. He claimed that electrodynamics and Galilean physics implied that the major laws of physics were well known. The statement is often quoted as an example of flawed predictions, since it reflects an incredible mental closure to the world around him. General relativity was still unknown, and so was quantum theory.

At the end of the nineteenth century, the progress in technology due to the use of electricity, chemistry and vacuum technology had allowed better and better machines and apparatuses to be built. All were built with classical physics in mind. In the years between 1890 and 1920, these classical machines completely destroyed the foundations of classical physics. Experiments with these apparatuses showed that matter is made of atoms, that electrical charge comes in the smallest amounts and that nature behaves randomly. In short, precise experiments show that nature does produce surprises – through in a restricted sense, as we will see. Like the British Empire, the reign of classical physics collapsed. Speaking simply, classical physics does not describe nature correctly at small scales.

But even without machines, the Victorian physicist could have predicted the situation. (In fact, many more progressive minds did so.) He had overlooked a contradiction between electrodynamics and nature for which he had no excuse. In our walk so far we found that clocks and metre bars are necessarily made of matter and based on electromagnetism. But as we just saw, classical electrodynamics does not explain the stability of matter. Matter is made of small particles, but the relation between these particles, electricity and the smallest charges is not clear. If we do not understand matter, we do not yet understand space and time, since they are defined using measurement devices made of matter.

* No surprises also imply no miracles. Classical physics is thus in opposition to many religions. Indeed, many religions argue that infinity is the necessary ingredient to perform miracles. Classical physics shows that this is not the case.

** From his 1894 address at the dedication ceremony for the Ryerson Physical Laboratory at the University of Chicago.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Worse, the Victorian physicist overlooked a simple fact: the classical description of nature does not allow one to understand *life*. The abilities of living beings – growing, seeing, hearing, feeling, thinking, being healthy or sick, reproducing and dying – are all unexplained by classical physics. In fact, all these abilities *contradict* classical physics. Understanding matter and its interactions, including life itself, is therefore the aim of the upcoming part of our ascent of Motion Mountain. The understanding will take place at small scales; to understand nature, we need to study particles. Indeed, the atomic structure of matter, the existence of a smallest charge and the existence of a smallest entropy makes us question the existence of the infinitely small. There is something to explore. Doing so will lead us from surprise to surprise. To be well prepared, we first take a break.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 30

THE STORY OF THE BRAIN

> Alles was überhaupt gedacht werden kann,
> kann klar gedacht werden.*
>
> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 4.116

In our quest for increased precision in the description of all motion around us, it is time to take a break, sit down and look back. In our walk so far, which has led us to investigate mechanics, general relativity and electrodynamics, we used several concepts without defining them. Examples are 'information', 'memory', 'measurement', 'set', 'number', 'infinity', 'existence', 'universe' and 'explanation'. Each of these is a common and important term. In this intermezzo, we take a look at these concepts and try to give some simple, but sufficiently precise definitions, keeping them as provocative and entertaining as possible. For example, can you explain to your parents what a concept is?

Challenge 1194 e

The reason for studying definitions is simple. We need the clarifications in order to get to the top of Motion Mountain, i.e., to the full description of motion. In the past, many have lost their way because of lack of clear concepts. In order to avoid these difficulties, physics has a special guiding role. All sciences share one result: every type of change observed in nature is a form of motion. In this sense, but in this sense *only*, physics, focusing on motion itself, forms the basis for all the other sciences. In other words, the search for the famed 'theory of everything' is an arrogant expression for the search for a *theory of motion*. Even though the knowledge of motion is basic, its precise description does not imply a description of 'everything': just try to solve a marriage problem using the Schrödinger equation to note the difference.

Given the basic importance of motion, it is necessary that in physics all statements on observations be as precise as possible. For this reason, many thinkers have investigated physical statements with particular care, using all criteria imaginable. Physics is detailed prattle by curious people about moving things. The criteria for precision appear once we ask: which abilities does this prattle require? You might want to fill in the list yourself.

Challenge 1195 e

The abilities necessary for talking are a topic of research even today. The way that the human species acquired the ability to chat about motion is studied by evolutionary biologists. Child psychologists study how the ability develops in a single human being. Physiologists, neurologists and computer scientists are concerned with the way the brain and the senses make this possible; linguists focus on the properties of the language we

* 'Everything that can be thought at all can be thought clearly.' This and other quotes of Ludwig Wittgenstein are from the equally short and famous *Tractatus logico-philosophicus*, written in 1918, first published in 1921; it has now been translated into many other languages.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 406 Ludwig Wittgenstein (1889–1951)

use, while logicians, mathematicians and philosophers of science study the general properties of statements about nature. All these fields investigate tools that are essential for the development of physics, the understanding of motion and the specification of the undefined concepts listed above. The fields structure the following exploration.

Evolution

> A hen is only an egg's way of making another egg.
>
> Samuel Butler, *Life and Habit*.

The evolution of the human species is the result of a long story that has been told in many excellent books. A summarizing table on the history of the universe is given in the chapter on general relativity. The almost incredible chain of events that has lead to one's own existence includes the formation of atoms, of the galaxies, the stars, the planets, the Moon, the atmosphere, the first cells, the water animals, the land animals, the mammals, the hominids, the humans, the ancestors, the family and finally oneself.

Ref. 700 Page 577 Ref. 701

The way the atoms we are made of moved during this sequence, being blown through space, being collected on Earth, becoming organized to form people, is one of the most awe-inspiring examples of motion. Remembering and meditating about this fantastic sequence of motion every now and then can be an enriching experience.

Challenge 1196 e

In particular, without biological evolution, we would not be able to talk about motion; only moving bodies can study moving bodies. And without a brain, we would not be able to think or talk. Evolution was also the fount of childhood and curiosity. In this chapter we will discover that most concepts of classical physics are already introduced by every little child, in the experiences it has while growing up.

Children, laws and physics

> Physicists also have a shared reality. Other than that, there isn't really a lot of difference between being a physicist and being a schizophrenic.
>
> Richard Bandler

Ref. 702

During childhood, everybody is a physicist. When we follow our own memories backwards in time as far as we can, we reach a certain stage, situated before birth, which forms the starting point of human experience. In that magic moment, we sensed somehow that apart from ourselves, there is something else. The first observation we make about the world, during the time in the womb, is thus the recognition that we can distinguish two

Ref. 703

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

parts: ourselves and the rest of the world. This distinction is an example – perhaps the first – of a large number of 'laws' of nature that we stumble upon in our lifetime. By discovering more and more distinctions we bring structure in the chaos of experience. We quickly find out that the world is made of related parts, such as mama, papa, milk, Earth, toys, etc.

Later, when we learn to speak, we enjoy using more difficult words and we call the surroundings the *environment*. Depending on the context, we call the whole formed by oneself and the environment together the (physical) *world*, the (physical) *universe*, *nature*, or the *cosmos*. These concepts are not distinguished from each other in this walk;* they are all taken to designate the sum of all parts and their relations. They are simply taken here to designate the *whole*.

The discovery of the first distinction starts a chain of similar discoveries. We extract the numerous distinctions that are possible in the environment, in our own body and in the various types of interactions between them. The ability to distinguish is the central ability that allows us to change our view from that of the world as *chaos*, i.e., as a big mess, to that of the world as a *system*, i.e., a structured set, in which parts are related in specific ways. (If you like precision, you may ponder whether the two choices of 'chaos' and 'system' are the only possible ones. We will return to this issue in the final part of our mountain ascent.)

Challenge 1197 s

In particular, the observation of the differences between oneself and the environment goes hand in hand with the recognition that not only are we not independent of the environment, but we are firmly tied to it in various inescapable ways: we can fall, get hurt, feel warm, cold, etc. Such relations are called *interactions*. Interactions express the observation that even though the parts of nature can be distinguished, they cannot be isolated. In other words, interactions describe the difference between the whole and the sum of its parts. No part can be defined without its relation to its environment. (Do you agree?)

Page 855

Challenge 1198 e

Interactions are not arbitrary; just take touch, smell or sight as examples. They differ in reach, strength and consequences. We call the characteristic aspects of interactions *patterns of nature*, or *properties of nature*, or *rules of nature* or, equivalently, with their historical but unfortunate name, *'laws' of nature*. The term 'law' stresses their general validity; unfortunately, it also implies design, aim, coercion and punishment for infringement. However, no design, aim or coercion is implied in the properties of nature, nor is infringement possible. The ambiguous term 'law of nature' was made popular by René Descartes (1596–1650) and has been adopted enthusiastically because it gave weight to the laws of the state – which were far from perfect at that time – and to those of other organizations – which rarely are. The expression is an anthropomorphism coined by an authoritarian world view, suggesting that nature is 'governed'. We will therefore use the term as rarely as possible in our walk and it will, if we do, be always between 'ironical' parentheses. Nature cannot be forced in any way. The 'laws' of nature are not obligations for nature or its parts, they are obligations only for physicists and all other people: the

* The differences in usage can be deduced from their linguistic origins. 'World' is derived from old Germanic 'wer' – person – and 'ald' – old – and originally means 'lifetime'. 'Universe' is from the Latin, and designates the one – 'unum' – which one sees turning – 'vertere', and refers to the starred sky at night which turns around the polar star. 'Nature' comes also from the Latin, and means 'what is born'. 'Cosmos' is from Greek κόσμος and originally means 'order'.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

patterns of nature oblige us to use certain descriptions and to discard others. Whenever one says that 'laws govern nature' one is talking nonsense; the correct expression is *rules describe nature*.

During childhood we learn to distinguish between interactions with the environment (or *perceptions*): some are shared with others and called *observations*, others are uniquely personal and are called *sensations*.* A still stricter criterion of 'sharedness' is used to divide the world into 'reality' and 'imagination' (or 'dreams'). Our walk will show that this distinction is not essential, provided that we stay faithful to the quest for ever increasing precision: we will find that the description of motion that we are looking for does not Page 1519 depend on whether the world is 'real' or 'imagined', 'personal' or 'public'.

Humans enjoy their ability to distinguish parts, which in other contexts they also call *details*, *aspects* or *entities*, and enjoy their ability to associate them or to observe the *re-* Ref. 705 *lations* between them. Humans call this activity *classification*. Colours, shapes, objects, mother, places, people and ideas are some of the entities that humans discover first.

Our anatomy provides a handy tool to make efficient use of these discoveries: *memory*. It stores a large amount of input that is called *experience* afterwards. Memory is a tool used by both young and old children to organize their world and to achieve a certain security in the chaos of life.

Memorized classifications are called *concepts*. Jean Piaget was the first researcher to describe the influence of the environment on the concepts that a child forms. Step by step, children learn that objects are localized in space, that space has three dimensions, that objects fall, that collisions produce noise, etc. In particular, Piaget showed that space and time are not a priori concepts, but result from the interactions of every child with its environment.**

---

* A child that is unable to make this distinction among perceptions – and who is thus unable to lie – almost Ref. 704 surely develops or already suffers from *autism*, as recent psychological research has shown.

** An overview of the origin of developmental psychology is given by J. H. Flavell, *The Developmental Psychology of Jean Piaget*, 1963. This work summarizes the observations by the French speaking Swiss Jean Piaget (1896–1980), the central figure in the field. He was one of the first researchers to look at child development in the same way that a physicist looks at nature: carefully observing, taking notes, making experiments, extracting hypotheses, testing them, deducing theories. His astonishingly numerous publications, based on his extensive observations, cover almost all stages of child development. His central contribution is the detailed description of the stages of development of the cognitive abilities of humans. He showed that all cognitive abilities of children, the formation of basic concepts, their way of thinking, their ability to talk, etc., result from the continuous interaction between the child and the environment.

In particular, Piaget described the way in which children first learn that they are different from the external environment, and how they then learn about the physical properties of the world. Of his many books related to physical concepts, two especially related to the topic of this walk are J. Piaget, *Les notions de mouvement et de vitesse chez l'enfant*, Presses Universitaires de France, 1972 and *Le developpement de la notion de temps chez l'enfant*, Presses Universitaires de France, 1981, this last book being born from a suggestion by Albert Einstein. These texts should be part of the reading of every physicist and science philosopher interested in these questions.

Piaget also describes how in children the mathematical and verbal intelligence derives from sensomotorial, practical intelligence, which itself stems from habits and acquired associations to construct new concepts. Practical intelligence requires the system of reflexes provided by the anatomical and morphological structure of our organism. Thus his work shows in detail that our faculty for mathematical description of the world is based, albeit indirectly, on the physical interaction of our organism with the world.

Some of his opinions on the importance of language in development are now being revised, notably Ref. 706 through the rediscovery of the work of Lev Vigotsky, who argues that all higher mental abilities, emotions,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Around the time that a child goes to school, it starts to understand the idea of *permanence of substances*, e.g. liquids, and the concept of *contrary*. Only at that stage does its subjective experience becomes *objective*, with abstract comprehension. Still later, the child's description of the world stops to be animistic: before this step, the Sun, a brook or a cloud are *alive*. In short, only after puberty does a human become ready for physics.

Ref. 707

Even though everyone has been a physicist in their youth, most people remain *classical* physicists. In this adventure we continue, using all the possibilities of a toy with which nature provides us: the brain.

> Experience is the name everyone gives to their mistakes.
>
> Oscar Wilde, *Lady Windermere's Fan*.

Polymer electronics

The brain is electrical. This was proven in 1924, when the neurologist Hans Berger (b. 1873 Neuses, d. 1941 Jena) recorded and named the first *electroencephalogram*. In more detail, the brain is a flexible, polymer-based, metal-free, short-lived, sensitive, unreliable and electronic device. Incidentally, all these properties are shared by polymer electronics, whether alive or not. That is the reason that commercial electronics is usually silicon-based instead.

The polymer electronics that forms the brain is organized like a computer. Some details are shown in Table 73. Though the functional blocks of a brain and a computer are similar, the specific mechanisms they use are usually completely different.

Ref. 708

Why a brain?

> Denken ist bereits Plastik.*
>
> Joseph Beuys, sculptor.

Ref. 709

Numerous observations show that sense input is processed, i.e., classified, stored and retrieved in the brain. Notably, lesions of the brain can lead to the loss of part or all of these functions. Among the important consequences of these basic abilities of the brain are thought and language. All such abilities result from the construction, from the 'hardware' of the brain.

Ref. 710

Ref. 711

Systems with the ability to deduce classifications from the input they receive are called *classifiers*, and are said to be able to *learn*. Our brain shares this property with many complex systems; the brain of many animals, but also certain computer algorithms, such as the so-called 'neural networks', are examples of such classifiers. Such systems are studied in several fields, from biology to neurology, mathematics and computer science. Classifiers have the double ability to discriminate and to associate; both are fundamental to thinking.

Ref. 712

Ref. 714

Machine classifiers have a lot in common with the brain. As an example, following an important recent hypothesis in evolutionary biology, the necessity to cool the brain in an effective way is responsible for the upright, bipedal walk of humans. The brain needs

Ref. 713

recollective memory, rational thought, voluntary attention and self-awareness, are not innate, but learned. This learning takes place through language and culture, and in particular through the process of talking to

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 73 Some aspects of the human brain

Aspect	Details	Computer equivalent
Hardware		
Ultrashort term memory	5 to 9 concepts	cache
Hippocampus	novelty detector, spatial memory, learning	RAM and Flash memory
Amygdala	emotions, learning	priority scheduler of operating system
Ventral striatum, dopamine and opiod provider	rewards system	priority scheduler of operating system
Neurons in cortex	women *c.* $19 \cdot 10^9$, men *c.* $22 \cdot 10^9$	hard disk
Neuron number decay	women $e^{3.05-0.00145 \cdot age/a} \cdot 10^9$, men $e^{3.2-0.00145 \cdot age/a} \cdot 10^9$	hard disk
Pulses exchanged between both brain halves	$4 \cdot 10^9/s$	internal bus speed
Synapses per neuron	10^4	
Total synapse connections	*c.* $2 \cdot 10^{14}$	memory cells
Input pathways from the eye	*c.* $2 \cdot 10^6$	camera wire
Input pathways from the ear	*c.* $2 \cdot 3000$	microphone line
Input pathways from skin, mouth, and nose	*c.* $0.5 \cdot 10^6$	sensor interfaces
Input signal capacity (total, 300 pulses/s per pathway)	*c.* 100 MB/s	input bandwidth
Output pathways (muscles, organs)	*c.* $1.5 \cdot 10^6$	actuator interfaces
Output signal capacity (total, 300 pulses/s per pathway)	*c.* 50 MB/s	output bandwith
Typical mass (Einstein's brain)	1.230 kg	
Power consumption (average)	1600 to 2200 kJ/d or 18 to 25 W	
Lifetime	130 years	often only 2 years
Software and processing		
Learning	changing synapse strength through long-term potentiation	activate, classify, store
Deep sleep	structured writing from hippocampus to cortex	back-up to hard disk
REM (dream) sleep	offline processing	data compression in batch process

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

a powerful cooling system to work well. In this it resembles modern computers, which usually have powerful fans or even water cooling systems built into them. It turns out that the human species has the most powerful cooling system of all mammals. An upright posture allowed the air to cool the body most effectively in the tropical environment where humans evolved. For even better cooling, humans have also no body hair, except on their head, where it protects the brain from direct heating by the Sun.*

All classifiers are built from smallest classifying entities, sometimes large numbers of them. Usually, the smallest units can classify input into only two different groups. The larger the number of these entities, often called 'neurons' by analogy to the brain, the more sophisticated classifications can be produced by the classifier.** Classifiers thus work by applying more or less sophisticated combinations of 'same' and 'different'. The distinction by a child of red and blue objects is such a classification; the distinction of compact and non-compact gauge symmetry groups in quantum theory is a more elaborate classification, but relies on the same fundamental ability.

In all classifiers, the smallest classifying units interact with each other. Often these interactions are channelled via connections, and the set is then called a *network*. In these connections, signals are exchanged, via moving objects, such as electrons or photons. Thus we arrive at the conclusion that the ability of the brain to classify the physical world, for example to distinguish moving objects interacting with each other, is a consequence of the fact that it itself consists of moving objects interacting with each other. Without a powerful classifier, humans would not have become such a successful animal species. And only the motion inside our brain allows us to talk about motion in general.

Numerous researchers are identifying the parts of the brain used when different intellectual tasks are performed. The experiments become possible using magnetic resonance imaging and other methods. Other researchers are studying how thought processes can be modelled from the brain structure. Neurology is still making regular progress. In particular, it is steadily destroying the belief that thinking is *more* than a physical process. This belief results from personal fears, as you might want to test by introspection. It will disappear as time goes by. How would you argue that thought is just a physical process?

Page 1222

Challenge 1199 s

What is information?

> These thoughts did not come in any verbal formulation. I rarely think in words at all. A thought comes, and I may try to express it in words afterward.
>
> Albert Einstein

We started by stating that studying physics means to talk about motion. To talk is to transmit information. Can information be measured? Can we measure the progress of physics in this way? Is the universe made of information?

oneself.

* 'Thinking is already sculpture.' Joseph Beuys (1920–1986).

* The upright posture in turn allowed humans to take breath independently of their steps, a feat that many animals cannot perform. This in turn allowed humans to develop speech. Speech in turn developed the brain.

** A good introduction to neural nets is J. Hertz, A. Krogh & R. Palmer, *Introduction to the Theory of Neural Computation*, Addison Wesley, 1991.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Information is the result of classification. A classification is the answer to one or to several yes–no questions. Such yes–no questions are the simplest classifications possible; they provide the basic *units* of classification, from which all others can be built. The simplest way to measure information is therefore to count the implied yes–no questions, the *bits*, leading to it. Are you able to say how many bits are necessary to define the place where you live? Obviously, the number of bits depends on the set of questions with which we start; that could be the names of all streets in a city, the set of all coordinates on the surface of the Earth, the names of all galaxies in the universe, the set of all letter combinations in the address. What is the most efficient method you can think of? A variation of the combination method is used in computers. For example, the story of this walk required about a thousand million bits. But since the amount of information in a normal letter depends on the set of questions with which we start, it is impossible to define a precise measure for information in this way.

Challenge 1200 s

The only way to measure information precisely is to take the largest possible set of questions that can be asked about a system, and to compare it with what is known about the system. In this case, the amount of unknown information is called entropy, a concept that we have already encountered. With this approach you should able to deduce yourself whether it is really possible to measure the advance of physics.

Page 282

Challenge 1201 s

Since categorization is an activity of the brain and other, similar classifiers, information as defined here is a concept that applies to the result of activities by people and by other classifiers. In short, information is produced when talking about the universe – the universe itself is *not the same* as information. There is a growing number of publications based on the opposite of this view; however, this is a conceptual short circuit. Any transmission of information implies an interaction; physically speaking, this means that any information needs *energy* for transmission and *matter* for storage. Without either of these, there is no information. In other words, the universe, with its matter and energy, has to exist *before* transmission of information is possible. Saying that the universe is made of information is as meaningful as saying that it is made of toothpaste.

The aim of physics is to give a *complete* classification of all types and examples of motion, in other words, to know everything about motion. Is this possible? Or are you able to find an argument against this endeavour?

Challenge 1202 s

What is memory?

> The brain is my second favorite organ.
>
> Woody Allen

Memory is the collection of records of perceptions. The production of such records is the essential aspect of observation. Records can be stored in human memory, i.e., in the brain, or in machine memory, as in computers, or in object memory, such as notes on paper. Without memory, there is no science, no life – since life is based on the records inside the DNA – and especially, no fun, as proven by the sad life of those who lose their memory.

Ref. 710

Obviously every record is an object. But under which conditions does an object qualify as a record? A signature can be the record of the agreement on a commercial transaction. A single small dot of ink is not a record, because it could have appeared by mistake,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

for example by an accidental blot. In contrast, it is improbable that ink should fall on paper exactly in the shape of a signature. (The simple signatures of physicians are obviously exceptions.) Simply speaking, a *record* is any object, which, in order to be copied, has to be forged. More precisely, a record is an object or a situation that cannot arise nor disappear by mistake or by chance. Our personal memories, be they images or voices, have the same property; we can usually trust them, because they are so detailed that they cannot have arisen by chance or by uncontrolled processes in our brain.

Can we estimate the probability for a record to appear or disappear by chance? Yes, we can. Every record is made of a characteristic number N of small entities, for example the number of the possible ink dots on paper, the number of iron crystals in a cassette tape, the electrons in a bit of computer memory, the silver iodide grains in a photographic negative, etc. The chance disturbances in any memory are due to internal fluctuations, also called *noise*. Noise makes the record unreadable; it can be dirt on a signature, thermal magnetization changes in iron crystals, electromagnetic noise inside a solid state memory, etc. Noise is found in all classifiers, since it is inherent in all interactions and thus in all information processing.

It is a general property that internal fluctuations due to noise decrease when the size, i.e., the number of components of the record is increased. In fact, the probability p_{mis} for a misreading or miswriting of a record changes as

Challenge 1203 ny

$$p_{\text{mis}} \sim 1/N \,, \tag{500}$$

where N is the number of particles or subsystems used for storing it. This relation appears because, for large numbers, the so-called *normal distribution* is a good approximation of almost any process; the width of the normal distribution, which determines the probability of record errors, grows less rapidly than its integral when the number of entities is increased. (Are you able to confirm this?)

Challenge 1204 ny

We conclude that any good record must be made from a *large* number of entities. The larger the number, the less sensitive the memory is to fluctuations. Now, a system of large size with small fluctuations is called a *(physical) bath*. Only baths make memories possible. In other words, every record contains a bath. We conclude that any *observation* of a system is the interaction of that system with a bath. This connection will be used several times in the following, in particular in quantum theory. When a record is produced by a machine, the 'observation' is usually called a *(generalized) measurement*. Are you able to specify the bath in the case of a person looking at a landscape?

Challenge 1205 s

From the preceding discussion we can deduce a powerful conclusion: since we have such a good memory at our disposition, we can deduce that we are made of many small parts. And since records exist, the world must also be made of a large number of small parts. No microscope of any kind is needed to confirm the existence of molecules or similar small entities; such a tool is only needed to determine the *sizes* of these particles. Their existence can be deduced simply from the observation that we have memory. (Of course, another argument proving that matter is made of small parts is the ubiquity of noise.)

Page 256

A second conclusion was popularized in the late 1920s by Leo Szilard. Writing a memory does not produce entropy; it is possible to store information into a memory without increasing entropy. However, entropy is produced in every case that the memory is *erased*.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1206 ny It turns out that the (minimum) entropy created by erasing one bit is given by

$$S_{\text{per erased bit}} = k \ln 2 \,, \tag{501}$$

and the number $\ln 2 \approx 0.69$ is the natural logarithm of 2. Erasing thus on one hand reduces the disorder of the data – the local entropy–, but on the other hand increases the total entropy. As is well known, energy is needed to reduce the entropy of a local system. In short, any system that erases memory requires energy. For example, a logical AND gate effectively erases one bit per operation. Logical thinking thus requires energy. It is also known that *dreaming* is connected with the erasing and reorganization of information. Could that be the reason that, when we are very tired, without any energy left, we do not dream as much as usual? Challenge 1207 s

Entropy is thus necessarily created when we forget. This is evident when we remind ourselves that forgetting is similar to the deterioration of an ancient manuscript. Entropy Ref. 715 increases when the manuscript is not readable any more, since the process is irreversible and dissipative.* Another way to see this is to recognize that to clear a memory, e.g. a magnetic tape, we have to put energy into it, and thus increase its entropy. Conversely, *writing* into a memory can often *reduce* entropy; we remember that signals, the entities that write memories, carry negative entropy. For example, the writing of magnetic tapes usually reduces their entropy.

The capacity of the brain

> “Computers are boring. They can give only answers.”
>
> (Wrongly) attributed to Pablo Picasso

The human brain is built in such a way that its fluctuations cannot destroy its contents. The brain is well protected by the skull for exactly this reason. In addition, the brain literally grows connections, called *synapses*, between its various *neurons*, which are the cells doing the signal processing. The neuron is the basic processing element of the brain, performing the basic classification. It can only do two things: to fire and not to fire. (It is possible that the time at which a neuron fires also carries information; this question is Ref. 718, Ref. 719 not yet settled.) The neuron fires depending on its input, which comes via the synapses from hundreds of other neurons. A neuron is thus an element that can distinguish the inputs it receives into two cases: those leading to firing and those that do not. Neurons are thus classifiers of the simplest type, able only to distinguish between two situations.

Every time we store something in our long term memory, such as a phone number, new synapses are grown or the connection strength of existing synapses is changed. The connections between the neurons are much stronger than the fluctuations in the brain.

Ref. 716 * As Wojciech Zurek clearly explains, the entropy created inside the memory is the main reason that even Maxwell's demon cannot reduce the entropy of two volumes of gases by opening a door between them in such a way that fast molecules accumulate on one side and slow molecules accumulate on the other. (Maxwell had introduced the 'demon' in 1871, to clarify the limits posed by nature to the gods.) This is just another way to rephrase the old result of Leo Szilard, who showed that the measurements by the demon Ref. 717 create more entropy than they can save. And every measurement apparatus contains a memory.

To play being Maxwell's demon, click on the www.wolfenet.com/~zeppelin/maxwell.htm website.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Only strong disturbances, such as a blocked blood vessel or a brain lesion, can destroy neurons and lead to loss of memory.

As a whole, the brain provides an extremely efficient memory. Despite intense efforts, engineers have not yet been able to build a memory with the capacity of the brain in the same volume. Let us estimated this memory capacity. By multiplying the number of neurons, about 10^{11},* by the average number of synapses per neuron, about 100, and also by the estimated number of bits stored in every synapse, about 10, we arrive at a storage capacity for the brain of about

$$M_{\text{rewritable}} \approx 10^{14}\,\text{bit} \approx 10^{4}\,\text{GB}\,. \tag{502}$$

(One *byte*, abbreviated B, is the usual name for eight bits of information.) Note that evolution has managed to put as many neurons in the brain as there are stars in the galaxy, and that if we add all the synapse lengths, we get a total length of about 10^{11} m, which corresponds to the distance to from the Earth to the Sun. Our brain truly is *astronomically* complex.

In practice, the capacity of the brain seems almost without limit, since the brain frees memory every time it needs some new space, by *forgetting* older data, e.g. during sleep. Note that this standard estimate of 10^{14} bits is not really correct! It assumes that the only component storing information in the brain is the synapse strength. Therefore it only measures the *erasable* storage capacity of the brain. In fact, information is also stored in the structure of the brain, i.e., in the exact configuration in which every cell is connected to other cells. Most of this structure is fixed at the age of about two years, but it continues to develop at a lower level for the rest of human life. Assuming that for each of the N cells with n connections there are $f\,n$ connection possibilities, this *write once* capacity of the brain can be estimated as roughly $N\sqrt{f\,n}\,f\,n\log f\,n$ bits. For $N = 10^{11}$, $n = 10^{2}$, $f = 6$, this gives

Challenge 1208 ny

$$M_{\text{writeonce}} \approx 10^{16}\,\text{bit} \approx 10^{6}\,\text{GB}\,. \tag{503}$$

Ref. 720 Recent measurements confirmed that bilingual persons, especially early bilinguals, have a higher density of grey mass in the small parietal cortex on the left hemisphere of the brain. This is a region mainly concerned with language processing. The brain thus makes also use of structural changes for optimized storage and processing.

Incidentally, even though the brains of sperm whales and of elephants can be five to six times as heavy as those of humans, the number of neurons and connections, and thus the capacity, is lower than for humans.

Sometimes it is claimed that people use only between 5% or 10% of their brain capacity. This myth, which goes back to the nineteenth century, would imply that it is possible to measure the actual data stored in the brain and compare it with its capacity to an impossible accuracy. Alternatively, the myth implies that the processing capacity can be measured. It also implies that nature would develop and maintain an organ with 90 % overcapacity, wasting all the energy and material to build, repair and maintain it. The myth is wrong.

* The number of neurons seems to be constant, and fixed at birth. The growth of interconnections is highest between age one and three, when it is said to reach up to 10^{7} new connections per second.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The large storage capacity of the brain also shows that human memory is filled by the environment and is not inborn: one human ovule plus one sperm have a mass of about 1 mg, which corresponds to about $3 \cdot 10^{16}$ atoms. Obviously, fluctuations make it impossible to store 10^{16} bits in it. In fact, nature stores only about $3 \cdot 10^9$ bits in the genes of an ovule, using 10^7 atoms per bit. In contrast, a typical brain has a mass of 1.5 to 2 kg, containing about 5 to $7 \cdot 10^{25}$ atoms, which makes it as efficient as the ovule. The difference between the number of bits in human DNA and those in the brain nicely shows that almost all information stored in the brain is taken from the environment; it cannot be of genetic origin, even allowing for smart decompression of stored information.

In total, all these tricks used by nature result in the most powerful classifier yet known.* Are there any limits to the brain's capacity to memorize and to classify? With the tools that humans have developed to expand the possibilities of the brain, such as paper, writing and printing to help memory, and the numerous tools available to simplify and to abbreviate classifications explored by mathematicians, brain classification is only limited by the time spent practising it. Without tools, there are strict limits, of course. Ref. 721 The two-millimetre thick cerebral cortex of humans has a surface of about four sheets of A4 paper, a chimpanzee's yields one sheet and a monkey's is the size of a postcard. It is estimated that the total intellectually accessible memory is of the order of

$$M_{\text{intellectual}} \approx 1\,\text{GB}\,, \tag{504}$$

though with a large experimental error.

The brain is also unparalleled in its processing capacity. This is most clearly demonstrated by the most important consequence deriving from memory and classification: thought and language. Indeed, the many types of thinking or language we use, such as comparing, distinguishing, remembering, recognizing, connecting, describing, deducing, explaining, imagining, etc., all describe different ways to classify memories or perceptions. In the end, every type of thinking or talking directly or indirectly classifies observations. But how far are computers from achieving this! The first attempt, in 1966, was a programming joke by Joseph Weizenbaum: the famous chatterbot program Eliza (try it at www.manifestation.com/neurotoys/eliza.php3) is a parody of a psychoanalyst. Even today, over 40 years later, conversation with a computer program, such as Friendbot (found at www.friendbot.co.uk), is still a disappointing experience. We need to understand the reasons for this slow development.

Curiosities about the brain

The brain plays strange games on the people that carry it. Modern research has shown that students can be distinguished into five separate groups.

1. Strong students
2. Uninterested students
3. Students that overestimate themselves (often, but not always, boys)
4. Students that underestimate themselves (often, but not always, girls)
5. Weak students

* Also the power consumption of the brain is important: even though it contains only about 2% of the body's mass, is uses 25% of the energy taken in by food.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

This has to be kept in mind when teaching classes. To which group do/did you belong?

* *

Teachers should all be brain experts. The brain learns best when it has an *aim*. How many teachers state the aim of their class at its beginning? Students need different *motivations*: potential applications, curiosity, competition, activation of already acquired knowledge, impressing the opposite sex, or exploring the unknown. And they need it on different levels of difficulty. Which teacher provides this mix? Students have different ways to *create concepts*: using words, sounds, images, emotions, body sensations, etc. Which teacher addresses them all in his lessons?



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 31

THOUGHT AND LANGUAGE

What is language?

> Reserve your right to think, for even to think wrongly is better than not to think at all.
>
> Hypatia of Alexandria

> Ein Satz kann nur sagen, *wie* ein Ding ist, nicht *was* es ist.*
>
> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 3.221

Language possibly is the most wonderful gift of human nature. Using the ability to produce sounds and to put ink on paper, people attach certain *symbols*,** also called *words* or *terms* in this context, to the many partitions they specify with the help of their thinking. Such a categorization is then said to define a *concept* or *notion*, and is set in *italic typeface* in this text. A standard set of concepts forms a language.*** In other words, a *(human) language* is a standard way of symbolic interaction between people.**** There are human languages based on facial expressions, on gestures, on spoken words, on whistles, on written words, and more. The use of *spoken* language is considerably younger than the human species; it seems that it appeared only about two hundred thousand years ago. Written language is even younger, namely only about six thousand years old. But the set of concepts used, the *vocabulary*, is still expanding. For humans, the understanding of language begins soon after birth (perhaps even before), the active use begins at around a year of age, the ability to read can start as early as two, and personal vocabulary continues to grow as long as curiosity is alive.

---

* 'A proposition can only say *how* a thing is, not *what* it is.'

** A symbol is a type of *sign*, i.e., an entity associated by some convention to the object it refers. Following Charles Peirce (1839–1914) – see www.peirce.org – the most original philosopher born in the United States, a symbol differs from an *icon* (or *image*) and from an *index*, which are also attached to objects by convention, in that it does not resemble the object, as does an icon, and in that it has no contact with the object, as is the case for an index.

*** The recognition that language is based on a partition of ideas, using the various differences between them to distinguish them from each other, goes back to the Swiss thinker Ferdinand de Saussure (1857–1913), who is regarded as the founder of linguistics. His textbook *Cours de linguistique générale*, Editions Payot, 1985, has been the reference work of the field for over half a century. Note that Saussure, in contrast to Peirce, prefers the term 'sign' to 'symbol', and that his definition of the term 'sign' includes also the object to which it refers.

**** For slightly different definitions and a wealth of other interesting information about language, see the beautiful book by David Crystal, *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*, Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 74 Language basics

Aspect	Value
Human phonemes	*c.* 70
English phonemes	44
German phonemes	40
Italian phonemes	30
Words of the English language (more than most languages, with the possible exception of German)	*c.* 350 000
Number of languages on Earth in the year 2000	*c.* 8000

Physics being a lazy way to chat about motion, it needs language as an essential tool. Of the many aspects of language, from literature to poetry, from jokes to military orders, from expressions of encouragement, dreams, love and emotions, physics uses only a small and rather special segment. This segment is defined by the inherent restriction to talk about motion. Since motion is an observation, i.e., an interaction with the environment that several people experience in the same way, this choice puts a number of restrictions on the contents – the vocabulary – and on the form – the grammar – of such discussions.

For example, from the definition that observations are shared by others, we get the requirement that the statements describing them must be translatable into all languages. But when can a statement be translated? On this question two extreme points of view are possible: the first maintains that *all* statements can be translated, since it follows from the properties of human languages that each of them can express every possible statement. In this view, only sign systems that allow one to express the complete spectrum of human messages form a *human language*. This property distinguishes spoken and sign language from animal languages, such as the signs used by apes, birds or honey bees, and also from computer languages, such as Pascal or C. With this meaning of language, all statements can be translated by definition.

It is more challenging for a discussion to follow the opposing view, namely that precise translation is possible only for those statements which use terms, word types and grammatical structures found in *all* languages. Linguistic research has invested considerable effort in the distillation of phonological, grammatical and semantic *universals*, as they are called, from the 6000 or so languages thought to exist today.*

The investigations into the *phonological* aspect, which showed for example that every

* A professional database by the linguist Merritt Ruhlen with 5700 languages and many details on each language can be found at ehl.santafe.edu/intro1.htm. A long but unprofessional list with 6 900 languages (and with 39 000 language and dialect names) can be found on the website www.ethnologue.com. Beware, it is edited by a fringe religious group that aims to increase the number of languages as much as possible.

It is estimated that 15 000 ± 5 000 languages have existed in the past.

Nevertheless, in today's world, and surely in the sciences, it is often sufficient to know one's own language plus English. Since English is the language with the largest number of words, learning it well is a greater challenge than learning most other languages. Ref. 722

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 75 The semantic primitives, following Anna Wierzbicka

I, you, someone, something, people	[substantives]
this, the same, one, two, all, much/many	[determiners and quantifiers]
know, want, think, feel, say	[mental predicates]
do, happen	[agent, patient]
good, bad	[evaluative]
big, small	[descriptors]
very	[intensifier]
can, if (would)	[modality, irrealis]
because	[causation]
no (not)	[negation]
when, where, after (before), under (above)	[time and place]
kind of, part of	[taxonomy, partonomy]
like	[hedge/prototype]

language has at least two consonants and two vowels, does not provide any material for the discussion of translation.* Studying the *grammatical* (or *syntactic*) aspect, one finds that all languages use smallest elements, called 'words', which they group into sentences. They all have pronouns for the first and second person, 'I' and 'you', and always contain nouns and verbs. All languages use *subjects* and *predicates* or, as one usually says, the three entities *subject*, *verb* and *object*, though not always in this order. Just check the languages you know. Challenge 1209 e

On the *semantic* aspect, the long list of lexical universals, i.e., words that appear in all languages, such as 'mother' or 'Sun', has recently been given a structure. The linguist Anna Wierzbicka performed a search for the building blocks from which all concepts can be built. She looked for the definition of every concept with the help of simpler ones, and continued doing so until a fundamental level was reached that cannot be further reduced. The set of concepts that are left over are the primitives. By repeating this exercise in many languages, Wierzbicka found that the list is the same in all cases. She thus had discovered *universal semantic primitives*. In November 1992, the list contained the terms given in Table 75.

Following the life-long research of Anna Wierzbicka and her research school, all these concepts exist in all languages of the world studied so far.** They have defined the meaning of each primitive in detail, performed consistency checks and eliminated alternative approaches. They have checked this list in languages from all language groups, in languages from all continents, thus showing that the result is valid everywhere. In every language all other concepts can be defined with the help of the semantic primitives. Ref. 723

* Studies explore topics such as the observation that in many languages the word for 'little' contains an 'i' (or high pitched 'e') sound: petit, piccolo, klein, tiny, pequeño, chiisai; exceptions are: small, parvus.

** It is easy to imagine that this research steps on the toes of many people. A list that maintains that 'true', 'good', 'creation', 'life', 'mother' or 'god' are composite will elicit violent reactions, despite the correctness of the statements. Indeed, some of these terms were added in the 1996 list, which is somewhat longer. In addition, a list that maintains that we only have about thirty basic concepts in our heads is taken by many to be offensive.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Simply stated, learning to speak means learning these basic terms, learning how to combine them and learning the names of these composites. The definition of language given above, namely as a means of communication that allows one to express everything one wants to say, can thus be refined: a *human language* is any set of concepts that includes the universal semantic primitives.

For physicists – who aim to talk in as few words as possible – the list of semantic primitives has three facets. First, the approach is appealing, as it is similar to physics' own aim: the idea of primitives gives a structured summary of everything that can be said, just as the atomic elements structure all objects that can be observed. Second, the list of primitives can be structured. In fact, the list of primitives can be divided into two groups: one group contains all terms describing motion (do, happen, when, where, feel, small, etc. – probably a term from the semantic field around light or colour should be added) and the other group contains all terms necessary to talk about abstract sets and relations (this, all, kind of, no, if, etc.). Even for linguistics, aspects of motion and logical concepts are the basic entities of human experience and human thinking. To bring the issue to a point, the semantic primitives contain the basic elements of physics and the basic elements of mathematics. All humans are thus both physicists and mathematicians. The third point is that the list of primitives is too long. The division of the list into two groups directly suggests shorter lists; we just have to ask physicists and mathematicians for concise summaries of their respective fields. To appreciate this aim, try to define what 'if' means, or what an 'opposite' is – and explore your own ways of reducing the list.

Challenge 1210 d

Reducing the list of primitives is also one of our aims in this adventure. We will explore the mathematical group of primitives in this chapter the physical group will occupy us in the rest of our adventure. However, a shorter list of primitives is not sufficient. Our goal is to arrive at a list consisting of only *one* basic concept. Reaching this goal is not simple, though. First, we need to check whether the set of classical physical concepts that we have discovered so far is complete. Can classical physical concepts describe *all* observations? The upcoming quantum part of our adventure is devoted to this question. The second task is to reduce the list. This task is not straightforward; we have already discovered that physics is based on a circular definition: in Galilean physics, space and time are defined using matter, and matter is defined using space and time. We will need quite some effort to overcome this obstacle. The final part of this text tells the precise story. After numerous adventures we will indeed discover a basic concept on which all other concepts are based.

Page 317

We can summarize all the above-mentioned results of linguistics in the following way. By constructing a statement made only of subject, verb and object, consisting only of nouns and verbs, using only concepts built from the semantic primitives, we are sure that it can be translated into all languages. This explains why physics textbooks are often so boring: the authors are often too afraid to depart from this basic scheme. On the other hand, research has shown that such straightforward statements are not restrictive: with them one can say everything that can be said.

> Every word was once a poem.
> Ralph Waldo Emerson*

* Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803–1882), US-American essayist and philosopher.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

What is a concept?

> Concepts are merely the results, rendered permanent by language, of a previous process of comparison.
>
> William Hamilton

There is a group of people that has taken the strict view on translation and on precision to the extreme. They build all concepts from an even smaller set of primitives, namely only two: 'set' and 'relation', and explore the various possible combinations of these two concepts, studying their classifications. Step by step, this radical group, commonly called *mathematicians*, came to define with full precision concepts such as numbers, points, curves, equations, symmetry groups and more. The construction of these concepts is summarized partly in the following and partly in Appendix B.

However, despite the involved precision, in fact precisely because of it, no mathematical concept talks about nature or about observations.* Therefore the study of motion needs other, more useful concepts. What properties must a useful concept have? For example, what is 'passion' and what is a 'cotton bud'? Obviously, a useful concept implies a list of its parts, its aspects and their internal relations, as well as their relation to the exterior world. Thinkers in various fields, from philosophy to politics, agree that the definition of any *concept* requires:

— explicit and fixed content,
— explicit and fixed limits,
— explicit and fixed domain of application.

The inability to state these properties or keep them fixed is often the easiest way to distinguish *crackpots* from more reliable thinkers. Unclearly defined terms, which thus do not qualify as concepts, regularly appear in myths, e.g. 'dragon' or 'sphinx', or in ideologies, e.g. 'worker' or 'soul'. Even physics is not immune. For example, we will discover later that neither 'universe' nor 'creation' are concepts. Are you able to argue the case?

Challenge 1211 s

But the three defining properties of any concepts are interesting in their own right. Explicit content means that concepts are built one onto another. In particular, the most fundamental concepts appear to be those that have no parts and no external relations, but only internal ones. Can you think of one? Only the last part of this walk will uncover the final word on the topic.

Challenge 1212 s

The requirements of explicit limits and explicit contents also imply that all concepts describing nature are *sets*, since sets obey the same requirements. In addition, explicit domains of application imply that all concepts also are *relations*.** Since mathematics is based on the concepts of 'set' and of 'relation', one follows directly that mathematics can

* Insofar as one can say that mathematics is based on the concepts of 'set' and 'relation', which are based on experience, one can say that mathematics explores a section of reality, and that its concepts are *derived* from experience. This and similar views of mathematics are called *platonism*. More concretely, platonism is the view that the concepts of mathematics exist *independently* of people, and that they are discovered, and not created, by mathematicians.

In short, since mathematics makes use of the brain, which is a physical system, actually *mathematics is applied physics*.

** We see that every physical concept is an example of a (mathematical) *category*, i.e., a combination of objects and mappings. For more details about categories, with a precise definition of the term, see page 826.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

provide the *form* for any concept, especially whenever high precision is required, as in the study of motion. Obviously, the *content* of the description is only provided by the study of nature itself; only then do concepts become useful.

In the case of physics, the search for sufficiently precise concepts can be seen as the single theme structuring the long history of the field. Regularly, new concepts have been proposed, explored in all their properties, and tested. Finally, concepts are rejected or adopted, in the same way that children reject or adopt a new toy. Children do this unconsciously, scientists do it consciously, using language.* For this reason, concepts are universally intelligible.

Note that the concept '*concept*' itself is not definable independently of experience; a concept is something that helps us to act and react to the world in which we live. Moreover, concepts do not live in a world separate from the physical one: every concept requires memory from its user, since the user has to remember the way in which it was formed; therefore every concept needs a material support for its use and application. Thus all thinking and all science is fundamentally based on experience.

In conclusion, all concepts are based on the idea that nature is made of related parts. This idea leads to complementing couples such as 'noun–verb' in linguistics, 'set–relation' or 'definition–theorem' in mathematics, and 'aspect of nature–pattern of nature' in physics. These couples constantly guide human thinking, from childhood onwards, as developmental psychology can testify.

What are sets? What are relations?

> Alles, was wir sehen, könnte auch anders sein. Alles, was wir überhaupt beschreiben können, könnte auch anders sein. Es gibt keine Ordnung der Dinge a priori.**
>
> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 5.634

Defining sets and defining relations are the two fundamental acts of our thinking. This can be seen most clearly in any book about mathematics; such a book is usually divided into paragraphs labelled 'definition', 'theorem', 'lemma' and 'corollary'. The first type of paragraph defines concepts, i.e., defines sets, and the other three types of paragraphs express relations, i.e., connections between these sets. *Mathematics* is thus the exploration of the possible symbolic concepts and their relations. Mathematics is the science of symbolic necessities.

Sets and relations are tools of classification; that is why they are also the tools of any bureaucrat. (See Figure 407.) This class of humans is characterized by heavy use of paper clips, files, metal closets, archives – which all define various types of sets – and by the extensive use of numbers, such as reference numbers, customer numbers, passport

* Concepts formed unconsciously in our early youth are the most difficult to define precisely, i.e., with language. Some who were unable to define them, such as the Prussian philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) used to call them 'a priori' concepts (such as 'space' and 'time') to contrast them with the more clearly defined 'a posteriori' concepts. Today, this distinction has been shown to be unfounded both by the study of child psychology (see the footnote on page 807) and by physics itself, so that these qualifiers are therefore not used in our walk.

** 'Everything we see could also be otherwise. Everything we describe at all could also be otherwise. There is no order of things a priori.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 407 Devices for the definition of sets (left) and of relations (right)

TABLE 76 The defining properties of a set – the ZFC axioms

The axioms of Zermelo–Fraenkel–C set theory
– Two sets are equal if and only if they have the same elements. (Axiom of extensionality)
– The empty set is a set. (Axiom of the null set)
– If x and y are sets, then the unordered pair $\{x, y\}$ is a set. (Axiom of unordered pairs)
– If x is a set of sets, the union of all its members is a set. (Union or sum set axiom)
– The entity $\{\varnothing, \{\varnothing\}, \{\{\varnothing\}\}, \{\{\{\varnothing\}\}\}, \ldots\}$ is a set [a] – in other words, infinite collections, such as the natural numbers, are sets. (Axiom of infinity)
– An entity defined by all elements having a given property is a set, provided this property is reasonable; some important technicalities defining 'reasonable' are necessary. (Axiom of separation)
– If the domain of a function is a set, so is its range. (Axiom of replacement)
– The entity y of all subsets of x is also a set, called the power set. (Axiom of the power set)
– A set is not an element of itself – plus some technicalities. (Axiom of regularity)
– The product of a family of non-empty sets is non-empty. Equivalently, picking elements from a list of sets allows one to construct a new set – plus technicalities. (Axiom of choice)

a. The more common formulation (though equivalent to the above) is: The entity $\{\varnothing, \{\varnothing\}, \{\varnothing, \{\varnothing\}\}, \{\varnothing, \{\varnothing\}, \{\varnothing, \{\varnothing\}\}\}, \ldots\}$ is a set.

numbers, account numbers, law article numbers – which define various types of relations between the items, i.e., between the elements of the sets.

Both the concepts of set and of relation express, in different ways, the fact that nature can be *described*, i.e., that it can be classified into parts that form a whole. The act of grouping together aspects of experience, i.e., the act of classifying them, is expressed in formal language by saying that a set is defined. In other words, a *set* is a collection of *elements* of our thinking. Every set distinguishes the elements from each other and from the set itself. This definition of 'set' is called the *naive* definition. For physics, the definition is sufficient, but you won't find many who will admit this. In fact, mathematicians have refined the definition of the concept 'set' several times, because the naive definition does not work well for infinite sets. A famous example is the story about sets which do not contain themselves. Obviously, any set is of two sorts: either it contains itself or it does not. If we take the set of all sets that do *not* contain themselves, to which sort does it belong?

Challenge 1213 s

To avoid problems with the concept of 'set', mathematics requires a precise definition. The first such definition was given by the German mathematician Ernst Zermelo (b. 1871 Berlin, d. 1951 Freiburg i.B.) and the German–Israeli mathematician Adolf/Abraham Fraenkel (b. 1891 München, d. 1965 Jerusalem). Later, the so-called *axiom of choice* was

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

added, in order to make it possible to manipulate a wider class of infinite sets. The result of these efforts is called the *ZFC* definition.* From this basic definition we can construct all mathematical concepts used in physics. From a practical point of view, it is sufficient to keep in mind that for the whole of physics, the naive definition of a set is equivalent to the precise ZFC definition, actually even to the simpler ZF definition. Subtleties appear only for some special types of infinite sets, but these are not used in physics. In short, from the basic, naive set definition we can construct all concepts used in physics.

Ref. 725 The naive set definition is far from boring. To satisfy two people when dividing a cake, we follow the rule: I cut, you choose. The method has two properties: it is *just*, as everybody thinks that they have the share that they deserve, and it is *fully satisfying*, as everybody has the feeling that they have at least as much as the other. What rule is needed Challenge 1215 d for three people? And for four?

Apart from defining sets, every child and every brain creates links between the different aspects of experience. For example, when it hears a voice, it automatically makes the connection that a human is present. In formal language, connections of this type are called *relations*. Relations connect and differentiate elements along other lines than sets: the two form a complementing couple. Defining a set unifies many objects and at the same time divides them into two: those belonging to the set and those that do not; defining a (binary) relation unifies elements two by two and divides them into many, namely into the many couples it defines.

Sets and relations are closely interrelated concepts. Indeed, one can define (mathematical) relations with the help of sets. A *(binary) relation* between two sets X and Y is a subset of the product set, where the *product set* or *Cartesian product* $X \times Y$ is the set of all ordered pairs (x, y) with $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$. An *ordered pair* (x, y) can easily be defined Challenge 1216 s with the help of sets. Can you find out how? For example, in the case of the relation 'is wife of', the set X is the set of all women and the set Y that of all men; the relation is given by the list all the appropriate ordered pairs, which is much smaller than the product set, i.e., the set of all possible woman–man combinations.

It should be noted that the definition of relation just given is not really complete, since every construction of the concept 'set' already contains certain relations, such as the relation 'is element of.' It does not seem to be possible to reduce either one of the concepts 'set' or 'relation' completely to the other one. This situation is reflected in the physical cases of sets and relations, such as space (as a set of points) and distance, which also seem impossible to separate completely from each other. In other words, even though mathematics does not pertain to nature, its two basic concepts, sets and relations, are taken from nature. In addition, the two concepts, like those of space-time and particles, are each defined with the other.

* A global overview of axiomatic set theory is given by Paul J. Cohen & Reuben Hersch, Non-Cantorian set theory, *Scientific American* **217**, pp. 104–116, 1967. Those were the times when *Scientific American* was a quality magazine.

Ref. 724 Other types of entities, more general than standard sets, obeying other properties, can also be defined, and are also subject of (comparatively little) mathematical research. To find an example, see the section Page 825 on cardinals later on. Such more general entities are called classes whenever they contain at least one set. Challenge 1214 s Can you give an example? In the final part of our mountain ascent we will meet physical concepts that are described neither by sets nor by classes, containing no set at all. That is where the real fun starts.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Infinity

Mathematicians soon discovered that the concept of 'set' is only useful if one can also call collections such as $\{0, 1, 2, 3\ldots\}$, i.e., of the number 0 and all its successors, a 'set'. To achieve this, one property in the Zermelo–Fraenkel list defining the term 'set' explicitly specifies that this collection can be called a set. (In fact, also the axiom of replacement states that sets may be infinite.) Infinity is thus put into mathematics and into the tools of our thought right at the very beginning, in the definition of the term 'set'. When describing nature, with or without mathematics, we should never forget this fact. A few additional points about infinity should be of general knowledge to any expert on motion.

Only *sets* can be infinite. And sets have parts, namely their elements. When a thing or a concept is called 'infinite' one can *always* ask and specify what its parts are: for space the parts are the points, for time the instants, for the set of integers the integers, etc. An indivisible or a finitely divisible entity cannot be called infinite.*

A set is infinite if there is a function from it into itself that is *injective* (i.e., different elements map to different results) but not *onto* (i.e., some elements do not appear as images of the map); e.g. the map $n \mapsto 2n$ shows that the set of integers is infinite. Infinity also can be checked in another way: a set is infinite if it remains so also after removing one element, even repeatedly. We just need to remember that the empty set is *finite*.

There are *many types* of infinities, all of different sizes.** This important result was discovered by the Danish-Russian-German mathematician Georg Cantor (1845–1918). He showed that from the countable set of natural numbers one can construct other infinite sets which are not countable. He did this by showing that the *power set* $P(\omega)$, namely the set of all subsets, of a countably infinite set is infinite, but *not* countably infinite. Sloppily speaking, the power set is 'more infinite' than the original set. The real numbers $\mathbb{R}$, to be defined shortly, are an example of an uncountably infinite set; there are many more of them than there are natural numbers. (Can you show this?) However, *any* type of infinite set contains at least one subset which is countably infinite.

Challenge 1217 s

Even for an infinite set one can define size as the number of its elements. Cantor called this the *cardinality* of a set. The cardinality of a finite set is simply given by the number of its elements. The cardinality of a power set is 2 exponentiated by the cardinality of the set. The cardinality of the set of integers is called $\aleph_0$, pronounced 'aleph zero', after the first letter of the Hebrew alphabet. The smallest *uncountable* cardinal is called $\aleph_1$. The next cardinal is called $\aleph_2$ etc. A whole branch of mathematics is concerned with the manipulation of these infinite 'numbers'; addition, multiplication, exponentiation are easily defined. For some of them, even logarithms and other functions make sense.***

Page 323

The cardinals defined in this way, including $\aleph_n$, $\aleph_\omega$, $\aleph_{\aleph_\aleph}$ are called accessible, because since Cantor, people have defined even larger types of infinities, called *inaccessible*. These numbers (inaccessible cardinals, measurable cardinals, supercompact cardinals,

* Therefore, most gods, being concepts and thus sets, are either finite or, in the case where they are infinite, they are divisible. It seems that only polytheistic world views are not disturbed by this conclusion.

** In fact, there is such a huge number of types of infinities that none of these infinities itself actually describes this number. Technically speaking, there are as many infinities as there are ordinals.

*** Many results are summarized in the excellent and delightful paperback by Rudy Rucker, *Infinity and the Mind – the Science and Philosophy of the Infinite*, Bantam, Toronto, 1983.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

etc.) need additional set axioms, extending the ZFC system. Like the ordinals and the cardinals, they form examples of what are called *transfinite* numbers.

The real numbers have the cardinality of the power set of the integers, namely $2^{\aleph_0}$. Challenge 1218 s Can you show this? The result leads to the famous question: Is $\aleph_1 = 2^{\aleph_0}$ or not? The statement that this be so is called the *continuum hypothesis* and was unproven for several generations. The surprising answer came in 1963: the usual definition of the concept of Ref. 726 set is not specific enough to fix the answer. By specifying the concept of set in more detail, with additional axioms – remember that axioms are defining properties – you can make the continuum hypothesis come out either right or wrong, as you prefer.

Another result of research into transfinites is important: for every definition of a type of infinite cardinal, it seems to be possible to find a larger one. In everyday life, the idea of infinity is often used to stop discussions about size: 'My big brother is stronger than yours.' 'But mine is infinitely stronger than yours!' Mathematics has shown that questions on size do continue afterwards: 'The strength of my brother is the power set of that of Ref. 727 yours!' Rucker reports that mathematicians conjecture that there is no possible nor any conceivable end to these discussions.

For physicists, a simple question appears directly. Do infinite quantities exist in nature? Or better, is it necessary to use infinite quantities to describe nature? You might Challenge 1219 e want to clarify your own opinion on the issue. It will be settled during the rest of our adventure.

Functions and structures

Which relations are useful to describe patterns in nature? A typical example is 'larger stones are heavier'. Such a relation is of a specific type: it relates one specific value of an observable 'volume' to one specific value of the observable 'weight'. Such a one-to-one relation is called a *(mathematical) function* or *mapping*. Functions are the most specific types of relations; thus they convey a maximum of information. In the same way as numbers are used for observables, functions allow easy and precise communication of relations between observations. All physical rules and 'laws' are therefore expressed with the help of functions and, since physical 'laws' are about measurements, functions of numbers are their main building blocks.

A *function* f, or *mapping*, is a thus binary relation, i.e., a set $f = \{(x, y)\}$ of ordered pairs, where for every value of the first element x, called the *argument*, there is only *one* pair (x, y). The second element y is called the *value* of the function at the argument x. The set X of all arguments x is called the *domain of definition* and the set Y of all second arguments y is called the *range* of the function. Instead of $f = \{(x, y)\}$ one writes

$$f : X \to Y \quad \text{and} \quad f : x \mapsto y \quad \text{or} \quad y = f(x)\,, \tag{505}$$

where the type of arrow – with initial bar or not – shows whether we are speaking about sets or about elements.

We note that it is also possible to use the couple 'set' and 'mapping' to define all mathematical concepts; in this case a relation is defined with the help of mappings. A modern school of mathematical thought formalized this approach by the use of (mathematical) *categories*, a concept that includes both sets and mappings on an equal footing in its def-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

inition.*

To think and talk more clearly about nature, we need to define more specialized concepts than sets, relations and functions, because these basic terms are too general. The most important concepts derived from them are operations, algebraic structures and numbers.

A *(binary) operation* is a function that maps the Cartesian product of two copies of a set X into itself. In other words, an operation w takes an ordered couple of arguments $x \in X$ and assigns to it a value $y \in X$:

$$w : X \times X \to X \quad \text{and} \quad w : (x, x) \mapsto y \,. \tag{506}$$

Challenge 1220 s Is division of numbers an operation in the sense just defined?

Now we are ready to define the first of three basic concepts of mathematics. An *algebraic structure*, also called an *algebraic system*, is (in the most restricted sense) a set together with certain operations. The most important algebraic structures appearing in
Page 886 physics are groups, vector spaces, and algebras.

In addition to algebraic structures, mathematics is based on *order structures* and on *topological structures*. Order structures are building blocks of numbers and necessary to define comparisons of any sort. Topological structures are built, via subsets, on the concept of neighbourhood. They are necessary to define continuity, limits, dimensionality,
Page 895 topological spaces and manifolds.

Obviously, most mathematical structures are combinations of various examples of these three basic structure types. For example, the *system* of real numbers is given by the *set* of real numbers with the *operations* of addition and multiplication, the *order relation* 'is larger than' and a *continuity* property. They are thus built by combining an algebraic
Ref. 728 structure, an order structure and a topological structure. Let us delve a bit into the details.

Numbers

> "Which numbers are multiplied by six when their last digit is taken away and transferred to the front?"

Challenge 1221 s

Numbers are the oldest mathematical concept and are found in all cultures. The notion of number, in Greek ἀριθμός, has been changed several times. Each time the aim was to include wider classes of objects, but always retaining the general idea that numbers are entities that can be added, subtracted, multiplied and divided.

The modern way to write numbers, as e.g. in $12\,345\,679 \cdot 54 = 666\,666\,666$, is essential

* A *category* is defined as a collection of objects and a collection of 'morphisms', or mappings. Morphisms can be composed; the composition is associative and there is an identity morphism. The strange world of category theory, sometimes called the abstraction of all abstractions, is presented in William Lawvere & Stephen H. Schanuel, *Conceptual Mathematics: a First Introduction to Categories*, Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Note that every category contains a set; since it is unclear whether nature contains sets, as we will discuss on page 860, it is questionable whether categories will be useful in the unification of physics, despite their intense and abstract charm.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

for science.* It can be argued that the lack of a good system for writing down and for calculating with numbers delayed the progress of science by several centuries. (By the way, the same can be said for the affordable mass reproduction of written texts.)

The simplest numbers, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, ..., are usually seen as being taken directly from experience. However, they can also be constructed from the notions of 'relation' and 'set'. Challenge 1222 s One of the many possible ways to do this (can you find another?) is by identifying a natural number with the set of its predecessors. With the relation 'successor of', abbreviated S, this definition can be written as

$$0 := \varnothing \quad , \quad 1 := S\,0 = \{0\} = \{\varnothing\} \quad ,$$
$$2 := S\,1 = \{0,1\} = \{\varnothing, \{\varnothing\}\} \quad \text{and} \quad n+1 := S\,n = \{0, \ldots, n\} \,. \tag{507}$$

This set, together with the binary operations 'addition' and 'multiplication,' constitutes the algebraic system $N = (N, +, \cdot, 1)$ of the *natural numbers*. For all number systems the algebraic system and the set are often sloppily designated by the same symbol. The Page 875 algebraic system N is a so-called semi-ring, as explained in Appendix B. (Some authors prefer not to count the number zero as a natural number.) Natural numbers are fairly useful.

TABLE 77 Some large numbers

Number	Example in nature
Around us	
1	number of angels that can be in one place at the same time, following Thomas Aquinas Ref. 729
8	number of times a newspaper can be folded in alternate perpendicular directions
12	largest number of times a paper strip has been folded in the same direction Ref. 730
20	number of digits in precision measurements that will probably never be achieved
34, 55, 89	petals of common types of daisy and sunflower Ref. 731
57	faces of a diamond with brilliant cut
2000	stars visible in the night sky
15 000	average number of objects in a European household
10^5	leaves of a tree (10 m beech)
6 to 7 $\cdot 10^9$	humans in the year 2000
10^{17}	ants in the world
c. 10^{20}	number of snowflakes falling on the Earth per year
c. 10^{24}	grains of sand in the Sahara desert
10^{22}	stars in the universe
10^{25}	cells on Earth

* However, there is no need for written numbers for doing mathematics, as shown by Marcia Ascher, *Ethnomathematics – A Multicultural View of Mathematical Ideas*, Brooks/Cole, 1991.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Number	Example in nature
$1.1 \cdot 10^{50}$	atoms making up the Earth ($6370^3\,\mathrm{km}^3 \cdot 4 \cdot 3.14/3 \cdot 5500\,\mathrm{kg/m}^3 \cdot 30\,\mathrm{mol/kg} \cdot 6 \cdot 10^{23}\,/\mathrm{mol}$)
10^{81}	atoms in the visible universe
10^{90}	photons in the visible universe
10^{169}	number of atoms fitting in the visible universe
10^{244}	number of space-time points inside the visible universe
Information	
51	record number of languages spoken by one person
c. 5000	words spoken on an average day by a man
c. 7000	words spoken on an average day by a woman
c. 2 000 000	number of scientists on Earth around the year 2000
$3 \cdot 10^8$	words spoken during a lifetime (2/3 time awake, 30 words per minute)
$4 \cdot 10^9$	pulses exchanged between both brain halves every second
10^9	words heard and read during a lifetime
10^{17}	image pixels seen in a lifetime ($3 \cdot 10^9\,\mathrm{s} \cdot (1/15\,\mathrm{ms}) \cdot 2/3$ (awake) $\cdot 10^6$ (nerves to the brain) Ref. 732
10^{19}	bits of information processed in a lifetime (the above times 32)
c. $5 \cdot 10^{12}$	printed words available in (different) books around the world (*c.* $100 \cdot 10^6$ books consisting of 50 000 words)
$2^{10} \cdot 3^7 \cdot 8! \cdot 12!$ $= 4.3 \cdot 10^{19}$	possible positions of the $3 \times 3 \times 3$ Rubik's Cube Ref. 733
$5.8 \cdot 10^{78}$	possible positions of the $4 \times 4 \times 4$ Rubik-like cube
$5.6 \cdot 10^{117}$	possible positions of the $5 \times 5 \times 5$ Rubik-like cube
c. 10^{200}	possible games of chess
c. 10^{800}	possible games of go
c. 10^{10^7}	possible states in a personal computer
Parts of us	
600	numbers of muscles in the human body, of which about half are in the face
150 000 ± 50 000	hairs on a healthy head
900 000	neurons in the brain of a grasshopper
$126 \cdot 10^6$	light sensitive cells per retina (120 million rods and 6 million cones)
10^{10} to 10^{11}	neurons in the human brain
$> 10^{16}$	memory bits in the human brain
$500 \cdot 10^6$	blinks of the eye during a lifetime (about once every four seconds when awake)
$300 \cdot 10^6$	breaths taken during human life
$3 \cdot 10^9$	heart beats during a human life
$3 \cdot 10^9$	letters (base pairs) in haploid human DNA
$6.1 \cdot 10^9$	bits in a compact disc
$1 \cdot 10^{11}$	humans who have ever lived
$10^{15\pm1}$	cells in the human body

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Number	Example in nature
$10^{16\pm1}$	bacteria carried in the human body

The system of *integers* $Z = (\ldots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \ldots, +, \cdot, 0, 1)$ is the minimal ring that is an extension of the natural numbers. The system of *rational numbers* $Q = (Q, +, \cdot, 0, 1)$ is the minimal field that is an extension of the ring of the integers. (The terms 'ring' and 'field' are explained in Appendix B.) The system of *real numbers* $R = (R, +, \cdot, 0, 1, >)$ is the minimal extension of the rationals that is continuous and totally ordered. (For the definition of continuity, see page 896 and 876.) Equivalently, the reals are the minimal extension of the rationals forming a complete, totally strictly-Archimedean ordered field. This is the historical construction – or definition – of the integer, rational and real numbers from the natural numbers. However, it is not the only one construction possible. The most beautiful definition of all these types of numbers is the one discovered in 1969 by John Conway, and popularized by him, Donald Knuth and Martin Kruskal.

Page 875

Ref. 734

— A number is a sequence of bits. The two bits are usually called 'up' and 'down'. Examples of numbers and the way to write them are given in Figure 408.
— The empty sequence is zero.
— A finite sequence of n ups is the integer number n, and a finite sequence of n downs is the integer $-n$. Finite sequences of mixed ups and downs give the *dyadic rational numbers*. Examples are 1, 2, 3, −7, 19/4, 37/256, etc. They all have denominators with a power of 2. The other *rational numbers* are those that end in an infinitely repeating string of ups and downs, such as the *reals*, the *infinitesimals* and simple infinite numbers. Longer countably infinite series give even more crazy numbers. The complete class is called the class of *surreal* numbers.*

There is a second way to write surreal numbers. The first is the just mentioned sequence of bits. But in order to define addition and multiplication, another notation is usually used, deduced from Figure 408. A surreal α is defined as the earliest number of all those between two series of earlier surreals, the left and the right series:

$$\alpha = \{a, b, c, \ldots | A, B, C, \ldots\} \quad \text{with} \quad a, b, c, < \alpha < A, B, C \,. \tag{508}$$

For example, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\{0|\} = 1\,,\ \{0,1|\} = 2\,,\ \{|0\} = -1\,,\ \{|-1,0\} = -2\,,\ \{0|1\} = 1/2\,, \\ &\{0|1/2, 1/4\} = 1\,,\ \{0, 1, 3/2, 25/16\,|\,41/16, 13/8, 7/4, 2\} = 1 + 37/64\,, \end{aligned} \tag{509}$$

showing that the finite surreals are the *dyadic numbers* $m/2^n$ (n and m being integers). Given two surreals $\alpha = \{\ldots, a, \ldots | \ldots, A, \ldots\}$ with $a < \alpha < A$ and $\beta = \{\ldots, b, \ldots | \ldots, B, \ldots\}$ with $b < \beta < B$, addition is defined recursively, using earlier, already defined numbers, as

$$\alpha + \beta = \{\ldots, a + \beta, \ldots, \alpha + b, \ldots | \ldots, A + \beta, \ldots, \alpha + B, \ldots\}\,. \tag{510}$$

* The surreal numbers do *not* form a set since they contain all *ordinal numbers*, which themselves do not form a set, even though they of course *contain* sets. In short, ordinals and surreals are classes which are *larger* than sets.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 408 The surreal numbers in conventional and in bit notation

This definition is used simply because it gives the same results as usual addition for integers and reals. Can you confirm this? By the way, addition is not always commutative. Are you able to find the exceptions, and to find the definition for subtraction? Multiplication is also defined recursively, namely by the expression

Challenge 1223 s

$$\alpha\beta = \{\dots, a\beta + \alpha b - ab, \dots, A\beta + \alpha B - AB, \dots | \dots, a\beta + \alpha B - aB, \dots, A\beta + \alpha b - Ab, \dots\} \,. \tag{511}$$

These definitions allow one to write $\iota = 1/\omega$, and to talk about numbers such as $\sqrt{\omega}$, the square root of infinity, about $\omega + 4$, $\omega - 1$, 2ω, e^{ω} and about other strange numbers shown in Figure 408. However, the surreal numbers are not commonly used. More common is one of their subsets.

Ref. 734

The *real numbers* are those surreals whose length is not larger than infinity and that do not have periodic endings with a period of length 1. In other words, the surreals distinguish the number 0.999999... from the number 1, whereas the reals do not. However, this is only the case if the nines form a *simple* infinite sequence. In that case, between the two numbers there are infinitely many surreal numbers. Can you name a few?

Challenge 1224 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Reals are more useful for describing nature than surreals, first because they form a set – which the surreals do not – and secondly because they allow the definition of integration. Other numbers defined with the help of reals, e.g. the complex numbers $\mathbb{C}$and the quaternions $\mathbb{H}$, are presented in Appendix B. A few more elaborate number systems are also presented there.

Appendix B

To conclude, in physics it is usual to call *numbers* the elements of any set that is a semi-ring (e.g. $\mathbb{N}$), a ring (e.g. $\mathbb{Z}$) or a field ($\mathbb{Q}$, $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{C}$ or $\mathbb{H}$). All these concepts are defined in Appendix B. Since numbers allow one to compare magnitudes and thus to measure, they play a central role in the description of observations.

Ref. 735

> A series of equal balls is packed in such a way that the area of needed wrapping paper is minimal. For small numbers of balls the linear package, with all balls in one row, is the most efficient. For which number of balls is the linear package no longer a minimum?

Challenge 1225 s

Why use mathematics?

> Die Forderung der Möglichkeit der einfachen Zeichen ist die Forderung der Bestimmtheit des Sinnes.*
>
> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 3.23

Several well-known physicists have repeatedly asked why mathematics is so important. For example, Niels Bohr is quoted as having said: 'We do not know why the language of mathematics has been so effective in formulating those laws in their most succinct form.' Eugene Wigner wrote an often cited paper entitled *The unreasonable effectiveness of mathematics*. At the start of science, many centuries earlier, Pythagoras and his contemporaries were so overwhelmed by the usefulness of numbers in describing nature, that Pythagoras was able to organize a sect based on this connection. The members of the inner circle of this sect were called 'learned people,' in Greek '*mathematicians*', from the Greek μάθημα 'teaching'. This sect title then became the name of the modern profession.

Ref. 736

Ref. 737

These men forgot that numbers, as well as a large part of mathematics, are concepts developed precisely with the aim of describing nature. Numbers and mathematical concepts were developed right from the start to provide as succinct a description as possible. That is one consequence of mathematics being the science of symbolic necessities.

Perhaps we are being too dismissive. Perhaps these thinkers mainly wanted to express their feeling of wonder when experiencing that language works, that thinking and our brain works, and that life and nature are so beautiful. This would put the title question nearer to the well-known statement by Albert Einstein: 'The most incomprehensible fact about the universe is that it is comprehensible.' Comprehension is another word for description, i.e., for classification. Obviously, any separable system is comprehensible, and there is nothing strange about it. But is the universe separable? As long as is it described as being made of particles and vacuum, this is the case.

We will find in the last part of this adventure that the basic assumption made at our start is built on sand. The assumption that observations in nature can be *counted*, and

* 'The requirement that simple signs be possible is the requirement that sense be determinate.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

thus that nature is separable, is an approximation. The quoted 'incomprehensibility' becomes amazement at the precision of this approximation. Nevertheless, Pythagoras' sect, which was based on the thought that 'everything in nature is numbers', was wrong. Like so many beliefs, observation will show that it was wrong.

> Die Physik ist für Physiker viel zu schwer.*
> David Hilbert

Is mathematics a language?

> Die Sätze der Mathematik sind Gleichungen, also Scheinsätze. Der Satz der Mathematik drückt keinen Gedanken aus.**
> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 6.2, 6.21

Surely, mathematics is a *vocabulary* that helps us to talk with precision. Mathematics can be seen as the exploration of *all* possible concepts that can be constructed from the two fundamental bricks 'set' and 'relation' (or some alternative, but equivalent pair). *Mathematics* is the science of symbolic necessities. Rephrased again, mathematics is the exploration of all possible types of classifications. This explains its usefulness in all situations where complex, yet precise classifications of observations are necessary, such as in physics.

However, mathematics cannot express everything that humans want to communicate, such as wishes, ideas or feelings. Just try to express the fun of swimming using mathematics. Indeed, *mathematics is the science of symbolic necessities*; thus mathematics is not a language, nor does it contain one. Mathematical concepts, being based on *abstract* sets and relations, do not pertain to nature. Despite its beauty, mathematics does not allow us to talk about nature or the observation of motion. Mathematics does not tell *what* to say about nature; it does tell us *how* to say it.

In his famous 1900 lecture in Paris, the German mathematician David Hilbert*** gave a list of 23 great challenges facing mathematics. The sixth of Hilbert's problems was to find a mathematical treatment of the axioms of physics. Our adventure so far has shown that physics started with *circular* definitions that has not yet been eliminated after 2500 years of investigations: space-time is defined with the help of objects and objects are de-
Page 317
fined with the help of space and time. Being based on a circular definition, physics is thus *not* modelled after mathematics, even if many physicists and mathematicians, including
Ref. 738
Hilbert, would like it to be so. Physicists have to live with logical problems and have to

* Physics is much too difficult for physicists.

** 'The propositions of mathematics are equations, and therefore pseudo-propositions. A proposition of mathematics does not express a thought.'

*** David Hilbert (1862 Königsberg–1943 Göttingen), professor of mathematics in Göttingen and greatest mathematician of his time. He was a central figure to many parts of mathematics, and also played an important role both in the birth of general relativity and of quantum theory. His textbooks are still in print. His famous personal credo was: 'Wir müssen wissen, wir werden wissen.' (We must know, we will know.) His famous Paris lecture is published e.g. in *Die Hilbertschen Probleme*, Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Geest & Portig, 1983. The lecture galvanized all of mathematics. (Despite efforts and promises of similar fame, *nobody* in the world had a similar overview of mathematics that allowed him or her to repeat the feat in the year 2000.) In his last decade he suffered the persecution of the Nazi regime; the persecution eliminated Göttingen from the list of important science universities, without recovering its place up to this day.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

walk on unsure ground in order to achieve progress. In fact, they have done so for 2500 years. If physics were an axiomatic system, it would not contain contradictions; on the other hand, it would cease to be a language and would cease to describe nature. We will Page 1442 return to this issue later.

Curiosities and fun challenges about mathematics

Challenge 1226 s What is the largest number that can be written with four digits of 2 and no other sign? And with four 4s?

* *

Pythagorean triplets are integers that obey $a^2 + b^2 = c^2$. Give at least ten examples. Then Challenge 1227 e show the following three properties: at least one number in a triplet is a multiple of 3; at least one number in a triplet is a multiple of 4; at least one number in a triplet is a multiple of 5.

* *

A mother is 21 years older than her child, and in 6 years the child will be 5 times younger Challenge 1228 s than the mother. Where is the father? This is the *young mother puzzle*.

* *

The number $1/n$, when written in decimal notation, has a periodic sequence of digits. The period is at most $n - 1$ digits long, as for $1/7 = 0.142857\,142857\,1428\ldots$. Which other Challenge 1229 d numbers $1/n$ have periods of length $n - 1$?

* *

Felix Klein was a famous professor of mathematics at Göttingen University. There were two types of mathematicians in his department: those who did research on whatever they wanted and those for which Klein provided the topic of research. To which type did Klein Challenge 1230 s belong?

Obviously, this is a variation of another famous puzzle. A barber shaves all those Challenge 1231 s people who do not shave themselves. Does the barber shave himself?

* *

Everybody knows what a *magic square* is: a square array of numbers, in the simplest case from 1 to 9, that are distributed in such a way that the sum of all rows, columns (and possibly all diagonals) give the same sum. Can you write down the simplest $3 \times 3 \times 3$ Challenge 1232 s *magic cube*?

* *

The digits 0 to 9 are found on keyboards in two different ways. Calculators and keyboards have the 7 at the top left, whereas telephones and automatic teller machines have the digit 1 at the top left. The two standards, respectively by the International Standards Organization (ISO) and by the International Telecommunication Union (ITU, formerly CCITT), Ref. 739 evolved separately and have never managed to merge.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 409 The only magic hexagon starting with the number 1 (up to reflections and rotations)

* *

Leonhard Euler in his notebooks sometimes wrote down equations like

$$1 + 2^2 + 2^4 + 2^6 + 2^8 + \ldots = -\frac{1}{3} \,. \tag{512}$$

Challenge 1233 d Can this make sense?

* *

In the history of recreational mathematics, several people have independently found the well-known magic hexagon shown in Figure 409. The first discoverer was, in 1887, Ernst von Hasselberg. The hexagon is called magic because all lines add up to the same number, 38. Hasselberg also proved the almost incredible result that no other magic hexagon exists.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 32

CONCEPTS, LIES AND PATTERNS OF NATURE

> Die Grenzen meiner Sprache bedeuten die Grenzen meiner Welt.*
>
> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 5.6

> Der Satz ist ein Bild der Wirklichkeit. Der Satz ist ein Modell der Wirklichkeit, so wie wir sie uns denken.**
>
> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 4.01

Ref. 740 In contrast to mathematics, physics does aim at being a language. Through the description of motion it aims to express *everything* observed and, in particular, all examples and possibilities of change.*** Like any language, physics consists of concepts and sentences. In order to be able to express everything, it must aim to use few words for a lot of facts.**** Physicists are essentially *lazy* people: they try to minimize the effort in everything they do. The concepts in use today have been optimized by the combined effort of many people to be as practical, i.e., as powerful as possible. A concept is called *powerful* when it allows one to express in a compact way a large amount of information, meaning that it can rapidly convey a large number of details about observations.

General statements about many examples of motion are called *rules* or *patterns*. In the past, it was often said that 'laws govern nature', using an old and inappropriate ideology. A physical 'law' is only a way of saying as much as possible with as few words as possible. When saying 'laws govern nature' we actually mean to say 'being lazy, we describe obser-

* 'The limits of my language are the limits of my world.'

** 'A proposition is a picture of reality. A proposition is a model of reality as we imagine it.'

*** All observations are about change or variation. The various types of change are studied by the various sciences; they are usually grouped in the three categories of *human sciences*, *formal sciences* and *natural sciences*. Among the latter, the oldest are astronomy and metallurgy. Then, with the increase of curiosity in early antiquity, came the natural science concerned with the topic of motion: *physics*. In the course of our walk it will become clear that this seemingly restrictive definition indeed covers the whole set of topics studied in physics. In particular it includes the more common definition of physics as the study of matter, its properties, its components and their interactions.

**** A particular, specific observation, i.e., a specific example of input shared by others, is called a *fact*, or in other contexts, an *event*. A striking and regularly observed fact is called a *phenomenon*, and a general observation made in many different situations is called a *(physical) principle*. (Often, when a concept is introduced that is used with other meaning in other fields, in this walk it is preceded by the qualifier 'physical' or 'mathematical' in parentheses.) Actions performed towards the aim of collecting observations are called *experiments*. The concept of experiment became established in the sixteenth century; in the evolution of a child, it can best be compared to that activity that has the same aim of collecting experiences: *play*.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

vations with patterns'. Laws are the epitome of laziness. Formulating laws is pure sloth. In fact, the correct expression is *patterns describe nature*.

Physicists have defined the laziness necessary for their field in much detail. In order to become a master of laziness, we need to distinguish lazy patterns from those which are not, such as lies, beliefs, statements that are not about observations, and statements that are not about motion. We do this below.

Page 840

The principle of extreme laziness is the origin, among others, of the use of numbers in physics. Observables are often best described with the help of numbers, because numbers allow easy and precise communication and classification. Length, velocity, angles, temperature, voltage or field strength are of this type. The notion of 'number', used in every measurement, is constructed, often unconsciously, from the notions of 'set' and 'relation', as shown above. Apart from the notion of number, other concepts are regularly defined to allow fast and compact communication of the 'laws' of nature; all are 'abbreviation tools.' In this sense, the statement 'the level of the Kac–Moody algebra of the Lagrangian of the heterotic superstring model is equal to one' contains precise information, explainable to everybody; however, it would take dozens of pages to express it using only the terms 'set' and 'relation.' In short, the *precision* common in physics results from its *quest for laziness*.

> Es ist besser, daß die Leute nicht wissen, wie Gesetze und Wurst zustande kommen. Sonst könnten sie nachts nicht ruhig schlafen.*
>
> Otto von Bismarck

Are physical concepts discovered or created?

> Das logische Bild der Tatsachen ist der Gedanke.**
>
> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 3

The title question is often rephrased as: are physical concepts free of beliefs, taste or personal choices? The question has been discussed so much that it even appears in Hollywood films. We give a short summary that can help you to distinguish honest from dishonest teachers.

Creation of concepts, in contrast to their discovery, would imply free choice between many alternative possibilities. The chosen alternative would then be due to the beliefs or tastes used. In physics (in obvious contrast to other, more ideological fields of enquiry), we know that different physical descriptions of observations are either equivalent or, in the opposite case, imprecise or even wrong. A description of observations is thus essentially unique: any choices of concepts are only apparent. There is no real freedom in the definition of physical concepts. In this property, physics is in strong contrast to artistic activity.

If two different concepts can be used to describe the same aspect of observations, they must be equivalent, even if the relation that leads to the equivalence is not immediately clear. In fact, the requirement that people with different standpoints and observing the same event deduce equivalent descriptions lies at the very basis of physics. It expresses

* 'It is better that people do not know how laws and sausages are made. Otherwise they would not sleep well at night.' Otto von Bismarck (1815–1898), Prussian Chancellor.

** 'A logical picture of facts is a thought.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

the requirement that observations are observer independent. In short, the strong requirement of viewpoint independence makes the free choice of concepts a logical impossibility.

The conclusion that concepts describing observations are discovered rather than created is also reached independently in the field of linguistics by the above-mentioned research on semantic primitives,* in the field of psychology by the observations on the formation of the concepts in the development of young children, and in the field of ethology by the observations of animal development, especially in the case of mammals. In all three fields detailed observations have been made of how the interactions between an individual and its environment lead to concepts, of which the most basic ones, such as space, time, object or interaction, are common across the sexes, cultures, races and across many animal species populating the world. Curiosity and the way that nature works leads to the same concepts for all people and even the animals; the world offers only one possibility, without room for imagination. Imagining that physical concepts can be created at your leisure is a belief – or a useful exercise, but never successful.

Physical concepts are classifications of observations. The activity of classification itself follows the patterns of nature; it is a mechanical process that machines can also perform. This means that any distinction, i.e., any statement that A is different from B, is a theory-free statement. No belief system is necessary to distinguish different entities in nature. Cats and pigs can also do so. Physicists *can* be replaced by animals, even by machines. Our mountain ascent will repeatedly confirm this point.

As already mentioned, the most popular physical concepts allow to describe observations as succinctly and as accurately as possible. They are formed with the aim of having the largest possible amount of understanding with the smallest possible amount of effort. Both Occam's razor – the requirement not to introduce unnecessary concepts – and the drive for unification automatically reduce the number and the type of concepts used in physics. In other words, the progress of physical science was and is based on a programme that reduces the possible choice of concepts as drastically as possible.

Page 1501

In summary, we found that physical concepts are the same for everybody and are free of beliefs and personal choices: they are first of all *boring*. Moreover, as they could stem from machines instead of people, they are *born of laziness*. Despite these human analogies – not meant to be taken too seriously – physical concepts are *not* created; they are discovered. If a teacher tells you the opposite, he is lying.

Having handled the case of physical concepts, let us now turn to physical statements. The situation is somewhat similar: physical statements must be lazy, arrogant and boring. Let us see why.

> Wo der Glaube anfängt, hört die Wissenschaft auf.**
>
> Ernst Haeckel, *Natürliche Schöpfungsgeschichte*, 1879.

* Anna Wierzbicka concludes that her research clearly indicates that semantic primitives are *discovered*, in particular that they are deduced from the fundamentals of human experience, and not invented.

Ref. 723

** Where belief starts, science ends.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 78 The 'scientific method'

Normal description **Curiosity**	Lobbyist description **Scientific method**
1. look around a lot	1. interact with the world
2. don't believe anything told	2. forget authority
3. choose something interesting and explore it yourself	3. observe
4. make up your own mind and describe precisely what you saw	4. use reason, build hypothesis
5. check if you can also describe similar situations in the same way	5. analyse hypothesis
6. increase the precision of observation until the checks either fail or are complete	6. perform experiments until hypothesis is proved false or established
7. depending on the case, continue with step 4 or 1	7. ask for more money

How do we find physical patterns and rules?

> Grau, treuer Freund, ist alle Theorie,
> Und grün des Lebens goldner Baum.*
>
> J.W. v. Goethe, *Faust*.

> Physics is usually presented as an objective science, but I notice that physics changes and the world stays the same, so there must be something subjective about physics.
>
> Richard Bandler

Progressing through the study of motion reflects a young child's attitude towards life. The progress follows the simple programme on the left of Table 78.

Adult scientists do not have much more to add, except the more fashionable terms on the right, plus several specialized professions to make money from them. The experts of step 7 are variously called lobbyists or fund raisers; instead of calling this program 'curiosity', they call it the 'scientific method.' They mostly talk. Physics being the talk about motion,** and motion being a vast topic, many people specialize in this step.

The experts of step 6 are called *experimental physicists* or simply *experimentalists*, a term derived from the Latin 'experiri', meaning 'to try out'. Most of them are part of the category 'graduate students'. The experts of steps 5 and 4 are called *theoretical physicists*

* 'Grey, dear friend, is all theory, and green the golden tree of life.' Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832), the influential German poet.

** Several sciences have the term 'talk' as part of their name, namely all those whose name finishes in '-logy', such as e.g. biology. The ending stems from ancient Greek and is deduced from λήγειν meaning 'to say, to talk'. Physics as the science of motion could thus be called 'kinesiology' from κίνησις, meaning 'motion'; but for historical reasons this term has a different meaning, namely the study of human muscular activity. The term 'physics' is either derived from the Greek φύσικη (τέχνη is understood) meaning '(the art of) nature', or from the title of Aristotle' works τά φυσικά meaning 'natural things'. Both expressions are derived from φύσις, meaning 'nature'.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

or simply *theoreticians*.* This is a rather modern term; for example, the first professors of theoretical physics were appointed around the start of the twentieth century. The term is derived from the Greek θεωρία meaning 'observation, contemplation'. Finally, there are the people who focus on steps 1 to 3, and who induce others to work on steps 4 to 6; they are called *geniuses*.

Obviously an important point is hidden in step 6: how do all these people know whether their checks fail? How do they recognize truth?

> All professions are conspiracies against laymen.
> George Bernard Shaw

What is a lie?

> Get your facts straight, and then you can distort them at your leisure.
> Mark Twain

> The pure truth is always a lie.
> Bert Hellinger

Lies are useful statements, as everybody learns during their youth. One reason that they are useful is because we can draw any imaginable conclusion from them. A well-known discussion between two Cambridge professors early in the twentieth century makes the point. McTaggart asked: 'If 2 + 2 = 5, how can you prove that I am the pope?' Godfrey Hardy: 'If 2 + 2 = 5, then 4 = 5; subtract 3; then 1 = 2; but McTaggart and the pope are two; therefore McTaggart and the pope are one.' As noted long ago, *ex falso quodlibet*; from what is wrong, anything imaginable can be deduced. It is true that in our mountain ascent we need to build on previously deduced results and that our trip could not be completed if we had a false statement somewhere in our chain of arguments. But lying is such an important activity that one should learn to perform it well.

There are various stages in the art of lying. Many animals have been shown to de-
Ref. 704 ceive their kin. Children start lying just before their third birthday, by hiding experiences. Adults cheat on taxes. And many intellectuals or politicians even claim that truth does not exist.

However, in most countries, everybody must know what 'truth' is, since in a law court for example, telling an untruth can lead to a prison sentence. The courts are full of experts in lie detection. If you lie in court, you better do it well; experience shows that you might get away with many criminal activities. In court, a *lie* is a statement that knowingly contrasts with observations.** The truth of a statement is thus checked by observation. The check itself is sometimes called the *proof* of the statement. For law courts, as for physics, *truth* is thus the correspondence with facts, and *facts* are shared observations. A 'good' lie is thus a lie whose contrast with shared observations is hard to discover.

* If you like theoretical physics, have a look at the refreshingly candid web page by Nobel Prize winner Gerard 't Hooft with the title *How to become a good theoretical physicist*. It can be found at www.phys.uu.nl/~thooft/theorist.html.

** Statements not yet checked are variously called *speculations*, *conjectures*, *hypotheses*, or – wrongly – simply *theses*. Statements that are in correspondence with observations are called *correct* or *true*; statements that contrast with observations are called *wrong* or *false*.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The first way of lying is to put an emphasis on the sharedness only. Populists and polemics do this regularly. ('Every foreigner is a danger for the values of our country.') Since almost any imaginable opinion, however weird, is held by some group – and thus shared – one can always claim it as true.* Unfortunately, it is no secret that ideas also get shared because they are fashionable, imposed or opposed to somebody who is generally disliked. Often a sibling in a family has this role – remember Cassandra.** For a good lie we thus need more than sharedness, more than *intersubjectivity* alone.

A good lie should be, like a true statement, really independent of the listener and the observer and, in particular, independent of their age, their sex, their education, their civilization or the group to which they belong. For example, it is especially hard – but not impossible – to lie with mathematics. The reason is that the basic concepts of mathematics, be they 'set', 'relation' or 'number', are taken from observation and are intersubjective, so that statements about them are easily checked. Usually, lies thus avoid mathematics.***

Secondly, a 'good' lie should avoid statements about observations and use *interpretations* instead. For example, some people like to talk about other universes, which implies talking about fantasies, not about observations. A good lie has to avoid, however, to fall in the opposite extreme, namely to make statements which are meaningless; the most destructive comment that can be made about a statement is the one used by the great
Page 1035 Austrian physicist Wolfgang Pauli: 'That is not even wrong.'

Thirdly, a good lie doesn't care about observations, only about imagination. Only truth needs to be *empirical*, to distinguish it from *speculative* statements. If you want to lie 'well' even with empirical statements, you need to pay attention. There are two types of empirical statements: *specific* statements and *universal* statements. For example, 'On the 31st of August 1960 I saw a green swan swimming on the northern shore of the lake of Varese' is specific, whereas 'All ravens are black' is universal, since it contains the term 'all'. There is a well-known difference between the two, which is important for lying well: specific statements cannot be falsified, they are only verifiable, and universal statements
Ref. 741 cannot be verified, they are only falsifiable. Why is this so?

Universal statements such as 'the speed of light is constant' cannot be tested for *all* possible cases. (Note that if they could, they would not be universal statements, but just a list of specific ones.) However, they can be reversed by a counter-example. Another example of the universal type is: 'Apples fall upwards.' Since it is falsified by an observation conducted by Newton several centuries ago, or by everyday experience, it qualifies as an (easily detectable) lie. In general therefore, lying by stating the opposite of a theory is usually unsuccessful. If somebody insists on doing so, the lie becomes a *superstition*, a *belief*, a *prejudice* or a *doctrine*. These are the low points in the art of lying. A famous

* The work of the French sociologist Gabriel Tarde (1843–1903), especially his concepts of *imitation* and group mind, already connects to this fact.

** The implications of birth order on creativity in science and on acceptance of new ideas has been studied in the fascinating book by Frank J. Sulloway, *Born to Rebel – Birth Order, Family Dynamics and Creative Lives*, Panthon Books, 1996. This exceptional book tells the result of a life-long study correlating the personal situations in the families of thousands of people and their receptivity to about twenty revolutions in the recent history. The book also includes a test in which the reader can deduce their own propensity to rebel, on a scale from 0 to 100 %. Darwin scores 96 % on this scale.

*** In mathematics, 'true' is usually specified as 'deducible' or 'provable'; this is in fact a special case of the usual definition of truth, namely 'correspondence with facts', if one remembers that mathematics studies the properties of classifications.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

case of insistence on a lie is that of the colleagues of Galileo, who are said to have refused to look through his telescope to be convinced that Jupiter has moons, an observation that would have shaken their belief that everything turns around the Earth. Obviously these astronomers were amateurs in the art of lying. A good universal lie is one whose counter-example is not so easily spotted.

There should be no insistence on lies in physics. Unfortunately, classical physics is full of lies. We will dispel them during the rest of our walk.

Lying by giving specific instead of universal statements is much easier. ('I can't remember.') Even a specific statement such as 'yesterday the Moon was green, cubic and smelled of cheese' can never be completely falsified: there is no way to show with absolute certainty that this is wrong. The only thing that we can do is to check whether the statement is compatible with other observations, such as whether the different shape affected the tides as expected, whether the smell can be found in air collected that day, etc. A good specific lie is thus not in contrast with other observations.*

Incidentally, universal and specific statements are connected: the *opposite* of a universal statement is always a specific statement, and vice versa. For example, the opposite of the general statement 'apples fall upwards', namely 'some apples fall downwards', is specific. Similarly, the the specific statement 'the Moon is made of green cheese' is in opposition to the universal statement 'the Moon is solid since millions of years and has almost no smell or atmosphere.'

In other words, law courts and philosophers disagree. Law courts have no problem with calling theories true, and specific statements lies. Many philosophers avoid this. For example, the statement 'ill-tempered gaseous vertebrates do not exist' is a statement of the universal type. If a universal statement is in agreement with observations, and if it is falsifiable, law courts call it *true*. The opposite, namely the statement: 'ill-tempered gaseous vertebrates do exist', is of the *specific* type, since it means 'Person X has observed an ill-tempered gaseous vertebrate in some place Y at some time Z'. To verify this, we need a record of the event. If such a record, for example a photographs or testimony does not exist, and if the statement *can* be falsified by other observations, law courts call the specific statement a *lie*. Even though these are the rules for everyday life and for the law, there is no agreement among philosophers and scientists that this is acceptable. Why? Intellectuals are a careful lot, because many of them have lost their lives as a result of exposing lies too openly.

In short, specific lies, like all specific statements, can never be falsified with certainty. This is what makes them so popular. Children learn specific lies first. ('I haven't eaten

* It is often difficult or tedious to verify statements concerning the past, and the difficulty increases with the distance in time. That is why people can insist on the occurrence of events which are supposed to be exceptions to the patterns of nature ('miracles'). Since the advent of rapid means of communication these checks are becoming increasingly easy, and no miracles are left over. This can be seen in Lourdes in France, where even though today the number of visitors is much higher than in the past, no miracles have been seen in decades.

In fact, all modern 'miracles' are kept alive only by consciously eschewing checks, such as the supposed yearly liquefaction of blood in Napoli, the milk supposedly drunk by statues in temples, the supposed healers in television evangelism, etc. Most miracles only remain because many organizations make money out of the difficulty of falsifying specific statements. For example, when the British princess Diana died in a car crash in 1997, even though the events were investigated in extreme detail, the scandal press could go on almost without end about the 'mysteries' of the accident.

Ref. 742

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

the jam.') General lies, like all general statements, can always be corroborated by examples. This is the reason for the success of ideologies. But the criteria for recognizing lies, even general lies, have become so commonplace that beliefs and lies try to keep up with them. It became fashionable to use expressions such as 'scientific fact' – there are no non-scientific facts –, or 'scientifically proven' – observations cannot be proven otherwise – and similar empty phrases. These are not 'good' lies; whenever we encounter sentences beginning with 'science says ...' or 'science and religion do ...', replacing 'science' by 'knowledge' or 'experience' is an efficient way of checking whether such statements are to be taken seriously or not.*

Lies differ from true statements in their emotional aspect. Specific statements are usually boring and fragile, whereas specific lies are often sensational and violent. In contrast, general statements are often daring and fragile whereas general lies are usually boring and violent. The truth is fragile. True statements require the author to stick his neck out to criticism. Researchers know that if one doesn't stick the neck out, it can't be an observation or a theory. (A *theory* is another name for one or several connected, not yet falsified universal statements about observations.)** Telling the truth does make vulnerable. For this reason, theories are often *daring*, *arrogant* or *provoking*; at the same time they have to be *fragile* and *vulnerable*. For men, theories thus resemble what they think about women. Darwin's *The origin of the species*, which developed daring theories, illustrates the stark contrast between the numerous boring and solid facts that Darwin collected and the daring theory that he deduced. Boredom of facts is a sign of truth.

In contrast, the witch-hunters propagating 'creationism' or so-called 'intelligent design' are examples of liars. The specific lies they propagate, such as 'the world was created in October 4004 BCE', are sensational, whereas the general lies they propagate, such as 'there have not been big changes in the past', are boring. This is in full contrast with common sense. Moreover, lies, in contrast to true statements, make people violent. The worse the lie, the more violent the people. This connection can be observed regularly in the news. In other words, 'creationism' and 'intelligent design' are not only lies, they are bad lies. A 'good' *general lie*, like a good physical theory, seems crazy and seems vulnerable, such as 'people have free will'. A 'good' *specific lie* is boring, such as 'this looks like bread, but for the next ten minutes it is not'. Good lies do not induce violence. Feelings can thus be a criterion to judge the quality of lies, if we pay careful attention to the type of statement. A number of common lies are discussed later in this chapter.

* To clarify the vocabulary usage of this text: *religion* is spirituality plus a varying degree of power abuse. The mixture depends on each person's history, background and environment. *Spirituality* is the open participation in the whole of nature. Most, maybe all, people with a passion for physics are spiritual. Most are not religious.

** In other words, a set of not yet falsified patterns of observations on the same topic is called a *(physical) theory*. The term 'theory' will always be used in this sense in this walk, i.e., with the meaning 'set of correct general statements'. This use results from its Greek origin: 'theoria' means 'observation'; its original meaning, 'passionate and emphatic contemplation', summarizes the whole of physics in a single word. ('Theory', like 'theatre', is formed from the root θέ, meaning 'the act of contemplating'.) Sometimes, however, the term 'theory' is used – being confused with 'hypothesis' – with the meaning of 'conjecture', as in 'your theory is wrong', sometimes with the meaning of 'model', as in 'Chern–Simons' theory and sometimes with the meaning of 'standard procedure', as in 'perturbation theory'. These incorrect uses are avoided here. To bring the issue to a point: the *theory of evolution* is not a conjecture, but a set of correct statements based on observation.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

An important aspect of any 'good' lie is to make as few *public* statements as possible, so that critics can check as little as possible. (For anybody sending corrections of mistakes in this text, the author provides a small reward.) To detect lies, public scrutiny is important, though not always reliable. Sometimes, even scientists make statements which are not based on observations. However, a 'good' lie is always well prepared and told on purpose; accidental lies are frowned upon by experts. Examples of good lies in science are 'aether', 'UFOs', 'creation science', or 'cold fusion'. Sometimes it took many decades to detect the lies in these domains.

To sum up, the central point of the art of lying without being caught is simple: do not divulge details. Be *vague*. All the methods used to verify a statement ask for details, for *precision*. For any statement, its degree of precision allows one to gauge the degree to which the author is sticking his neck out. The more precision that is demanded, the weaker a statement becomes, and the more likely a fault will be found, if there is one. This is the main reason that we chose an increase in precision as a guide for our mountain ascent. By the way, the same method is used in criminal trials. To discover the truth, investigators typically ask all the witnesses a large number of questions, allowing as many *details* as possible come to light. When sufficient details are collected, and the precision is high enough, the situation becomes clear. Telling 'good' lies is much more difficult than telling the truth; it requires an excellent imagination.

> Truth is an abyss.
>
> Democritus

> To teach superstitions as truth is a most terrible thing.
>
> Hypatia of Alexandria (*c.* 355–415)

> [Absolute truth:] It is what scientists say it is when they come to the end of their labors.
>
> Charles Peirce

Ref. 744

Is this statement true? – A bit about nonsense

> Truth is a rhetorical concept.
>
> Paul Feyerabend

> There are three types of people: those who believe in Father Christmas, those who do not believe in Father Christmas, and those who are Father Christmas.

Not all statements can be categorized as true or false. There is a third option: statements can simply make no sense. There are even such statements in mathematics, where they are called *undecidable*. An example is the continuum hypothesis. This hypothesis is undecidable because it makes a statement that depends on the precise meaning of the term 'set'; in standard mathematical usage the term is not defined sufficiently precisely so that a truth value can be assigned to the continuum hypothesis. In short, statements can be undecidable because the concepts contained in them are not sharply defined.

Statements can also be undecidable for other reasons. Phrases such as 'This statement

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

is not true' illustrate the situation. Kurt Gödel* has even devised a general way of constructing such statements in the domain of logic and mathematics. The different variations of these *self-referential* statements, especially popular both in the field of logic and computer science, have captured a large public.** Similarly undecidable statements can be constructed with terms such as 'calculable', 'provable' and 'deducible'. Ref. 745

In fact, self-referential statements are undecidable because they are meaningless. If the usual definition of 'true', namely corresponding to facts, is substituted into the sentence 'This statement is not true', we quickly see that it has no meaningful content. The most famous meaningless sentence of them all was constructed by the linguist Noam Chomsky:

Colorless green ideas sleep furiously.

It is often used as an example for the language processing properties of the brain, but nobody sensible elevates it to the status of a paradox and writes philosophical discussions about it. To do that with the title of this section is a similar waste of energy. Ref. 711

The main reason for the popular success of self-reference is the difficulty in perceiving the lack of meaning.*** A good example is the statement:

This statement is false or you are an angel.

We can actually deduce from it that 'you are an angel.' Can you see how? If you want, you can change the second half and get even more interesting statements. Such examples show that statements referring to themselves have to be treated with great care when under investigation. In short, whenever you meet somebody who tries to use the self-referential construction by Kurt Gödel to deduce another statement, take a step back, or better, a few more. Self-reference, especially the type defined by Gödel, is a hard but common path – especially amongst wannabe-intellectuals – to think, tell and write *nonsense*. Nothing useful can be deduced from nonsense. Well, not entirely; it does help to meet psychiatrists on a regular basis. Challenge 1235 s

In physics, in the other natural sciences, and in legal trials these problems do not emerge, because self-referential statements are not used.**** In fact, the work of logicians confirms, often rather spectacularly, that there is no way to extend the term 'truth' beyond the definition of 'correspondence with facts.'

---

* Kurt Gödel (1906–1978), famous Austrian logician.

** A general introduction is given in the beautiful books by RAYMOND SMULLYAN: *Satan, Cantor and Infinity and Other Mind-boggling Puzzles*, Knopf, 1992; *What is the Name of This Book? The Riddle of Dracula and Other Logical Puzzles*, Touchstone, 1986, and *The Lady or the Tiger? And Other Puzzles*, Times Books, 1982. Also definitions can have no content, such as David Hilbert's 'smallest number that has not been mentioned this century' or 'the smallest sequence of numbers that is described by more signs than this sentence'.

*** A well-known victim of this difficulty is Paulus of Tarsus. The paradox of the Cretan poet *Epimenedes* (6th century BCE) who said 'All Cretans lie' is too difficult for the notoriously humour-impaired Paulus, who in his letter to Titus (chapter 1, verses 12 and 13, in the christian bible) calls Epimenedes a 'prophet', adds some racist comments, and states that this 'testimony' is true. But wait! There is a final twist to this story. The statement 'All Cretans lie' is *not* a paradox at all; a truth value can actually be ascribed to it, because the statement is not really self-referential. Can you confirm this? The only *genuine* paradox is 'I am lying', to which it is indeed impossible to ascribe a truth value. Ref. 746 Challenge 1234 s

**** Why are circular statements, like those of Galilean physics, not self-referential? Challenge 1236 ny

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

> Ein Satz kann unmöglich von sich selbst aussagen, daß er wahr ist.*
> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 4.442

Curiosities and fun challenges about lies and nonsense

> Es ist ja nicht alles, was ich den Bürgern sage, gelogen.**
> Konrad Adenauer, 1962, West German Chancellor.

Some lies are entertaining, others are made with criminal intent; some are good, others are bad.

* *

Challenge 1237 e 'Yesterday I drowned.' Is this a good or a bad lie?

* *

During a church sermon, a man fell asleep. He dreamt about the French revolution: he was being brought to the guillotine. At that moment, his wife noticed that he was sleeping. In the same moment in which the man dreamt that the knife was hitting him, his wife gave him a tap on his neck with her fan. The shock instantly killed the man. – Is this story
Challenge 1238 e true or false?

* *

Starting in the 1990s, so-called *crop circles* were produced by people walking with stilts, a piece of wood and some rope into fields of crops. Nevertheless, many pretended and others believed that these circles were made by extraterrestrial beings. Is this a good or a
Challenge 1239 ny bad lie? Can you find a reason why this is impossible?

* *

Often one hears or reads statements like: 'mind (or spirit or soul) is stronger than matter.' Beware of anybody who says this; he wants something from you. Can you show that these
Challenge 1240 e statements are all and always wrong?

* *

In certain countries, two lies were particularly frequent in the early twenty-first century. The first: global warming does not exist. The second: global warming is not due to human
Challenge 1241 s causes. Are these good or bad lies?

* *

Sometimes it is heard that a person whose skin is completely covered with finest metal powder will die, due to the impossibility of the skin to breathe. Can you show that this
Challenge 1242 ny is wrong?

---

* 'It is quite impossible for a proposition to state that it itself is true.'
** 'Indeed, not everything that I tell the people is a lie.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

A famous mixture of hoax and belief premises that the Earth was created about six thousand years ago. (Some believers even use this false statement as justification for violence against non-believers.) Can you explain why the number is wrong?

Challenge 1243 ny

* *

A famous provocation: the world has been created last Saturday. Can you decide whether this is wrong?

Challenge 1244 s

* *

Hundreds of hoaxes are found on the www.museumofhoaxes.com website. It gives an excellent introduction into the art of lying; of course it exposes only those who have been caught. Enjoy the science stories, especially those about archaeology. (Several other sites with similar content can be found on the internet.)

* *

In the 1990s, many so-called 'healers' in the Philippines made millions by suggesting patients that they were able to extract objects from their bodies without operating. Why is this not possible? (For more information on health lies, see the www.quackwatch.com website.)

Challenge 1245 e

* *

Since the 1980s, people have claimed that it is possible to acquire knowledge simply from somebody 1000 km away, without any communication between the two people. However, the assumed 'morphogenetic fields' cannot exist. Why not?

Challenge 1246 e

* *

It is claimed that a Fire Brigade building in a city in the US hosts a light bulb that has been burning without interruption since 1901 (at least this was the case in 2005). Can this be true? Hundreds of such stories, often called 'urban legends,' can be found on the www.snopes.com website. However, some of the stories are not urban legends, but true, as the site shows.

Challenge 1247 s

* *

'This statement has been translated from French into English.' Is the statement true, false or neither?

* *

Aeroplanes have no seat row 13. Many tall hotels have no floor 13. What is the lie behind this habit? What is the truth behind it?

Challenge 1248 s

* *

Since about a thousand years, certain people pretend that they have been stigmatized, i.e., that they have 'miraculously' suffered wounds that are similar to those of Jesus's crucifixion. How can one prove by a one-second observation that all of these people, without exception, produced the wounds by themselves?

Challenge 1249 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

'In the middle age and in antiquity, people believed in the flat Earth.' This is a famous lie that is rarely questioned. The historian Reinhard Krüger has shown that the lie is most of all due to the writers Thomas Paine (1794) and Washington Irving (1928). Fact is that since Aristotle, everybody believed in a spherical Earth.

* *

Challenge 1250 s Is the term 'multiverse', a claimed opposite to 'universe', a lie or a belief?

* *

The following is not a lie. A good way to suppress curiosity in children is used in many environments: let the child watch television whenever it wants. Do it for a few weeks and you will not recognize the child any more. Do it for a few years, and the curiosity will not come back at all.

* *

Challenge 1251 e How would you show that Earth rays are a lie?

* *

Challenge 1252 s How would you show that the statement 'the laws of nature could change any time' is a lie?

* *

Challenge 1253 e 'I can generate energy from the vacuum.' Show that this is a lie.

* *

Challenge 1254 e 'Not everything that exists can be measured.' Show that this is a lie.

* *

'Not everything is known.' This statement is quite interesting: modern physics indeed claims the opposite in many domains. For example, all forms of energy are known; so are all forms of moving entities. In short, even though this statement is correct – indeed, not everything is known – it is often used by liars. Be careful when you hear it.

* *

Here is a lie that uses mathematics, from a journalist: 'Your university exams treat women applicants worse than men; your statistics show that only 41 % of all female, but 57% of all male applicants are admitted.' The university is small and has only two faculties; so it checks its numbers.

Faculty 1 admitted 60% of all males (60 of 100 applicants) and 65% of all applicant females (13 of 20 applicants). Faculty 2 admitted 30% of all males (3 of 10 applicants) and 32% of all females (16 of 50 applicants).

In total, the university thus admitted 63 of 110 male applicants (or 57%) and 29 of 70 female applicants (or 41%). In other words, even though in each faculties the percentage of admitted females was *higher*, the *total* admission percentage for females was *lower*.

Challenge 1255 e Why? In fact, this is a true story; in this version, the numbers are simplified, to make the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

situation as clear as possible. But a large university once got in trouble with journalists in this way, despite preferring women in each of its departments. Some journalists are excellent liars.

OBSERVATIONS

> Knowledge is a sophisticated statement of ignorance.
>
> Attributed to Karl Popper

The collection of a large number of true statements about a type of observations, i.e., of a large number of facts, is called *knowledge*. Where the domain of observations is sufficiently extended, one speaks of a *science*. A *scientist* is thus somebody who collects knowledge.* We found above that an observation is classified input into the memory of several people. Since there is motion all around, to describe all these observations is a mammoth task. As for every large task, to a large extent the use of appropriate tools determines the degree of success that can be achieved. These tools, in physics and in all other sciences, fall in three groups: tools for the collection of observations, tools to communicate observations and tools to communicate relations between observations. The latter group has been already discussed in the section on language and on mathematics. We just touch on the other two.

Ref. 747

Have enough observations been recorded?

> Every generation is inclined to define 'the end of physics' as coincident with the end of their scientific contributions.
>
> Julian Schwinger**

Physics is an experimental science; it rests on the collection of observations. To realize this task effectively, all sorts of *instruments*, i.e., tools that facilitate observations, have been developed and built. Microscopes, telescopes, oscilloscopes, as well as thermometers, hygrometers, manometers, pyrometers, spectrometers amongst others are familiar examples. The precision of many of these tools is being continuously improved even today; their production is a sizeable part of modern industrial activity, examples being electrical measuring apparatus and diagnostic tools for medicine, chemistry and biology.

* The term 'scientist' is a misnomer peculiar to the English language. Properly speaking, a 'scientist' is a follower of *scientism*, an extremist philosophical school that tried to resolve all problems through science. For this reason, some religious sects have the term in their name. Since the English language did not have a shorter term to designate 'scientific persons', as they used to be called, the term 'scientist' started to appear in the United States, from the eighteenth century onwards. Nowadays the term is used in all English-speaking countries – but not outside them, fortunately.

** Julian Seymour Schwinger (1918–1994), US-American infant prodigy. He was famous for his clear thinking and his excellent lectures. He worked on waveguides and synchroton radiation, made contributions to nuclear physics and developed quantum electrodynamics. For the latter he received the 1965 Nobel Prize in Physics together with Tomonaga and Feynman. He was a thesis advisor to many famous physicists and wrote several excellent and influential textbooks. Nevertheless, at the end of his life, he became strangely interested in a hoax turned sour: cold fusion.

Ref. 748

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Instruments can be as small as a tip of a few tungsten atoms to produce an electron beam of a few volts, and as large as 27 km in circumference, producing an electron beam with more than 100 GV effective accelerating voltage. Instruments have been built that contain and measure the coldest known matter in the universe. Other instruments can measure length variations of much less than a proton diameter over kilometre long distances. Instruments have been put deep inside the Earth, on the Moon, on several planets, and have been sent outside the Solar system.

In this walk, instruments are not described; many good textbooks on this topic are available. Most observations collected by instruments are not mentioned here. The most important results in physics are recorded in standard publications, such as the Landolt–Börnstein series and the physics journals (Appendix E gives a general overview of information sources).

Ref. 749, Ref. 750

Ref. 751

Will there be significant new future observations in the domain of the fundamentals of motion? At present, *in this specific domain*, even though the number of physicists and publications is at an all-time high, the number of new experimental discoveries has been steadily diminishing for many years and is now fairly small. The sophistication and investment necessary to obtain new results has become extremely high. In many cases, measuring instruments have reached the limits of technology, of budgets or even those of nature. The number of new experiments that produce results showing no deviation from theoretical predictions is increasing steadily. The number of historical papers that try to enliven dull or stalled fields of enquiry are increasing. Claims of new effects which turn out to be false, due to measurement errors, self-deceit or even fraud have become so frequent that scepticism has become a common response. Although in many domains of science, including physics, discoveries are still expected, on the fundamentals of motion the arguments just presented seem to show that new observations are only a remote possibility. The task of collecting observations on the foundations of motion (though not on other topics of physics) seems to be *complete*. Indeed, most observations described here were obtained before the end of the twentieth century. We are not too early with our walk.

> “Measure what is measurable; make measurable what is not.”
>
> Wrongly attributed to Galileo.

Ref. 752

Are all physical observables known?

> “Scientists have odious manners, except when you prop up their theory; then you can borrow money from them.”
>
> Mark Twain

The most practical way to communicate observations was developed a long time ago: by measurements. A measurement allows effective communication of an observation to other times and places. This is not always as trivial as it sounds; for example, in the Middle Ages people were unable to compare precisely the ‘coldness’ of the winters of two different years! The invention of the thermometer provided a reliable solution to this requirement. A *measurement* is thus the classification of an observation into a standard set of observations; to put it simply, a measurement is a *comparison with a standard*. This definition of a measurement is precise and practical, and has therefore been universally

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

adopted. For example, when the length of a house is measured, this aspect of the house is classified into a certain set of standard lengths, namely the set of lengths defined by multiples of a unit. A *unit* is the abstract name of the standard for a certain observable. Numbers and units allow the most precise and most effective communication of measurement results.

For all measurable quantities, practical standard units and measurement methods have been defined; the main ones are listed and defined in Appendix C. All units are derived from a few fundamental ones; this is ultimately due to our limited number of senses: length, time and mass are related to sight, hearing and touch. Our limited number of senses is, in turn, due to the small number of observables of nature.

We call *observables* the different measurable aspects of a system. Most observables, such as size, speed, position, etc. can be described by numbers, and in this case they are *quantities*, i.e., multiples of some standard unit. Observables are usually abbreviated by *(mathematical) symbols*, usually letters from some alphabet. For example, the symbol c commonly specifies the velocity of light. For most observables, standard symbols have been defined by international bodies.* The symbols for the observables that describe the state of an object are also called *variables*. Variables on which other observables depend are often called *parameters*. (Remember: a parameter is a variable constant.) For example, the speed of light is a constant, the position a variable, the temperature is often a parameter, on which the length of an object, for example, can depend. Note that not all observables are quantities; in particular, parities are not multiples of any unit.

Today the task of defining tools for the communication of observations can be considered *complete*. (For quantities, this is surely correct; for parity-type observables there could be a few examples to be discovered.) This is a simple and strong statement. Even the BIPM, the Bureau International des Poids et Mesures, has stopped adding new units.**

As a note, the greatness of a physicist can be ranked by the number of observables he has introduced. Even a great scientist such as Einstein, who discovered many 'laws' of nature, only introduced one new observable, namely the metric tensor for the description of gravity. Following this criterion – as well as several others – Maxwell is the most important physicist, having introduced electric and magnetic fields, the vector potential, and several other material dependent observables. For Heisenberg, Dirac and Schrödinger, the wave function describing electron motion could be counted as half an observable (as it is a quantity necessary to calculate measurement results, but not itself an observable). Incidentally, even the introduction of *any* term that is taken up by others is a rare event; 'gas', 'entropy' and only a few others are such examples. It has always been much more difficult to discover an observable than to discover a 'law'; usually, observables are developed by many people cooperating together. Indeed, many 'laws' bear people's names, but almost no observables.

* All mathematical symbols used in this walk, together with the alphabets from which they are taken, are listed in Appendix A on notation. They follow international standards whenever they are defined. The standard symbols of the physical quantities, as defined by the International Standards Organization (ISO), the International Union of Pure and Applied Physics (IUPAP) and the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC), can be found for example in the *bible*, i.e., the *CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 1992.

** The last, the katal or mol/s, was introduced in 1999. Physical units are presented in Appendix C.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

If the list of observables necessary to describe nature is complete, does this mean that all the patterns or rules of nature are known? No; in the history of physics, observables were usually defined and measured long *before* the precise rules connecting them were found. For example, all observables used in the description of motion itself, such as time, position and its derivatives, momentum, energy and all the thermodynamic quantities, were defined before or during the nineteenth century, whereas the most precise versions of the patterns or 'laws' of nature connecting them, special relativity and non-equilibrium thermodynamics, have been found only in the twentieth century. The same is true for all observables connected to electromagnetic interaction. The corresponding patterns of nature, quantum electrodynamics, was discovered long after the corresponding observables. The observables that were discovered last were the fields of the strong and the weak nuclear interactions. Also, in this case, the patterns of nature were formulated much later.*

Do observations take time?

An observation is an interaction with some part of nature leading to the production of a record, such as a memory in the brain, data on a tape, ink on paper, or any other fixed pattern applied to a support. The necessary irreversible interaction process is often called *writing* the record. Obviously, writing takes a certain amount of time; zero interaction time would give no record at all. Therefore any recording device, including our brain, always records some *time average* of the observation, however short it may be.

What we call a fixed image, be it a mental image or a photograph, is always the time average of a moving situation. Without time averaging, we would have no fixed memories. On the other hand, any time averaging introduces a blur that hides certain details; and in our quest for precision, at a certain moment, these details are bound to become important. The discovery of these details will begin in the upcoming part of the walk, the one centred on quantum theory. In the final part of our mountain ascent we will discover that there is a shortest possible averaging time. Observations of that short duration show so many details that even the distinction between particles and empty space is lost. In contrast, our concepts of everyday life appear only after relatively long time averages. The search for an average-free description of nature is one of the big challenges of our adventure.

Is induction a problem in physics?

> Nur *gesetzmäßige* Zusammenhänge sind *denkbar*.**
>
> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 6.361

* Is it possible to talk about observations at all? It is many a philosopher's hobby to discuss whether there actually is an example for an 'Elementarsatz' – an atomic fact – mentioned by Wittgenstein in his *Tractatus*. There seems to be at least one that fits: *Differences exist*. It is a simple sentence; in the final part of our walk, it will play a central role.

** 'Only connexions that are *subject to law* are *thinkable*.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

> There is a tradition of opposition between adherents of induction and of deduction. In my view it would be just as sensible for the two ends of a worm to quarrel.
>
> Alfred North Whitehead

Induction is the usual term used for the act of making, from a small and finite number of experiments, general conclusions about the outcome of *all* possible experiments performed in other places, or at other times. In a sense, it is the technical term for sticking out one's neck, which is necessary in every scientific statement. Induction has been a major topic of discussion for science commentators. Frequently one finds the remark that knowledge in general, and physics in particular, relies on induction for its statements. According to some, induction is a type of hidden belief that underlies all sciences but at the same time contrasts with them.

To avoid wasting energy, we make only a few remarks. The first can be deduced from a simple experiment. Try to convince a critic of induction to put their hand into a fire. Nobody who honestly calls induction a belief should conclude from a few unfortunate experiences in the past that such an act would also be dangerous in the future... In short, somehow induction works.

A second point is that physical universal statements are always openly stated; they are never hidden. The refusal to put one's hand into a fire is a consequence of the invariance of observations under time and space translations. Indeed, general statements of this type form the very basis of physics. However, no physical statement is a belief only because it is universal; it always remains open to experimental checks. Physical induction is not a hidden method of argumentation, it is an explicit part of experimental statements. In fact, the complete list of 'inductive' statements used in physics is given in the table on page 220. These statements are so important that they have been given a special name: they are called *symmetries*. The table lists all known symmetries of nature; in other words, it lists all inductive statements used in physics.

Perhaps the best argument for the use of induction is that there is no way to avoid it when one is thinking. There is no way to think, to talk or to remember without using concepts, i.e., without assuming that most objects or entities have the same properties over time. There is also no way to communicate with others without assuming that the observations made from the other's viewpoint are similar to one's own. There is no way to think without symmetry and induction. Indeed, the concepts related to symmetry and induction, such as space and time, belong to the fundamental concepts of language. The only sentences which do not use induction, the sentences of logic, do not have any content (*Tractatus*, 6.11). Indeed, without induction, we cannot classify observations at all! Evolution has given us memory and a brain because induction works. To criticize induction is not to criticize natural sciences, it is to criticize the use of thought in general. We should never take too seriously people who themselves do what they criticize in others; sporadically pointing out the ridicule of this endeavour is just the right amount of attention they deserve.

Page 819
Ref. 747
Challenge 1256 s

The topic could be concluded here, were it not for some interesting developments in modern physics that put two additional nails in the coffin of arguments against induction. First, in physics whenever we make statements about all experiments, all times or all velocities, such statements are actually about a *finite number* of cases. We know today that

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

infinities, both in size and in number, do not occur in nature. The infinite number of cases appearing in statements in classical physics and in quantum mechanics are apparent, not real, and due to human simplifications and approximations. Statements that a certain experiment gives the same result 'everywhere' or that a given equation is correct for 'all times', always encompass only a *finite* number of examples. A great deal of otherwise often instinctive repulsion to such statements is avoided in this way. In the sciences, as well as in this book, 'all' *never* means an infinite number of cases.

Finally, it is well known that extrapolating from a few cases to many is false when the few cases are independent of each other. However, this conclusion is correct if the cases are interdependent. From the fact that somebody found a penny on the street on two subsequent months, cannot follow that he will find one the coming month. Induction is only correct if we know that all cases have similar behaviour, e.g. because they follow from the same origin. For example, if a neighbour with a hole in his pocket carries his salary across that street once a month, and the hole always opens at that point because of the beginning of stairs, then the conclusion would be correct. It turns out that the results of modern physics encountered in the final part of our walk show that all situations in nature are indeed interdependent, and thus we prove in detail that what is called 'induction' is in fact a logically correct conclusion.

> In the progress of physics, the exception usually turned out to be the general case.

THE QUEST FOR PRECISION AND ITS IMPLICATIONS

> Der Zweck der Philosophie ist die logische Klärung der Gedanken.*
>
> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 4.112

To talk well about motion means to talk precisely. Precision requires avoiding three common mistakes in the description of nature.

First, concepts should never have a contradiction built into their definition. For example, any phenomenon occurring in nature evidently is a 'natural' phenomenon; therefore, to talk about either 'supernatural' phenomena or 'unnatural' phenomena is a mistake that nobody interested in motion should let go unchallenged; such terms contain a logical contradiction. Naturally, *all* observations are natural. Incidentally, there is a reward of more than a million dollars for anybody proving the opposite. In over twenty years, nobody has yet been able to collect it.

Ref. 753

Second, concepts should not have unclear or constantly changing definitions. Their content and their limits must be kept constant and explicit. The opposite of this is often encountered in crackpots or populist politicians; it distinguishes them from more reliable thinkers. Physicists can also fall into the trap; for example, there is, of course, only one *single* (physical) universe, as even the name says. To talk about more than one universe is an increasingly frequent error.

Ref. 754

Third, concepts should not be used outside their domain of application. It is easy to succumb to the temptation to transfer results from physics to philosophy without check-

* 'The object of philosophy is the logical clarification of thoughts.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

ing the content. An example is the question: 'Why do particles follow the laws of nature?' The flaw in the question is due to a misunderstanding of the term 'laws of nature' and to a confusion with the laws of the state. If nature were governed by 'laws', they could be changed by parliament. Remembering that 'laws of nature' simply means 'pattern', 'property' or 'description of behaviour', and rephrasing the question correctly as 'Why do particles behave in the way we describe their behaviour?' one can recognize its senselessness.

In the course of our walk, we will often be tempted by these three mistakes. A few such situations follow, with the ways of avoiding them.

> Consistency is the last refuge of the unimaginative.
>
> Oscar Wilde

What are interactions? – No emergence

> The whole is always more than the sum of its parts.
>
> Aristotle, *Metaphysica*, 10f–1045a.

In the physical description of nature, the whole is always *more* than the sum of its parts. Actually, the difference between the whole and the sum of its parts is so important that it has a special name: the *interaction* between the parts. For example, the energy of the whole minus the sum of the energies of its parts is called the energy of interaction. In fact, the study of interactions is the main topic of physics. In other words, physics is concerned *primarily* with the difference between the parts and the whole, contrary to what is often suggested by bad journalists or other sloppy thinkers.

Note that the term 'interaction' is based on the general observation that anything that affects anything else is, in turn, affected by it; interactions are *reciprocal*. For example, if one body changes the momentum of another, then the second changes the momentum of the first by the same (negative) amount. The reciprocity of interactions is a result of conservation 'laws'. The reciprocity is also the reason that somebody who uses the term 'interaction' is considered a heretic by monotheistic religions, as theologians regularly point out. They repeatedly stress that such a reciprocity implicitly denies the immutability of the deity. (Are they correct?)

Challenge 1257 s

The application of the definition of interaction also settles the frequently heard question of whether in nature there are 'emergent' properties, i.e., properties of systems that cannot be deduced from the properties of their parts and interactions. By definition, there are no emergent properties. 'Emergent' properties can only appear if interactions are approximated or neglected. The idea of 'emergent' properties is a product of minds with restricted horizons, unable to see or admit the richness of consequences that general principles can produce. In defending the idea of emergence, one belittles the importance of interactions, working, in a seemingly innocuous, maybe unconscious, but in fact sneaky way, against the use of reason in the study of nature. 'Emergence' is a belief.

Page 309

Ref. 755

The simple definition of interaction given above sounds elementary, but it leads to surprising conclusions. Take the atomic idea of Democritus in its modern form: nature is made of vacuum and of particles. The first consequence is the *paradox of incomplete description*: experiments show that there are interactions between vacuum and particles. However, interactions are differences between parts and the whole, in this case between

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

vacuum and particles on the one hand, and the whole on the other. We thus have deduced that nature is not made of vacuum and particles alone.

The second consequence is the *paradox of overcomplete description*: experiments also show that interactions happen through exchange of particles. However, we have counted particles already as basic building blocks. Does this mean that the description of nature by vacuum and particles is an overdescription, counting things twice?

Challenge 1258 s

Page 1418

We will resolve both paradoxes in the last part of our mountain ascent.

What is existence?

> You know what I like most?
> Rhetorical questions.

Ref. 756

Assume a friend tells you 'I have seen a *grampus* today!' You would naturally ask what it looks like. What answer do we expect? We expect something like 'It's an animal with a certain number of heads similar to a X, attached to a body like a Y, with wings like a Z, it make noises like a U and it felt like a V' – the letters denoting some other animal or object. Generally speaking, in the case of an object, this scene from Darwin's voyage to South America shows that in order to talk to each other, we first need certain basic, common concepts ('animal', 'head', 'wing', etc.). In addition, for the definition of a new entity we need a characterization of its parts ('size', 'colour'), of the way these parts relate to each other, and of the way that the whole interacts with the outside world ('feel', 'sound'). In other words, for an object to exist, we must be able to give a list of relations with the outside world. An object exists if we can interact with it. (Is observation sufficient to determine existence?)

Challenge 1259 s

For an abstract concept, such as 'time' or 'superstring', the definition of existence has to be refined only marginally: *(physical) existence is the effectiveness to describe interactions accurately*. This definition applies to trees, time, virtual particles, imaginary numbers, entropy and so on. It is thus pointless to discuss whether a physical concept 'exists' or whether it is 'only' an abstraction used as a tool for descriptions of observations. The two possibilities coincide. The point of dispute can only be whether the description provided by a concept is or is not *precise*.

For mathematical concepts, existence has a somewhat different meaning: a mathematical concept is said to exist if it has no built-in contradictions. This is a much weaker requirement than physical existence. It is thus incorrect to deduce physical existence from mathematical existence. This is a frequent error; from Pythagoras' times onwards it was often stated that since mathematical concepts exist, they must therefore also exist in nature. Historically, this error occurred in the statements that planet orbits 'must' be circles, that planet shapes 'must' be spheres or that physical space 'must' be Euclidean. Today this is still happening with the statements that space and time 'must' be continuous and that nature 'must' be described by sets. In all these cases, the reasoning is wrong. In fact, the continuous attempts to deduce physical existence from mathematical existence hide that the opposite is correct: a short reflection shows that mathematical existence is a special case of physical existence.

Challenge 1260 s

We note that there is also a different type of existence, namely *psychological existence*. A concept can be said to exist psychologically if it describes human internal experience.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Thus a concept can exist psychologically even if it does not exist physically. It is easy to
Challenge 1261 s find examples from the religions or from systems that describe inner experiences. Also myths, legends and comic strips define concepts that only exist psychologically, not physically. In our walk, whenever we talk about existence, we mean physical existence only.

Do things exist?

> Wer Wissenschaft und Kunst besitzt,
> Hat auch Religion;
> Wer jene beiden nicht besitzt,
> Der habe Religion.*
>
> Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Zahme Xenien, IX*

Using the above definition of existence, the question becomes either trivial or imprecise. It is trivial in the sense that things necessarily exist if they describe observations, since they were defined that way. But perhaps the questioner meant to ask: Does reality exist independently of the observer?

Using the above, this question can be rephrased: 'Do the things we observe exist independently of observation?' After thousands of years of extensive discussion by professional philosophers, logicians, sophists and amateurs the answer is the same: it is 'Yes', because the world did not change after great-grandmother died. The disappearance of observers does not seem to change the universe. These experimental findings can be corroborated by inserting the definition of 'existence' into the question, which then becomes: 'Do the things we observe interact with other aspects of nature when they do not interact with people?' The answer is evident. Recent popular books on quantum mechanics fantasize about the importance of the 'mind' of observers – whatever this term may mean; they provide pretty examples of authors who see themselves as irreplaceable, seemingly having lost the ability to see themselves as part of a larger entity.

Of course there are other opinions about the existence of things. The most famous is that of the Irishman George Berkeley (1685–1753) who rightly understood that thoughts based on observation alone, if spread, would undermine the basis of the religious organization of which he was one of the top managers. To counteract this tendency, in 1710 he published *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge*, a book denying the existence of the material world. This reactionary book became widely known in like-minded circles (it was a time when few books were written) even though it is based on a fundamentally flawed idea: it assumes that the concept of 'existence' and that of 'world'
Challenge 1262 e can be defined independently. (You may be curious to try the feat.)

Berkeley had two aims when he wrote his book. First, he tried to deny the capacity of people to arrive at judgements on nature or on any other matter *from their own experience*. Second, he also tried to deny the *ontological reach* of science, i.e., the conclusions one can draw from experience on the questions about human existence. Even though Berkeley is generally despised nowadays, he actually achieved his main aim: he was the originator of the statement that science and religion do not contradict, but *complement* each other. By religion, Berkeley did not mean either morality or spirituality; every scientist is a friend of both of these. By religion, Berkeley meant that the standard set of beliefs for which he

* He who possesses science and art, also has religion; he who does not possess the two, better have religion.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

stood is above the deductions of reason. This widely cited statement, itself a belief, is still held dearly by many even to this day. However, when searching for the origin of motion, all beliefs stand in the way, including this one. Carrying beliefs is like carrying oversized baggage: it prevents one from reaching the top of Motion Mountain.

Does the void exist?

> Teacher: 'What is found between the nucleus and the electrons?'
> Student: 'Nothing, only air.'
>
> Natura abhorret vacuum.
>
> Antiquity

In philosophical discussions '*void*' is usually defined as 'non-existence'. It then becomes a game of words to ask for a yes or no answer to the question 'Does the void exist?' The expression 'the existence of non-existence' is either a contradiction of terms or is at least unclearly defined; the topic would not seem to be of great interest. However, similar questions do appear in physics, and a physicist should be prepared to notice the difference of this from the previous one. Does a vacuum exist? Does empty space exist? Or is the world 'full' everywhere, as the more conservative biologist Aristotle maintained? In the past, people have been killed for giving an answer that was unacceptable to authorities.

It is not obvious, but it is nevertheless important, that the modern physical concepts of 'vacuum' and 'empty space' are not the same as the philosophical concept of 'void'. 'Vacuum' is not defined as 'non-existence'; on the contrary, it is defined as the absence of matter and radiation. Vacuum is an entity with specific observable properties, such as its number of dimensions, its electromagnetic constants, its curvature, its vanishing mass, its interaction with matter through curvature and through its influence on decay, etc. (A table of the properties of a physical vacuum is given on page 757.) Historically, it took a long time to clarify the distinction between a physical vacuum and a philosophical void. People confused the two concepts and debated the existence of the vacuum for more than two thousand years. The first to state that it existed, with the courage to try to look through the logical contradiction at the underlying physical reality, were Leucippus and Democritus, the most daring thinkers of antiquity. Their speculations in turn elicited the reactionary response of Aristotle, who rejected the concept of vacuum. Aristotle and his disciples propagated the belief about nature's *horror of the vacuum*.

The discussion changed completely in the seventeenth century, when the first experimental method to realize a vacuum was devised by Torricelli.* Using mercury in a glass tube, he produced the first laboratory vacuum. Can you guess how? Arguments against the existence of the vacuum again appeared around 1900, when it was argued that light needed 'aether' for its propagation, using almost the same arguments that had been used two hundred years earlier, but in different words. However, experiments failed to detect any of the supposed properties of this unclearly defined concept. Experiments in the field of general relativity showed that a vacuum can move – though in a completely different way from the way in which the aether was expected to move – that the vacuum can be

Challenge 1263 s

* Evangelista Torricelli (b. 1608 Faenza, d. 1647 Florence), Italian physicist, pupil and successor to Galileo. The (non-SI) pressure unit 'torr' is named after him.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

bent, but it then tends to return to its shape. Then, in the late twentieth century, quantum field theory again argued against the existence of a true vacuum and in favour of a space full of virtual particle–antiparticle pairs, culminating in the discussions around the cosmological constant.

Page 1396

The question 'Does the void exist?' is settled conclusively only in the last part of this walk, in a rather surprising way.

Page 1420

Is nature infinite?

> It is certain and evident to our senses, that in the world some things are in motion. Now whatever is moved is moved by another... If that by which it is moved be itself moved, then this also needs to be to be moved by another, and that by another again. But this cannot go on to infinity, because then there would be no first mover and consequently, no other mover, seeing that subsequent movers move only inasmuch as they are moved by the first mover, as the staff moves only because it is moved by the hand. Therefore it is necessary to arrive at a first mover, moved by no other; and this everyone understands to be god.
>
> Thomas Aquinas (*c.* 1225–1274) *Summa Theologiae*, I, q. 2.

Most of the modern discussions about set theory centre on ways to defining the term 'set' for various types of infinite collections. For the description of motion this leads to two questions: Is the universe infinite? Is it a set? We begin with the first one. Illuminating the question from various viewpoints, we will quickly discover that it is both simple and imprecise.

Do we need infinite quantities to describe nature? Certainly, in classical and quantum physics we do, e.g. in the case of space-time. Is this necessary? We can say already a few things.

Any set can be finite in one aspect and infinite in another. For example, it is possible to proceed along a finite mathematical distance in an infinite amount of time. It is also possible to travel along any distance whatsoever in a given amount of mathematical time, making infinite speed an option, even if relativity is taken into account, as was explained earlier.

Page 425

Despite the use of infinities, scientists are still limited. We saw above that many types of infinities exist. However, no infinity larger than the cardinality of the real numbers plays a role in physics. No space of functions or phase space in classical physics and no Hilbert space in quantum theory has higher cardinality. Despite the ability of mathematicians to define much larger kinds of infinities, the description of nature does not need them. Even the most elaborate descriptions of motion use only the infinity of the real numbers.

Page 825

Ref. 743

But is it possible at all to say *of nature* or of one of its aspects that it is indeed *infinite*? Can such a statement be compatible with observations? No. It is evident that every statement that claims that something in nature is infinite is a belief, and is not backed by

Challenge 1264 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

observations. We shall patiently eliminate this belief in the following.

The possibility of introducing false infinities make any discussion on whether humanity is near the 'end of science' rather difficult. The amount of knowledge and the time required to discover it are unrelated. Depending on the speed with which one advances through it, the end of science can be near or unreachable. In practice, scientists have thus the power to *make* science infinite or not, e.g. by reducing the speed of progress. As scientists need funding for their work, one can guess the stand that they usually take.

Ref. 744

In short, the universe cannot be proven to be infinite. But can it be *finite*? At first sight, this would be the only possibility left. (It is not, as we shall see.) But even though many have tried to describe the universe as finite in all its aspects, no one has yet been successful. In order to understand the problems that they encountered, we continue with the other question mentioned above:

Is the universe a set?

A simple observation leads us to question whether the universe is a set. For 2500 years it has been said that the universe is made of vacuum and particles. This implies that the universe is made of a certain *number* of particles. Perhaps the only person to have taken this conclusion to the limit was the English astrophysicist Arthur Eddington (1882–1944), who wrote:

Ref. 757

> Ref. 758 I believe there are 15,747,724,136,275,002,577,605,653,961,181,555,468,044,717,914, 527,116,709,366,231,425,076,185,631,031,296 protons in the universe and the same number of electrons.

Eddington was ridiculed over and over again for this statement and for his beliefs that lead up to it. His arguments were indeed based on his personal preferences for certain pet numbers. However, we should not laugh too loudly. In fact, for 2500 years almost all scientists have thought along the same line, the only difference being that they have left the precise number unspecified! In fact, *any other number* put into the above sentence would be equally ridiculous. Avoiding specifying it is just a cowards' way of avoiding looking at this foggy aspect of the particle description of nature.

Is there a particle number at all in nature? If you smiled at Eddington's statement, or if you shook your head over it, it may mean that you instinctively believe that nature is not a set. Is this so? Whenever we define the universe as the totality of events, or as the totality of all space-time points and objects, we imply that space-time points can be distinguished, that objects can be distinguished and that both can be distinguished from each other. We thus assume that nature is separable and a set. But is this correct? The question is important. The ability to distinguish space-time points and particles from each other is often called *locality*. Thus the universe is separable or is a set if and only if our description of it is local.* And in everyday life, locality is observed without exception.

In daily life we also observe that nature is separable and a whole at the same time. It is a 'many that can be thought as one': in daily life nature is a set. Indeed, the basic

* In quantum mechanics also other, more detailed definitions of locality are used. We will mention them in the quantum part of this text. The issue mentioned here is a different, more fundamental one, and not connected with that of quantum theory.

Page 1082

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

characteristic of nature is its diversity. In the world around us we observe changes and differences; we observe that nature is separable. Furthermore, all aspects of nature belong together: there are relations between these aspects, often called 'laws,' stating that the different aspects of nature form a whole, usually called the universe.

In other words, the possibility of describing observations with the help of 'laws' follows from our experience of the separability of nature. The more precisely the separability is specified, the more precisely the 'laws' can be formulated. Indeed, if nature were not separable or were not a unity, we could not explain why stones fall downwards. Thus we are led to speculate that we should be able to deduce all 'laws' from the fact that nature is separable.

In addition, only the separability allows us to describe nature at all. A description is a classification, that is, a mapping between certain aspects of nature and certain concepts. All concepts are sets and relations. Since the universe is separable, it can be described with the help of sets and relations. Both are separable entities with distinguishable parts. A precise description is commonly called an understanding. In short, the universe is comprehensible only because it is separable.

Moreover, only the separability of the universe makes our brain such a good instrument. The brain is built from a large number of connected components, and only the brain's separability allows it to function. In other words, thinking is only possible because nature is separable.

Finally, only the separability of the universe allows us to distinguish reference frames, and thus to define all symmetries at the basis of physical descriptions. And in the same way that separability is thus necessary for *covariant* descriptions, the unity of nature is necessary for *invariant* descriptions. In other words, the so-called 'laws' of nature are based on the experience that nature is both separable and unifiable – that it is a set.

These arguments seem overwhelmingly to prove that the universe is a set. However, these arguments apply only to everyday experience, everyday dimensions and everyday energies. Is nature a set also *outside* the domains of daily life? Are objects different at all energies, even when they are looked at with the highest precision possible? We have three open issues left: the issue of the number of particles in the universe; the circular definition of space, time and matter; and the issue as to whether describing nature as made of particles and void is an overdescription, an underdescription, or neither. These three issues make us doubt whether objects are countable at all energies. We will discover in the final part of our mountain ascent that this is not the case in nature. The consequences will be extensive and fascinating. As an example, try to answer the following: if the universe is not a set, what does that mean for space and time?

Page 1440

Challenge 1265 s

Does the universe exist?

> Each progressive spirit is opposed by a
> thousand men appointed to guard the past.
> Maurice Maeterlink

Following the definition above, existence of a concept means its usefulness to describe interactions. There are two common definitions of the concept of 'universe'. The first is the totality of all matter, energy and space-time. But this usage results in a strange consequence: since nothing can interact with this totality, we cannot claim that the universe

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

exists.

So let us take the more restricted view, namely that the universe is only the totality of all matter and energy. But also in this case it is impossible to interact with the universe. Challenge 1266 s Can you give a few arguments to support this?

In short, we arrive at the conclusion that the universe does not exist. We will indeed Page 1443 confirm this result in more detail later on in our walk. In particular, since the universe does not exist, it does not make sense to even try to answer *why* it exists. The best answer Ref. 711 might be: because of furiously sleeping, colourless green ideas.

What is creation?

> (Gigni) De nihilo nihilum, in nihilum nil posse reverti.*
>
> Ref. 759 Persius, *Satira*, III, v. 83-84.

> Anaxagoras, discovering the ancient theory that nothing comes from nothing, decided to abolish the concept of creation and introduced in its place that of discrimination; he did not hesitate to state, in effect, that all things are mixed to the others and that discrimination produces their growth.
>
> Ref. 760 *Anonymous fragment*, Middle Ages.

The term 'creation' is often heard when talking about nature. It is used in various contexts with different meanings.

One speaks of creation as the characterization of human actions, such as observed in an artist painting or a secretary typing. Obviously, this is one type of change. In the classification of change introduced at the beginning of our walk, the changes cited are movements of objects, such as the electrons in the brain, the molecules in the muscles, the material of the paint, or the electrons inside the computer. This type of creation is thus a special case of motion.

One also speaks of creation in the biological or social sense, such as in 'the creation of life', or 'creation of a business', or 'the creation of civilization'. These events are forms of growth or of self-organization; again, they are special cases of motion.

Physicists one often say that a lamp 'creates' light or that a stone falling into a pond 'creates' water ripples. Similarly, they talk of 'pair creation' of matter and antimatter. It Page 1049 was one of the important discoveries of physics that all these processes are special types Page 1184 of motion, namely excitation of fields.

In popular writing on cosmology, 'creation' is also a term commonly applied, or better misapplied, to the *big bang*. However, the expansion of the universe is a pure example of motion, and contrary to a frequent misunderstanding, the description of the big bang contains only processes that fall into one of the previous three categories, as shown in the Page 591 relevant chapter in general relativity. The big bang is not an example of creation. Quantum cosmology provides more reasons to support the fact that the naive term 'creation' Page 590 is not applicable to the big bang. First, it turns out that the big bang was not an event.

* Nothing (can appear) from nothing, nothing can disappear into nothing.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Second, it was not a beginning. Third, it did not provide a *choice* from a large set of possibilities. The big bang does not have any properties attributed to the term 'creation'.

In summary, we conclude that in all cases, *creation is a type of motion*. (The same applies to the notions of 'disappearance' and 'annihilation'.) No other type of creation is observed in nature. In particular, the naive sense of 'creation', namely 'appearance from nothing' – *ex nihilo* in Latin – is never observed in nature. All observed types of 'creation' require space, time, forces, energy and matter for their realization. Creation requires something to exist already, in order to take place. In addition, precise exploration shows that no physical process and no example of motion has a beginning. Our walk will show us that nature does not allow us to pinpoint beginnings. This property alone is sufficient to show that 'creation' is not a concept applicable to what happens in nature. Worse still, creation is applied only to physical systems; we will discover that nature is not a system and that systems do not exist.

The opposite of creation is *conservation*. The central statements of physics are conservation theorems: for energy, mass, linear momentum, angular momentum, charge, etc. In fact, every conservation 'law' is a detailed and accurate rejection of the concept of creation. The ancient Greek idea of atoms already contains this rejection. Atomists stated that there is no creation and no disappearance, but only motion of atoms. Every transformation of matter is a motion of atoms. In other words, the idea of the atom was a direct consequence of the negation of creation. It took humanity over 2000 years before it stopped locking people in jail for talking about atoms, as had happened to Galileo.

Page 252

However, there is one exception in which the naive concept of creation does apply: it describes what magicians do on stage. When a magician makes a rabbit appear from nowhere, we indeed experience 'creation' from nothing. At its best such magic is a form of entertainment, at its worst, a misuse of gullibility. The idea that the universe results from either of these two does not seem appealing; on second thought though, maybe looking at the universe as the ultimate entertainment could open up a fresh and more productive approach to life.

Voltaire (1694–1778) popularized an argument against creation often used in the past: we do not know whether creation has taken place or not. Today the situation is different: we *do* know that it has *not* taken place, because creation is a type of motion and, as we will see in the concluding part of our mountain ascent, motion did not exist near the big bang.

Have you ever heard the expression 'creation of the laws of nature'? It is one of the most common examples of disinformation. First of all, this expression confuses the 'laws' with nature itself. A description is not the same as the thing itself; everybody knows that giving their beloved a description of a rose is different from giving an actual rose. Second, the expression implies that nature is the way it is because it is somehow 'forced' to follow the 'laws' – a rather childish and, what is more, incorrect view. And third, the expression assumes that it is possible to 'create' descriptions of nature. But a 'law' is a description, and a description by definition cannot be created: so the expression makes no sense at all. The expression 'creation of the laws of nature' is the epitome of confused thinking.

It may well be that calling a great artist 'creative' or 'divine', as was common during the Renaissance, is not blasphemy, but simply an encouragement to the gods to try to do as well. In fact, whenever one uses the term 'creation' to mean anything other than some form of motion, one is discarding both observations and human reason. It is one

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

of the last pseudo-concepts of our modern time; no expert on motion should forget this. It is impossible to escalate Motion Mountain without getting rid of 'creation'. This is not easy. We will encounter the next attempt to bring back creation in the study of quantum theory.

Page 1343

> Every act of creation is first of all an act of destruction.
>
> Pablo Picasso

Is nature designed?

> In the beginning the universe was created. This has made a lot of people very angry and has been widely regarded as a bad move.
>
> Douglas Adams

The tendency to infer the creation of an object from its simple existence is widespread. Some people jump to this conclusion every time they see a beautiful landscape. This habit stems from the triple prejudice that a beautiful scene implies a complex description, in turn implying complex building instructions, and therefore pointing to an underlying *design*.

This chain of thought contains several mistakes. First, in general, beauty is not a consequence of complexity. Usually it is the opposite: indeed, the study of chaos and of self-organization demonstrated how beautifully complex shapes and patterns can be generated with extremely simple descriptions. True, for most human artefacts, complex descriptions indeed imply complex building processes; a personal computer is a good example of a complex object with a complex production process. But in nature, this connection does not apply. We have seen above that even the amount of information needed to construct a human body is about a million times smaller than the information stored in the brain alone. Similar results have been found for plant architecture and for many other examples of patterns in nature. The simple descriptions behind the apparent complexities of nature have been and are still being uncovered by the study of self-organization, chaos, turbulence and fractal shapes. In nature, complex structures derive from *simple* processes. Beware of anyone who says that nature has 'infinite complexity': first of all, complexity is not a measurable entity, despite many attempts to quantify it. In addition, all known complex system can be described by (relatively) few parameters and simple equations. Finally, nothing in nature is infinite.

Ref. 761

The second mistake in the argument for design is to link a description with an 'instruction', and maybe even to imagine that some unknown 'intelligence' is somehow pulling the strings of the world's stage. The study of nature has consistently shown that there is no hidden intelligence and no instruction behind the processes of nature. An instruction is a list of orders to an executioner. But there are no orders in nature, and no executioners. There are no 'laws' of nature, only descriptions of processes. Nobody is building a tree; the tree is an outcome of the motion of molecules making it up. The genes in the tree do contain information; but no molecule is given any instructions. What seem to be instructions to us are just natural movements of molecules and energy, described by the same patterns taking place in non-living systems. The whole idea of instruction – like that of 'law' of nature – is an ideology, born from an analogy with monarchy or even

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

tyranny, and a typical anthropomorphism.

The third mistake in the argument for design is the suggestion that a complex description for a system implies an underlying design. This is not correct. A complex description only implies that the system has a long evolution behind it. The correct deduction is: something of large complexity exists; therefore it has *grown*, i.e., it has been transformed through input of (moderate) energy over time. This deduction applies to flowers, mountains, stars, life, people, watches, books, personal computers and works of art; in fact it applies to all objects in the universe. The complexity of our environment thus points out the considerable age of our environment and reminds us of the shortness of our own life.

The lack of basic complexity and the lack of instructions in nature confirm a simple result: there is not a single observation in nature that implies or requires design or creation. On the other hand, the variety and intensity of nature's phenomena fills us with deep awe. The wild beauty of nature shows us how *small* a part of nature we actually are, both in space and in time.* We shall explore this experience in detail. We shall find that remaining open to nature's phenomena in all their overwhelming intensity is central to the rest of our adventure.

Page 1343

> There is a separation between state and church,
> but not yet between state and science.
>
> Paul Feyerabend

What is a description?

> In theory, there is no difference between theory
> and practice. In practice, there is.

Following standard vocabulary usage, a description of an observation is a list of the details. The above example of the grampus showed this clearly. In other words, a *description* of an observation is the act of categorizing it, i.e., of comparing, by identifying or distinguishing, the observation with all the other observations already made. A description is a classification. In short, *to describe means to see as an element of a larger set*.

Page 856

A description can be compared to the 'you are here' sign on a city tourist map. Out of a set of possible positions, the 'you are here' sign gives the actual one. Similarly, a description highlights the given situation in comparison with all other possibilities. For example, the formula $a = GM/r^2$ is a description of the observations relating motion to gravity, because it classifies the observed accelerations a according to distance to the central body r and to its mass M; indeed such a description sees each specific case as an example of a general pattern. The habit of generalizing is one reason for the often disturbing dismissiveness of scientists: when they observe something, their professional training usually makes them classify it as a special case of a known phenomenon and thus keeps them from being surprised or from being exited about it.

A description is thus the opposite of a *metaphor*; the latter is an analogy relating an observation with another *special* case; a description relates an observation with a *general* case, such as a physical theory.

* The search for a 'sense' in life or in nature is a complicated (and necessary) way to try to face the smallness of human existence.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

> Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas,
> atque metus omnis et inexorabile fatum
> subjecit pedibus strepitumque acherontis avari.
> Vergilius*

Reason, purpose and explanation

> Der ganzen modernen Weltanschauung liegt
> die Täuschung zugrunde, daß die sogenannten
> Naturgesetze die Erklärungen der
> Naturerscheinungen seien.**
> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 6.371

— Why are the leaves of most trees green? Because they absorb red and blue light. Why do they absorb those colours? Because they contain chlorophyll. Why is chlorophyll green? Because all chlorophyll types contain magnesium between four pyrrole groups, and this chemical combination gives the green colour, as a result of its quantum mechanical energy levels. Why do plants contain chlorophyll? Because this is what land plants can synthesize. Why only this? Because all land plants originally evolved from the green algae, who are only able to synthesize this compound, and not the compounds found in the blue or in the red algae, which are also found in the sea.
— Why do children climb trees, and why do some people climb mountains? Because of the sensations they experience during their activity: the feelings of achievement, the symbolic act to go upwards, the wish to get a wider view of the world are part of this type of adventure.

The 'why'-questions in the last two paragraphs show the general difference between reasons and purposes (although the details of these two terms are not defined in the same way by everybody). A *purpose* or *intention* is a classification applied to the actions of humans or animals; strictly speaking, it specifies the quest for a feeling, namely for achieving some type of satisfaction after completion of the action. On the other hand, a *reason* is a specific relation of a fact with the rest of the universe, usually its past. What we call a reason always rests outside the observation itself, whereas a purpose is always internal to it.

Reasons and purposes are the two possibilities of explanations, i.e., the two possible answers to questions starting with 'why'. Usually, physics is not concerned with purpose or with people's feeling, mainly because its original aim, to talk about motion with precision, does not seem to be achievable in this domain. Therefore, *physical* explanations of facts are never purposes, but are always reasons. A *physical explanation* of an observation is always the description of its relation with the rest of nature.*** Ref. 762

* 'Happy he who can know the causes of things and who, free of all fears, can lay the inexorable fate and the noise of Acheron to his feet.' *Georgica*, book II, verses 490 ss.) Publius Vergilius Maro (70–19 BCE), the great roman poet, is author of the Aeneid. Acheron was the river crossed by those who had just died and were on their way to the Hades.

** 'The whole modern conception of the world is founded on the illusion that the so-called laws of nature are the explanations of natural phenomena.'

*** It is important to note that purposes are *not* put aside because they pertain to the future, but because they are inadmissible anthropomorphisms. In fact, for deterministic systems, we can equally say that the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

This means that – contrary to common opinion – a question starting with 'why' is accessible to physical investigation as long as it asks for a reason and not for a purpose. In particular, questions such as 'why do stones fall downwards and not upwards?' or 'why do electrons have that value of mass, and why do they have mass at all?' or 'why does space have three dimensions and not thirty-six?' can be answered, as these ask for the connection between specific observations and more general ones. Of course, not all demands for explanation have been answered yet, and there are still problems to be solved. Our present trail only leads from a few answers to some of the more fundamental questions about motion.

The most general quest for an explanation derives from the question: why is the universe the way it is? The topic is covered in our mountain ascent using the two usual approaches, namely:

Unification and demarcation

> Tout sujet est un; et, quelque vaste qu'il soit, il peut être renfermé dans un seul discours.*
>
> Buffon, *Discours sur le style.*

Studying the properties of motion, constantly paying attention to increase the accuracy of description, we find that explanations are generally of two types:**

— 'It is like all such cases; also this one is described by ...' The situation is recognized as a *special case* of a general behaviour.
— 'If the situation were different, we would have a conclusion in contrast with observations.' The situation is recognized as the *only possible case*.***

In other words, the first approach is to formulate rules or 'laws' that describe larger and larger numbers of observations, and compare the observation with them. This endeavour is called the *unification* of physics – by those who like it; those who don't like it, call it 'reductionism'. For example, the same rule describes the flight of a tennis ball, the motion of the tides at the sea shore, the timing of ice ages, and the time at which the planet Venus ceases to be the evening star and starts to be the morning star. These processes are all consequences of universal gravitation. Similarly, it is not evident that the same rule describes the origin of the colour of the eyes, the formation of lightning, the digestion of food and the working of the brain. These processes are described by quantum electrodynamics.

Unification has its most impressive successes when it predicts an observation that has not been made before. A famous example is the existence of antimatter, predicted

future is actually a *reason* for the present and the past, a fact often forgotten.

* Every subject is one and, however vast it is, it can be comprised in a single discourse.

Challenge 1267 s ** Are these the only possible ones?

*** These two cases have not to be confused with similar sentences that *seem* to be explanations, but that aren't:

— 'It is like the case of ...' A similarity with another *single* case is *not* an explanation.
— 'If it were different, it would contradict the idea that ...' A contradiction with an *idea* or with a theory is *not* an explanation.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

by Dirac when he investigated the solutions of an equation that describes the precise behaviour of common matter.

The second procedure in the search for explanations is the elimination of all other imaginable alternatives in favour of the actually correct one. This endeavour has no commonly accepted name: it could be called the *demarcation* of the 'laws' of physics – by those who like it; others call it 'anthropocentrism', or simply 'arrogance'.

When we discover that light travels in such a way that it takes the shortest possible time to its destination, when we describe motion by a principle of least action, or when we discover that trees are branched in such a way that they achieve the largest effect with the smallest effort, we are using a demarcation viewpoint.

In summary, unification, answering 'why' questions, and demarcation, answering 'why not' questions, are typical for the progress throughout the history of physics. We can say that the dual aspects of unification and demarcation form the composing and the opposing traits of physics. They stand for the desire to *know everything*.

Challenge 1268 s
Challenge 1269 s

However, neither demarcation nor unification can explain the universe. Can you see why? In fact, apart from unification and demarcation, there is a third possibility that merges the two and allows one to say more about the universe. Can you find it? Our walk will automatically lead to it later.

Pigs, apes and the anthropic principle

> Das wichtigste Instrument des Wissenschaftlers ist der Papierkorb.*

The wish to achieve demarcation of the patterns of nature is most interesting when we follow the consequences of different rules of nature until we find them in contradiction with the most striking observation: our own human existence. In this special case the program of demarcation is often called the *anthropic principle* – from the Greek ἄνθρωπος, meaning 'man'.

For example, if the Sun–Earth distance were different from what it is, the resulting temperature change on the Earth would have made impossible the appearance of life, which needs liquid water. Similarly, our brain would not work if the Moon did not circle the Earth. It is also well-known that if there were fewer large planets in the solar system, the evolution of humans would have been impossible. The large planets divert large numbers of comets, preventing them from hitting the Earth. The spectacular collision of comet Shoemaker–Levy-9 with Jupiter, the astronomical event of July 1994, was an example of this diversion of a comet.**

Also the anthropic principle has its most impressive successes when it predicts unknown observations. The most famous example stems from the study of stars. Carbon atoms, like all other atoms except most hydrogen, helium or lithium atoms, are formed in stars through fusion. While studying the mechanisms of fusion in 1953, the well-known British astrophysicist Fred Hoyle*** found that carbon nuclei could not be formed from

* The most important instrument of a scientist is the waste paper basket.

** For a collection of pictures of this event, see e.g. the garbo.uwasa.fi/pc/gifslevy.html website.

*** Fred Hoyle (b. 1915 Bingley, d. 2001), important British astronomer and astrophysicist. He was the first and maybe only physicist who ever made a specific prediction – namely the existence of an excited state of

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

the alpha particles present inside stars at reasonable temperatures, unless they had an excited state with an increased cross-section. From the fact of our existence, which is based on carbon, Hoyle thus predicted the existence of a previously unknown excited state of the carbon nucleus. And, indeed, the excited state was found a few months later by Willy Fowler.*

Ref. 763

In its *serious* form, the anthropic principle is therefore the quest to deduce the description of nature from the experimental fact of our own existence. In the popular literature, however, the anthropic principle is often changed from a simple experimental method to deduce the patterns of nature, to its *perverted* form, a melting pot of absurd metaphysical ideas in which everybody mixes up their favourite beliefs. Most frequently, the experimental observation of our own existence has been perverted to reintroduce the idea of 'design', i.e., that the universe has been constructed with the aim of producing humans; often it is even suggested that the anthropic principle is an *explanation* – a gross example of disinformation.

Ref. 764

How can we distinguish between the serious and the perverted form? We start with an observation. We would get exactly the same rules and patterns of nature if we used the existence of pigs or monkeys as a starting point. In other words, if we would reach *different* conclusions by using the *porcine principle* or the *simian principle*, we are using the perverted form of the anthropic principle, otherwise we are using the serious form. (The carbon-12 story is thus an example of the serious form.) This test is effective because there is no known pattern or 'law' of nature that is particular to humans but unnecessary for apes or pigs.**

> Er wunderte sich, daß den Katzen genau an den Stellen Löcher in den Pelz geschnitten wären, wo sie Augen hätten.
>
> Georg Christoph Lichtenberg***

Does one need cause and effect in explanations?

> In nature there are neither rewards nor punishments – there are consequences.
>
> Ivan Illich

> The world owes you nothing. It was there first.
>
> Mark Twain

the carbon nucleus – from the simple fact that humans exist. A permanent maverick, he coined the term 'big bang' even though he did not accept the evidence for it, and proposed another model, the 'steady state'. His most important and well-known research was on the formation of atoms inside stars. He also propagated the belief that life was brought to Earth from extraterrestrial microbes.

* William A. Fowler (1911–1995) shared the 1983 Nobel Prize in Physics with Subramanyan Chandrasekhar for this and related discoveries.

** Though apes do not seem to be good physicists, as described in the text by D. J. Povinelli, *Folk Physics for Apes: the Chimpanzee's Theory of How the World Works*, Oxford University Press, 2000.

*** 'He was amazed that cats had holes cut into their fur precisely in those places where they had eyes.' Georg Christoph Lichtenberg (1742–1799), German physicist and intellectual, professor in Göttingen, still famous today for his extremely numerous and witty aphorisms and satires. Among others of his time, Lichtenberg made fun of all those who maintained that the universe was made exactly to the measure of man, a frequently encountered idea in the foggy world of the anthropic principle.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

> No matter how cruel and nasty and evil you may be, every time you take a breath you make a flower happy.
>
> Mort Sahl

Historically, the two terms 'cause' and 'effect' have played an important role in philosophical discussions. In particular, during the birth of modern mechanics, it was important to point out that every effect has a cause, in order to distinguish precise thought from thought based on beliefs, such as 'miracles', 'divine surprises' or 'evolution from nothing'. It was equally essential to stress that effects are different from causes; this distinction avoids pseudo-explanations such as the famous example by Molière where the doctor explains to his patient in elaborate terms that sleeping pills work because they contain a dormitive virtue.

Ref. 765

But in physics, the concepts of cause and effect are not used at all. That miracles do not appear is expressed every time we use symmetries and conservation theorems. The observation that cause and effect differ from each other is inherent in any evolution equation. Moreover, the concepts of cause and effect are not clearly defined; for example, it is especially difficult to define what is meant by one cause as opposed to several of them, and the same for one or several effects. Both terms are impossible to quantify and to measure. In other words, useful as 'cause' and 'effect' may be in personal life for distinction between events that regularly succeed each other, they are not necessary in physics. In physical explanations, they play no special roles.

> Ἀγαθον καὶ ξαξόν · ἔν καὶ ταὐτό.*
>
> Heraclitus

> Wenn ein Arzt hinter dem Sarg seines Patienten geht, so folgt manchmal tatsächlich die Ursache der Wirkung.**
>
> Robert Koch

Is consciousness required?

> Variatio delectat.***
>
> Cicero

Ref. 766

A lot of mediocre discussions are going on about this topic, and we will skip them here. What is consciousness? Most simply and concretely, consciousness means the possession of a small part of oneself that is watching what the rest of oneself is perceiving, feeling, thinking and doing. In short, consciousness is the ability to observe oneself, and in particular one's inner mechanisms and motivations. *Consciousness* is the ability of introspection. For this reason, consciousness is *not* a prerequisite for studying motion. Indeed, animals, plants or machines are also able to observe motion. For the same reason, consciousness is not necessary to observe quantum mechanical motion. On the other hand, both the study of motion and that of oneself have a lot in common: the need to observe

* 'Good and bad – one and the same.'
** 'When a doctor walks behind the coffin of his patient, indeed the cause sometimes follows the effect.'
*** 'Change pleases.' Marcus Tullius Cicero (106–43 BCE), important lawyer, orator and politician at the end of the Roman republic.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

carefully, to overcome preconceptions, to overcome fear and the fun of doing so.

For the time being, we have put enough emphasis on the precision of concepts. Talking about motion is also something to be deeply enjoyed. Let us see why.

> Precision and clarity obey the indeterminacy relation: their product is constant.

Curiosity

> Precision is the child of curiosity.

Like the history of every person, also the history of mankind charts a long struggle to avoid the pitfalls of accepting the statements of authorities as truth, without checking the facts. Indeed, whenever curiosity leads us to formulate a question, there are always two general ways to proceed. One is to check the facts personally, the other is to ask somebody. However, the last way is dangerous: it means to give up a part of oneself. Healthy people, children whose curiosity is still alive, as well as scientists, choose the first way. After all, science is adult curiosity.

Curiosity, also called the *exploratory drive*, plays strange games with people. Starting with the original experience of the world as a big 'soup' of interacting parts, curiosity can drive one to find *all* the parts and *all* the interactions. It drives not only people. It has been observed that when rats show curious behaviour, certain brain cells in the hypothalamus get active and secrete hormones that produce positive feelings and emotions. If a rat has the possibility, via some implanted electrodes, to excite these same cells by pressing a switch, it does so voluntarily: rats get *addicted* to the feelings connected with curiosity. Like rats, humans are curious because they enjoy it. They do so in at least four ways: because they are artists, because they are fond of pleasure, because they are adventurers and because they are dreamers. Let us see how.

Ref. 767

Originally, curiosity stems from the desire to interact in a positive way with the environment. Young children provide good examples: curiosity is a natural ingredient of their life, in the same way that it is for other mammals and a few bird species; incidentally, the same taxonomic distribution is found for play behaviour. In short, all animals that play are curious, and vice versa. Curiosity provides the basis for learning, for creativity and thus for every human activity that leaves a legacy, such as art or science. The artist and art theoretician Joseph Beuys (1920–1986) had as his own guiding principle that *every* creative act is a form of art. Humans, and especially children, enjoy curiosity because they feel its importance for creativity, and for growth in general.

Ref. 768

Curiosity regularly leads one to exclaim: 'Oh!', an experience that leads to the second reason to be curious: relishing feelings of wonder and surprise. Epicurus (Epikuros) (341–271 BCE) maintained that this experience, θαυμάζειν, is the origin of philosophy. These feelings, which nowadays are variously called religious, spiritual, numinous, etc., are the same as those to which rats can become addicted. Among these feelings, Rudolf Otto has introduced the now classical distinction into the fascinating and the frightening. He named the corresponding experiences 'mysterium fascinans' and 'mysterium tremen-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

dum'.* Within these distinctions, physicists, scientists, children and connoisseurs take a clear stand: they choose the fascinans as the starting point for their actions and for their approach to the world. Such feelings of fascination induce some children who look at the night sky to dream about becoming astronomers, some who look through a microscope to become biologists or physicists, and so on. (It could also be that genetics plays a role in this pleasure of novelty seeking.) Ref. 769

Perhaps the most beautiful moments in the study of physics are those appearing after new observations have shaken our previously held thinking habits, have forced us to give up a previously held conviction, and have engendered the feeling of being lost. When, in this moment of crisis, we finally discover a more adequate and precise description of the observations, which provide a better insight into the world, we are struck by a feeling usually called illumination. Anyone who has kept alive the memory and the taste for these magic moments knows that in these situations one is pervaded by a feeling of union between oneself and the world.** The pleasure of these moments, the adventures of the change of thought structures connected with them, and the joy of insight following them provides the drive for many scientists. Little talk and lots of pleasure is their common denominator. In this spirit, the well-known Austrian physicist Victor Weisskopf (1908–2002) liked to say jokingly: 'There are two things that make life worth living: Mozart and quantum mechanics.'

The choice of moving away from the tremendum towards the fascinans stems from an innate desire, most obvious in children, to reduce uncertainty and fear. This drive is the father of all adventures. It has a well-known parallel in ancient Greece, where the first men studying observations, such as Epicurus, stated explicitly that their aim was to free people from unnecessary fear by deepening knowledge and transforming people from frightened passive victims into fascinated, active and responsible beings. Those ancient thinkers started to popularize the idea that, like the common events in our life, the rarer events also follow rules. For example, Epicurus underlined that lightning is a natural phenomenon caused by interactions between clouds, and stressed that it was a natural process, i.e., a process that followed rules, in the same way as the falling of a stone or any other familiar process of everyday life.

Investigating the phenomena around them, philosophers and later scientists succeeded in freeing people from most of their fears caused by uncertainty and a lack of knowledge about nature. This liberation played an important role in the history of human culture and still pervades in the personal history of many scientists. The aim to arrive at stable, rock-bottom truths has inspired (but also hindered) many of them; Albert Einstein is a well-known example for this, discovering relativity, helping to start up but then denying quantum mechanics.

* This distinction is the basis of Rudolf Otto, *Das Heilige – Über das Irrationale in der Idee des Göttlichen und sein Verhältnis zum Rationalen*, Beck, München, 1991. This is a new edition of the epoch-making work originally published at the beginning of the twentieth century. Rudolf Otto (1869–1937) was one of the most important theologians of his time.

** Several researchers have studied the situations leading to these magic moments in more detail, notably the Prussian physician and physicist Hermann von Helmholtz (1821–1894) and the French mathematician Henri Poincaré (1854–1912). They distinguish four stages in the conception of an idea at the basis of such a magic moment: saturation, incubation, illumination and verification. Ref. 770

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Interestingly, in the experience and in the development of every human being, curiosity, and therefore the sciences, appears *before* magic and superstition. Magic needs deceit to be effective, and superstition needs indoctrination; curiosity doesn't need either. Conflicts of curiosity with superstitions, ideologies, authorities or the rest of society are thus preprogrammed.

Curiosity is the exploration of limits. For every limit, there are two possibilities: the limit can turn out to be real or apparent. If the limit is real, the most productive attitude is that of acceptance. Approaching the limit then gives strength. If the limit is only apparent and in fact non-existent, the most productive attitude is to re-evaluate the mistaken view, extract the positive role it performed, and then cross the limit. Distinguishing between real and apparent limits is only possible when the limit is investigated with great care, openness and unintentionality. Most of all, exploring limits need courage.

> "Das gelüftete Geheimnis rächt sich.*"
>
> Bert Hellinger

Courage

> "Il est dangereux d'avoir raison dans des choses où des hommes accrédités ont tort.**"
>
> Voltaire

> "Manche suchen Sicherheit, wo Mut gefragt ist, und suchen Freiheit, wo das Richtige keine Wahl läßt.***"
>
> Bert Hellinger

Most of the material in this chapter is necessary in the adventure to get to the top of Ref. 771 Motion Mountain. But we need more. Like any enterprise, curiosity also requires courage, and complete curiosity, as aimed for in our quest, requires complete courage. In fact, it is easy to get discouraged on this trip. The journey is often dismissed by others as useless, uninteresting, childish, confusing, damaging or, most often, evil. For example, between the death of Socrates in 399 BCE and Paul Thierry, Baron d'Holbach, in the eighteenth century, no book was published with the statement 'gods do not exist', because of the threats to the life of anyone who dared to make the point. Even today, this type of attitude still abounds, as the newspapers show.

Through the constant elimination of uncertainty, both curiosity and scientific activity are implicitly opposed to any idea, person or organization that tries to avoid the comparison of statements with observations. These 'avoiders' demand to live with superstitions and beliefs. But superstitions and beliefs produce unnecessary fear. And fear is the basis of all unjust authorities. One gets into a vicious circle: avoiding comparison with observation produces fear – fear keeps unjust authority in place – unjust authority avoids

* 'The unveiled secret takes revenge.'

** 'It is dangerous to be right in matters where established men are wrong.' Voltaire writes this in his *Catalogue pour la plupart des écrivains français qui ont paru dans Le Siècle de Louis XIV, pour servir à l'histoire littéraire de ce temps* (1752).

*** 'Some look for security where courage is required and look for freedom where the right way doesn't leave any choice.' This is from the beautiful booklet by Bert Hellinger, *Verdichtetes*, Carl-Auer Systeme Verlag, 1996.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

comparison with observation – etc.

As a consequence, curiosity and science are fundamentally opposed to unjust authority, a connection that made life difficult for people such as Anaxagoras (500–428 BCE) in ancient Greece, Hypatia in the Christian Roman empire, Galileo Galilei in the church state, Antoine Lavoisier in France and Albert Einstein (and many others) in Germany. In the second half of the twentieth century, victims were Robert Oppenheimer, Melba Phillips and Chandler Davis in the United States and Andrei Sakharov in the Soviet Union. Each of them tell a horrible but instructive story, as have, more recently, Fang Lizhi, Xu Liangying, Liu Gang and Wang Juntao in China, Kim Song-Man in South Korea, Otanazar Aripov in Uzbekistan, Ramadan al-Hadi al-Hush in Libya, Bo Bo Htun in Burma, Sami Kilani and Salman Salman in Palestine, as well as many hundreds of others. In many authoritarian societies the antagonism between curiosity and injustice has hindered or even completely suppressed the development of physics and other sciences, with extremely negative economic, social and cultural consequences.

When embarking on this ascent, we need to be conscious of what we are doing. In fact, external obstacles can be avoided or at least largely reduced by keeping the project to oneself. Other difficulties still remain, this time of personal nature. Many have tried to embark on this adventure with some hidden or explicit intention, usually of an ideological nature, and then have got entangled by it before reaching the end. Some have not been prepared to accept the humility required for such an endeavour. Others were not prepared for the openness required, which can shatter deeply held beliefs. Still others were not ready to turn towards the unclear, the dark and the unknown, confronting them at every occasion.

On the other hand, the dangers are worth it. By taking curiosity as a maxim, facing disinformation and fear with all one's courage, one achieves freedom from all beliefs. In exchange, you come to savour the fullest pleasures and the deepest satisfaction that life has to offer.

We thus continue our hike. At this point, the trail towards the top of Motion Mountain is leading us towards the next adventure: discovering the origin of sizes and shapes in nature.

> "And the gods said to man: 'Take what you want, and pay the price.'"
>
> (Popular saying)

> "It is difficult to make a man miserable while he feels he is worthy of himself."
>
> Abraham Lincoln



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Appendix B

NUMBERS AND SPACES

> A mathematician is a machine that transforms coffee into theorems.
> Paul Erdős (b. 1913 Budapest, d. 1996 Warsaw)

Mathematical concepts can all be expressed in terms of 'sets' and 'relations.' any fundamental concepts were presented in the last chapter. Why does athematics, given this simple basis, grow into a passion for certain people? The following pages present a few more advanced concepts as simply* and vividly as possible, for all those who want to smell the passion for mathematics.

Ref. 772

In particular, in this appendix we shall expand the range of *algebraic* and of *topological* structures; the third basic type of mathematical structures, *order* structures, are not so important in physics.

Mathematicians are concerned not only with the exploration of concepts, but also with their *classification*. Whenever a new mathematical concept is introduced, mathematicians try to classify all the possible cases and types. This has been achieved most spectacularly for the different types of numbers, for finite simple groups, and for many types of spaces and manifolds.

NUMBERS AS MATHEMATICAL STRUCTURES

> A person who can solve $x^2 - 92y^2 = 1$ in less than a year is a mathematician.
> Brahmagupta (b. 598 Sindh, d. 668) (implied: solve in *integers*)

Challenge 1270 ny

We start with a short introduction to the vocabulary. Any mathematical system with the same basic properties as the *natural* numbers is called a *semi-ring*. Any mathematical system with the same basic properties as the *integers* is called a *ring*. (The term is due to David Hilbert. Both structures can also be finite rather than infinite.) More precisely, a *ring* $(R, +, \cdot)$ is a set R of elements with two binary operations, called *addition* and *multiplication*, usually written + and · (the latter may simply be understood without notation), for which the following properties hold for all elements $a, b, c \in R$:

* The opposite approach can have the same effect: it is taken in the delightful text by Carl E. Linderholm, *Mathematics Made Difficult*, Wolfe Publishing, 1971.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

— R is a commutative group with respect to addition, i.e.
$a+b \in R,\ a+b=b+a,\ a+0=a,\ a+(-a)=a-a=0$ and $a+(b+c)=(a+b)+c$;
— R is closed under multiplication, i.e., $ab \in R$;
— multiplication is associative, i.e., $a(bc)=(ab)c$;
— distributivity holds, i.e., $a(b+c)=ab+ac$ and $(b+c)a=ba+ca$.

Defining properties such as these are called *axioms*. Note that axioms are *not* basic beliefs, as is often stated; axioms are the basic properties used in the definition of a concept: in this case, of a ring.

A *semi-ring* is a set satisfying all the axioms of a ring, except that the existence of neutral and negative elements for addition is replaced by the weaker requirement that if $a+c=b+c$ then $a=b$.

To incorporate division and define the rational numbers, we need another concept. A *field* K is a ring with

— an identity 1, such that all elements a obey $1a=a$;
— at least one element different from zero; and most importantly
— a (multiplicative) inverse a^{-1} for every element $a \neq 0$.

A ring or field is said to be *commutative* if the multiplication is commutative. A non-commutative field is also called a *skew field*. Fields can be finite or infinite. (A field or a ring is characterized by its *characteristic* p. This is the smallest number of times one has to add 1 to itself to give zero. If there is no such number the characteristic is set to 0. p is always a prime number or zero.) All finite fields are commutative. In a field, all equations of the type $cx=b$ and $xc=b$ $(c \neq 0)$ have solutions for x; there is a unique solution if $b \neq 0$. To sum up sloppily by focusing on the most important property, a field is a set of elements for which, together with addition, subtraction and multiplication, a *division* (by non-zero elements) is also defined. The *rational numbers* are the simplest field that incorporates the integers.

The system of the *real numbers* is the minimal extension of the rationals which is complete and totally ordered.*

However, the concept of 'number' is not limited to these examples. It can be generalized in several ways. The simplest generalization is achieved by extending the real numbers to manifolds of more than one dimension. Ref. 774

* A set is mathematically *complete* if physicists call it continuous. More precisely, a set of numbers is *complete* if every non-empty subset that is bounded above has a least upper bound.

A set is *totally ordered* if there exists a binary relation $\leqslant$ between pairs of elements such that for all elements a and b

— if $a \leqslant b$ and $b \leqslant c$, then $a \leqslant c$;
— if $a \leqslant b$ and $b \leqslant a$, then $a=b$;
— $a \leqslant b$ or $b \leqslant a$ holds.

In summary, a set is totally ordered if there is a binary relation that allows to say about any two elements which one is the predecessor of the other in a consistent way.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 410 A property of triangles easily provable with complex numbers

Complex numbers

A complex number is defined by $z = a + ib$, where a and b are real numbers, and i is a new symbol. Under multiplication, the generators of the complex numbers, 1 and i, obey

·	1	i
1	1	i
i	i	−1

(513)

often summarized as $i = +\sqrt{-1}$.

The *complex conjugate* z^*, also written $\bar{z}$, of a complex number $z = a + ib$ is defined as $z^* = a - ib$. The *absolute value* $|z|$ of a complex number is defined as $|z| = \sqrt{zz^*} = \sqrt{z^*z} = \sqrt{a^2 + b^2}$. It defines a *norm* on the vector space of the complex numbers. From $|wz| = |w|\,|z|$ follows the *two-squares theorem*

$$(a_1^2 + a_2^2)(b_1^2 + b_2^2) = (a_1b_1 - a_2b_2)^2 + (a_1b_2 + a_2b_1)^2 \tag{514}$$

valid for all real numbers a_i, b_i. It was already known, in its version for integers, to Diophantus of Alexandria.

Complex numbers can also be written as ordered pairs (a, A) of real numbers, with their addition defined as $(a, A) + (b, B) = (a + b, A + B)$ and their multiplication defined as $(a, A) \cdot (b, B) = (ab - AB, aB + bA)$. This notation allows us to identify the complex numbers with the *points* on a plane or, if we prefer, to *arrows* in a plane. Translating the definition of multiplication into geometrical language allows us to rapidly prove certain geometrical theorems, such as the one of Figure 410.

Challenge 1271 e

Complex numbers $a + ib$ can also be represented as 2×2 matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ -b & a \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with} a, b \in \mathbb{R}\,. \tag{515}$$

Matrix addition and multiplication then correspond to complex addition and multiplication. In this way, complex numbers can be represented by a special type of real matrix.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1272 s What is $|z|$ in matrix language?

The set $\mathbb{C}$ of complex numbers with addition and multiplication as defined above forms both a commutative two-dimensional field and a vector space over $\mathbb{R}$. In the field of complex numbers, quadratic equations $az^2 + bz + c = 0$ for an unknown z always have two solutions (for $a \neq 0$ and counting multiplicity).

Challenge 1273 ny

Complex numbers can be used to describe the points of a plane. A rotation around the origin can be described by multiplication by a complex number of unit length. Other two-dimensional quantities can also be described with complex numbers. Electrical engineers use complex numbers to describe quantities with phases, such as alternating currents or electrical fields in space.

Writing complex numbers of unit length as $\cos\theta + i\sin\theta$ is a useful method for remembering angle addition formulae. Since one has $\cos n\theta + i\sin n\theta = (\cos\theta + i\sin\theta)^n$, one can easily deduce formulae $\cos 2\theta = \cos^2\theta - \sin^2\theta$ and $\sin 2\theta = 2\sin\theta\cos\theta$.

Challenge 1274 e

The complex exponential function is periodic in $2\pi i$; in other words, one has

$$e^1 = e^{1+2\pi i} \,. \tag{516}$$

If one uses this equation twice, one gets

$$e^1 = (e^{1+2\pi i})^{1+2\pi i} = e^{(1+2\pi i)(1+2\pi i)} = e^{1-4\pi^2+4\pi i} = e^{1-4\pi^2} \,. \tag{517}$$

Challenge 1275 e Oops, that would imply $\pi = 0$! What is wrong here?

Challenge 1276 s By the way, there are exactly as many complex numbers as there are real numbers. Can you show this?

Challenge 1277 e The unit complex numbers form the group SO(2)=U(1).

> Love is complex: it has real and imaginary parts.

Quaternions

The positions of the points on a line can be described by real numbers. Complex numbers can be used to describe the positions of the points of a plane. It is natural to try to generalize the idea of a number to higher-dimensional spaces. However, it turns out that no useful number system can be defined for *three*-dimensional space. A new number system, the *quaternions*, can be constructed which corresponds the points of *four*-dimensional space, but only if the commutativity of multiplication is sacrificed. No useful number system can be defined for dimensions other than 1, 2 and 4.

The quaternions were discovered by several mathematicians in the nineteenth century, among them Hamilton,* who studied them for much of his life. In fact, Maxwell's theory of electrodynamics was formulated in terms of quaternions before three-dimensional vectors were used.

Ref. 775

Page 888 Under multiplication, the quaternions $\mathbb{H}$ form a 4-dimensional algebra over the reals

* William Rowan Hamilton (b. 1805 Dublin, d. 1865 Dunsink), Irish child prodigy and famous mathematician, named the quaternions after an expression from the Vulgate (Acts. 12: 4).

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

with a basis 1, i, j, k satisfying

$\cdot$	1	i	j	k
1	1	i	j	k
i	i	-1	k	$-j$
j	j	$-k$	-1	i
k	k	j	$-i$	-1

. (518)

These relations are also often written $i^2 = j^2 = k^2 = -1$, $ij = -ji = k$, $jk = -kj = i$, $ki = -ik = j$. The quaternions 1, i, j, k are also called *basic units* or *generators*. The lack of symmetry across the diagonal of the table shows the non-commutativity of quaternionic multiplication. With the quaternions, the idea of a non-commutative product appeared for the first time in mathematics. However, the multiplication of quaternions *is* associative. As a consequence of non-commutativity, polynomial equations in quaternions have many more solutions than in complex numbers: just search for all solutions of the equation $X^2 + 1 = 0$ to convince yourself of it.

Challenge 1278 ny

Every quaternion X can be written in the form

$$X = x_0 + x_1 i + x_2 j + x_3 k = x_0 + \boldsymbol{v} = (x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3) = (x_0, \boldsymbol{v}) \,, \tag{519}$$

where x_0 is called the *scalar* part and $\boldsymbol{v}$ the *vector* part. The multiplication is thus defined as $(x, \boldsymbol{v})(y, \boldsymbol{w}) = (xy - \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \boldsymbol{w}, x\boldsymbol{w} + y\boldsymbol{v} + \boldsymbol{v} \times \boldsymbol{w})$. The multiplication of two general quaternions can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}(a_1, b_1, c_1, d_1)(a_2, b_2, c_2, d_2) = (&a_1a_2 - b_1b_2 - c_1c_2 - d_1d_2 \,,\; a_1b_2 + b_1a_2 + c_1d_2 - d_1c_2, \\ &a_1c_2 - b_1d_2 + c_1a_2 + d_1b_2, a_1d_2 + b_1c_2 - c_1b_2 + d_1a_2) \,.\end{aligned} \tag{520}$$

The conjugate quaternion $\overline{X}$ is defined as $\overline{X} = x_0 - \boldsymbol{v}$, so that $\overline{XY} = \overline{YX}$. The *norm* $|X|$ of a quaternion X is defined as $|X|^2 = X\overline{X} = \overline{X}X = x_0^2 + x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 = x_0^2 + \boldsymbol{v}^2$. The norm is multiplicative, i.e., $|XY| = |X|\,|Y|$.

Unlike complex numbers, every quaternion is related to its complex conjugate by

$$\overline{X} = -\tfrac{1}{2}(X + iXi + jXj + kXk) \,. \tag{521}$$

No relation of this type exists for complex numbers. In the language of physics, a complex number and its conjugate are independent variables; for quaternions, this is not the case. As a result, functions of quaternions are less useful in physics than functions of complex variables.

The relation $|XY| = |X|\,|Y|$ implies the *four-squares theorem*

$$\begin{aligned}&(a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2 + a_4^2)(b_1^2 + b_2^2 + b_3^2 + b_4^2) \\ &= (a_1b_1 - a_2b_2 - a_3b_3 - a_4b_4)^2 + (a_1b_2 + a_2b_1 + a_3b_4 - a_4b_3)^2 \\ &+(a_1b_3 + a_3b_1 + a_4b_2 - a_2b_4)^2 + (a_1b_4 + a_4b_1 + a_2b_3 - a_3b_2)^2\end{aligned} \tag{522}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 411 Combinations of rotations

valid for all real numbers a_i and b_i, and thus also for any set of eight integers. It was discovered in 1748 by Leonhard Euler (1707–1783) when trying to prove that each integer is the sum of four squares. (That fact was proved only in 1770, by Joseph Lagrange.)

Hamilton thought that a quaternion with zero scalar part, which he simply called a *vector* (a term which he invented), could be identified with an ordinary three-dimensional translation vector; but this is wrong. Such a quaternion is now called a *pure*, or *homogeneous*, or *imaginary* quaternion. The product of two pure quaternions $V = (0, \boldsymbol{v})$ and $W = (0, \boldsymbol{w})$ is given by $VW = (-\boldsymbol{v} \cdot \boldsymbol{w}, \boldsymbol{v} \times \boldsymbol{w})$, where $\cdot$ denotes the scalar product and $\times$ denotes the vector product. Note that any quaternion can be written as the ratio of two pure quaternions.

In reality, a pure quaternion $(0, \boldsymbol{v})$ does not behave like a translation vector under coordinate transformations; in fact, a pure quaternion represents a *rotation* by the angle π or 180° around the axis defined by the direction $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_x, v_y, v_z)$.

Challenge 1279 ny

It turns out that in three-dimensional space, a *general* rotation about the origin can be described by a *unit* quaternion Q, also called a *normed* quaternion, for which $|Q| = 1$. Such a quaternion can be written as $(\cos\theta/2, \boldsymbol{n}\sin\theta/2)$, where $\boldsymbol{n} = (n_x, n_y, n_z)$ is the normed vector describing the direction of the rotation axis and θ is the rotation angle. Such a unit quaternion $Q = (\cos\theta/2, \boldsymbol{n}\sin\theta/2)$ rotates a pure quaternion $V = (0, \boldsymbol{v})$ into another pure quaternion $W = (0, \boldsymbol{w})$ given by

$$W = QVQ^* \,. \tag{523}$$

Thus, if we use pure quaternions such as V or W to describe positions, we can use unit quaternions to describe rotations and to calculate coordinate changes. The concatenation of two rotations is then given by the product of the corresponding unit quaternions. Indeed, a rotation by an angle α about the axis $\boldsymbol{l}$ followed by a rotation by an angle β about the axis $\boldsymbol{m}$ gives a rotation by an angle γ about the axis $\boldsymbol{n}$, with the values determined by

$$(\cos\gamma/2, \sin\gamma/2\boldsymbol{n}) = (\cos\alpha/2, \sin\alpha/2\boldsymbol{l})(\cos\beta/2, \sin\beta/2\boldsymbol{m}) \,. \tag{524}$$

One way to show the result graphically is given in Figure 411. By drawing a triangle on a unit sphere, and taking care to remember the factor 1/2 in the angles, the combination

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 412 The top and back of the right hand, and the quaternions

of two rotations can be simply determined.

The interpretation of quaternions as rotations is also illustrated, in a somewhat different way, in the motion of any hand. To see this, take a green marker and write the letters 1, i, j and k on your hand as shown in Figure 412. Defining the three possible 180° rotation axes as shown in the figure and taking concatenation as multiplication, the motion of the right hand follows the same 'laws' as those of pure unit quaternions. (One still needs to distinguish $+i$ and $-i$, and the same for the other units, by the sense of the arm twist. And the result of a multiplication is that letter that can be read by a person facing you.) You can show that $i^2 = j^2 = k^2 = -1$, that $i^4 = 1$, and all other quaternion relations.) The model also shows that the rotation angle of the arm is half the rotation angle of the corresponding quaternion. In other words, quaternions can be used to describe the belt trick, if the multiplication VW of two quaternions is taken to mean that rotation V is performed *after* rotation W. Quaternions, like human hands, thus behave like a spin 1/2 particle. Quaternions and spinors are isomorphic.

Ref. 773 Challenge 1280 e Challenge 1281 s Page 1066

The reason for the half-angle behaviour of rotations can be specified more precisely using mathematical language. The rotations in three dimensions around a point form the 'special orthogonal group' in three dimensions, which is called SO(3). But the motions of a hand attached to a shoulder via an arm form a different group, isomorphic to the Lie group SU(2). The difference is due to the appearance of half angles in the parametrization of rotations; indeed, the above parametrizations imply that a rotation by 2π corresponds to a multiplication by -1. Only in the twentieth century was it realized that there exist fundamental physical observables that behaves like hands attached to arms: they are called *spinors*. More on spinors can be found in the section on permutation symmetry, where belts are used as an analogy as well as arms. In short, the group SU(2) of the quaternions is the *double cover* of the rotation group SO(3).

Page 901 Page 1066 Ref. 776

The simple representation of rotations and positions with quaternions is used by computer programmes in robotics, in astronomy and in flight simulation. In the software used to create three-dimensional images and animations, visualization software, quaternions are often used to calculate the path taken by repeatedly reflected light rays and thus

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

give surfaces a realistic appearance.

The algebra of the quaternions is the only associative, non-commutative, finite-dimensional normed algebra with an identity over the field of real numbers. Quaternions form a non-commutative field, i.e., a skew field, in which the inverse of a quaternion X is $\overline{X}/|X|$. We can therefore define division of quaternions (while being careful to distinguish XY^{-1} and $Y^{-1}X$). Therefore quaternions are said to form a *division algebra*. In fact, the quaternions $\mathbb{H}$, the complex numbers $\mathbb{C}$ and the reals $\mathbb{R}$ are the only three finite-dimensional associative division algebras. In other words, the skew-field of quaternions is the only finite-dimensional real associative non-commutative algebra without divisors of zero. The *centre* of the quaternions, i.e., the set of quaternions that commute with all other quaternions, is just the set of real numbers.

Quaternions can be represented as matrices of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ -B^* & A^* \end{pmatrix} \text{with } A, B \in \mathbb{C}, \quad \text{or as} \begin{pmatrix} a & b & c & d \\ -b & a & -d & c \\ -c & d & a & -b \\ -d & -c & b & a \end{pmatrix} \text{with } a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{525}$$

where $A = a + ib, B = c + id$ and the quaternion X is $X = A + Bj = a + ib + jc + kd$; matrix addition and multiplication then corresponds to quaternionic addition and multiplication.

The generators of the quaternions can be realized as

$$1 : \sigma_0 \quad , \quad i : -i\sigma_1 \quad , \quad j : -i\sigma_2 \quad , \quad k : -i\sigma_3 \tag{526}$$

where the σ_n are the Pauli spin matrices.*

Real 4×4 representations are not unique, as the alternative representation

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b & -d & -c \\ -b & a & -c & d \\ d & c & a & b \\ c & -d & -b & a \end{pmatrix} \tag{528}$$

Challenge 1282 ny shows; however, no representation by 3×3 matrices is possible.

These matrices contain real and complex elements, which pose no special problems. In contrast, when matrices with quaternionic elements are constructed, care has to be taken, because quaternionic multiplication is not commutative, so that simple relations such as $\mathrm{tr}AB = \mathrm{tr}BA$ are *not* generally valid.

* The *Pauli spin matrices* are the complex Hermitean matrices

$$\sigma_0 = \mathbf{1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad \sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad \sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{527}$$

Page 891 all of whose eigenvalues are ± 1; they satisfy the relations $[\sigma_i, \sigma_k]_+ = 2\,\delta_{ik}$ and $[\sigma_i, \sigma_k] = 2i\,\varepsilon_{ikl}\,\sigma_l$. The linear combinations $\sigma_\pm = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_1 \pm \sigma_2)$ are also frequently used. By the way, another possible representation of the quaternions is $i : i\sigma_3, j : i\sigma_2, k : i\sigma_1$.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

What can we learn from quaternions about the description of nature? First of all, we see that binary rotations are similar to positions, and thus to translations: all are represented by 3-vectors. Are rotations the basic operations of nature? Is it possible that translations are only 'shadows' of rotations? The connection between translations and rotations is investigated in the last part of our mountain ascent.

When Maxwell wrote down his equations of electrodynamics, he used quaternion notation. (The now usual 3-vector notation was introduced later by Hertz and Heaviside.) The equations can be written in various ways using quaternions. The simplest is achieved when one keeps a distinction between $\sqrt{-1}$ and the units i, j, k of the quaternions. One then can write all of electrodynamics in a single equation:

Page 706
Ref. 775
Challenge 1283 s

$$\mathrm{d}F = -\frac{Q}{\varepsilon_0} \tag{529}$$

where F is the generalized electromagnetic field and Q the generalized charge. These are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} F &= E + \sqrt{-1}\,cB \\ E &= iE_x + jE_y + kE_z \\ B &= iB_x + jB_y + kB_z \\ \mathrm{d} &= \delta + \sqrt{-1}\,\partial_t/c \\ \delta &= i\partial_x + j\partial_y + k\partial_z \\ Q &= \rho + \sqrt{-1}\,J/c \end{aligned} \tag{530}$$

where the fields E and B and the charge distributions ρ and J have the usual meanings. The content of equation 529 for the electromagnetic field is exactly the same as the usual formulation.

Despite their charm, quaternions do not seem to be ready for the reformulation of special relativity; the main reason for this is the sign in the expression for their norm. Therefore, relativity and space-time are usually described using real numbers.

Octonions

In the same way that quaternions are constructed from complex numbers, *octonions* can be constructed from quaternions. They were first investigated by Arthur Cayley (1821–1895). Under multiplication, *octonions* (or *octaves*) are the elements of an eight-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

dimensional algebra over the reals with the generators 1, i_n with $n = 1 \dots 7$ satisfying

$\cdot$	1	i_1	i_2	i_3	i_4	i_5	i_6	i_7
1	1	i_1	i_2	i_3	i_4	i_5	i_6	i_7
i_1	i_1	-1	i_3	$-i_2$	i_5	$-i_4$	i_7	$-i_6$
i_2	i_2	$-i_3$	-1	i_1	$-i_6$	i_7	i_4	$-i_5$
i_3	i_3	i_2	$-i_1$	-1	i_7	i_6	$-i_5$	$-i_4$
i_4	i_4	$-i_5$	i_6	$-i_7$	-1	i_1	$-i_2$	i_3
i_5	i_5	i_4	$-i_7$	$-i_6$	$-i_1$	-1	i_3	i_2
i_6	i_6	$-i_7$	$-i_4$	i_5	i_2	$-i_3$	-1	i_1
i_7	i_7	i_6	i_5	i_4	$-i_3$	$-i_2$	$-i_1$	-1

(531)

479 other, equivalent multiplication tables are also possible. This algebra is called the *Cayley algebra*; it has an identity and a unique division. The algebra is non-commutative, and also non-associative. It is, however, *alternative*, meaning that for all elements x and y, one has $x(xy) = x^2y$ and $(xy)y = xy^2$: a property somewhat weaker than associativity. It is the only 8-dimensional real alternative algebra without zero divisors. Because it is not associative, the set $\mathbb{O}$ of all octonions does not form a field, nor even a ring, so that the old designation of 'Cayley numbers' has been abandoned. The octonions are the most general hypercomplex 'numbers' whose norm is multiplicative. Its generators obey $(i_n i_m) i_l = \pm i_n (i_m i_l)$, where the minus sign, which shows the non-associativity, is valid for combinations of indices, such as 1-2-4, which are not quaternionic.

Octonions can be represented as matrices of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ -\bar{B} & \bar{A} \end{pmatrix} \text{where } A, B \in \mathbb{H}\,, \quad \text{or as real } 8 \times 8 \text{ matrices.} \tag{532}$$

Matrix multiplication then gives the same result as octonionic multiplication.

The relation $|wz| = |w|\,|z|$ allows one to deduce the impressive *eight-squares theorem*

$$\begin{aligned}
&(a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2 + a_4^2 + a_5^2 + a_6^2 + a_7^2 + a_8^2)(b_1^2 + b_2^2 + b_3^2 + b_4^2 + b_5^2 + b_6^2 + b_7^2 + b_8^2) \\
&\quad = (a_1b_1 - a_2b_2 - a_3b_3 - a_4b_4 - a_5b_5 - a_6b_6 - a_7b_7 - a_8b_8)^2 \\
&\quad + (a_1b_2 + a_2b_1 + a_3b_4 - a_4b_3 + a_5b_6 - a_6b_5 + a_7b_8 - a_8b_7)^2 \\
&\quad + (a_1b_3 - a_2b_4 + a_3b_1 + a_4b_2 - a_5b_7 + a_6b_8 + a_7b_5 - a_8b_6)^2 \\
&\quad + (a_1b_4 + a_2b_3 - a_3b_2 + a_4b_1 + a_5b_8 + a_6b_7 - a_7b_6 - a_8b_5)^2 \\
&\quad + (a_1b_5 - a_2b_6 + a_3b_7 - a_4b_8 + a_5b_1 + a_6b_2 - a_7b_3 + a_8b_4)^2 \\
&\quad + (a_1b_6 + a_2b_5 - a_3b_8 - a_4b_7 - a_5b_2 + a_6b_1 + a_7b_4 + a_8b_3)^2 \\
&\quad + (a_1b_7 - a_2b_8 - a_3b_5 + a_4b_6 + a_5b_3 - a_6b_4 + a_7b_1 + a_8b_2)^2 \\
&\quad + (a_1b_8 + a_2b_7 + a_3b_6 + a_4b_5 - a_5b_4 - a_6b_3 - a_7b_2 + a_8b_1)^2
\end{aligned} \tag{533}$$

valid for all real numbers a_i and b_i and thus in particular also for all integers. (There are many variations of this expression, with different possible sign combinations.) The theorem was discovered in 1818 by Carl Ferdinand Degen (1766–1825), and then redis-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

covered in 1844 by John Graves and in 1845 by Arthur Cayley. There is no generalization to higher numbers of squares, a fact proved by Adolf Hurwitz (1859–1919) in 1898.

The octonions can be used to show that a vector product can be defined in more than three dimensions. A *vector product* or *cross product* is an operation × satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} u \times v &= -v \times u \quad \textit{anticommutativity} \\ (u \times v)w &= u(v \times w) \quad \textit{exchange rule.} \end{aligned} \tag{534}$$

Using the definition

$$X \times Y = \frac{1}{2}(XY - YX) \,, \tag{535}$$

the ×-products of imaginary quaternions, i.e., of quaternions of the type $(0, \boldsymbol{u})$, are again imaginary, and correspond to the usual vector product, thus fulfilling (534). Interestingly, it is possible to use definition (535) for *octonions* as well. In that case, the product of imaginary octonions is also imaginary, and (534) is again satisfied. In fact, this is the only other non-trivial example of a vector product. Thus a vector product exists only in three and in seven dimensions.

Ref. 774

Challenge 1284 e

Other types of numbers

The process of constructing new systems of hypercomplex 'numbers' or real algebras by 'doubling' a given one can be continued ad infinitum. However, octonions, *sedenions* and all the following doublings are neither rings nor fields, but only non-associative algebras with unity. Other finite-dimensional algebras with unit element over the reals, once called hypercomplex 'numbers', can also be defined: they include the so-called 'dual numbers', 'double numbers', 'Clifford–Lifshitz numbers' etc. They play no special role in physics.

Mathematicians have also defined number fields which have 'one and a bit' dimensions, such as algebraic number fields. There is also a generalization of the concept of integers to the complex domain: the *Gaussian integers*, defined as $n + im$, where n and m are ordinary integers. Gauss even defined what are now known as *Gaussian primes*. (Can you find out how?) They are not used in the description of nature, but are important in number theory.

Ref. 777

Challenge 1285 s

Physicists used to call quantum-mechanical operators 'q-numbers.' But this term has now fallen out of fashion.

Another way in which the natural numbers can be extended is to include numbers larger infinite numbers. The most important such classes of *transfinite number* are the *ordinals*, the *cardinals* and the *surreals* (which were defined in a previous chapter). The ordinals are essentially an extension of the integers beyond infinity, whereas the surreals are a continuous extension of the reals, also beyond infinity. Loosely speaking, among the transfinites, the ordinals have a similar role as the integers have among the reals; the surreals fill in all the gaps between the ordinals, like the reals do for integers. Interestingly, many series that diverge in $\mathbb{R}$ converge in the surreals. Can you find one example?

Ref. 778

Page 830

Challenge 1286 ny

The surreals include infinitely small numbers, as do the numbers of *nonstandard analysis*, also called *hyperreals*. In both number systems, in contrast to real numbers, the

Ref. 774

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

numbers 1 and 0.999 999 9... (where an infinite, but hyperfinite string of nines is implied) do not coincide, but are separated by infinitely many other numbers.

Page 831

Grassmann numbers

With the discovery of supersymmetry, another system of numbers became important, called the *Grassmann numbers*.* They are in fact a special type of hypercomplex numbers. In supersymmetric Lagrangians, fields depend on two types of coordinates: on the usual real space-time coordinates and additionally on the Grassmann coordinates.

Grassmann numbers, also called *fermionic coordinates*, θ have the defining properties

$$\theta^2 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_i\theta_j + \theta_j\theta_i = 0 \,. \tag{536}$$

Challenge 1287 ny You may want to look for a matrix representation of these numbers.

VECTOR SPACES

Vector spaces, also called linear spaces, are mathematical generalizations of certain aspects of the intuitive three-dimensional space. A set of elements any two of which can be added together and any one of which can be multiplied by a number is called a vector space, if the result is again in the set and the usual rules of calculation hold.

More precisely, a *vector space* over a number field K is a set of elements, called *vectors*, for which a vector addition and a *scalar multiplication* is defined, such that for all vectors a, b, c and for all numbers s and r from K one has

$$\begin{aligned}
(a+b)+c = a+(b+c) = a+b+c \quad & \textit{associativity of vector addition} \\
n + a = a \quad & \textit{existence of null vector} \\
(-a) + a = n \quad & \textit{existence of negative vector} \\
1a = a \quad & \textit{regularity of scalar multiplication} \\
(s+r)(a+b) = sa + sb + ra + rb \quad & \textit{complete distributivity of scalar multiplication}
\end{aligned} \tag{537}$$

If the field K, whose elements are called *scalars* in this context, is taken to be the real (or complex, or quaternionic) numbers, one speaks of a real (or complex, or quaternionic) vector space. Vector spaces are also called *linear vector spaces* or simply *linear spaces*.

The complex numbers, the set of all real functions defined on the real line, the set of all polynomials, the set of matrices with a given number of rows and columns, all form vector spaces. In mathematics, a vector is thus a more general concept than in physics.

Challenge 1288 ny (What is the simplest possible mathematical vector space?)

In physics, the term 'vector' is reserved for elements of a more specialized type of vector space, namely normed inner product spaces. To define these, we first need the concept of a metric space.

* Hermann Günther Grassmann (1809–1877), schoolteacher in Stettin, and one of the most profound mathematical thinkers of the nineteenth century.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

A *metric space* is a set with a metric, i.e., a way to define distances between elements. A real function $d(a, b)$ between elements is called a metric if

$$\begin{aligned} d(a,b) &\geqslant 0 && \textit{positivity of metric} \\ d(a,b) + d(b,c) &\geqslant d(a,c) && \textit{triangle inequality} \\ d(a,b) = 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad a &= b && \textit{regularity of metric} \end{aligned} \tag{538}$$

A non-trivial example is the following. We define a special distance d between cities. If the two cities lie on a line going through Paris, we use the usual distance. In all other cases, we define the distance d by the shortest distance from one to the other travelling via Paris. This strange method defines a metric between all cities in France.

Challenge 1289 s

A *normed* vector space is a linear space with a norm, or 'length', associated to each a vector. A norm is a non-negative number $||a||$ defined for each vector a with the properties

$$\begin{aligned} ||ra|| &= |r|\,||a|| && \textit{linearity of norm} \\ ||a+b|| &\leqslant ||a|| + ||b|| && \textit{triangle inequality} \\ ||a|| = 0 \quad \text{only if} \quad a &= 0 && \textit{regularity} \end{aligned} \tag{539}$$

Challenge 1290 ny

Usually there are many ways to define a norm for a given space. Note that a norm can always be used to define a metric by setting

$$d(a,b) = ||a-b|| \tag{540}$$

so that all normed spaces are also metric spaces. This is the natural distance definition (in contrast to unnatural ones like that between French cities).

The norm is often defined with the help of an inner product. Indeed, the most special class of linear spaces are the *inner product spaces*. These are vector spaces with an *inner product*, also called *scalar product* $\cdot$ (not to be confused with the scalar multiplication!) which associates a number to each pair of vectors. An inner product space over $\mathbb{R}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} a \cdot b &= b \cdot a && \textit{commutativity of scalar product} \\ (ra)\cdot(sb) &= rs(a\cdot b) && \textit{bilinearity of scalar product} \\ (a+b)\cdot c &= a\cdot c + b\cdot c && \textit{left distributivity of scalar product} \\ a\cdot(b+c) &= a\cdot b + a\cdot c && \textit{right distributivity of scalar product} \\ a\cdot a &\geqslant 0 && \textit{positivity of scalar product} \\ a\cdot a = 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad a &= 0 && \textit{regularity of scalar product} \end{aligned} \tag{541}$$

for all vectors a, b, c and all scalars r, s. A *real* inner product space of finite dimension is also called a *Euclidean* vector space. The set of all velocities, the set of all positions, or the set of all possible momenta form such spaces.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

An inner product space over $\mathbb{C}$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}
a \cdot b = \overline{b \cdot a} = \overline{b} \cdot \overline{a} \quad & \textit{Hermitean property} \\
(ra) \cdot (sb) = r\overline{s}(a \cdot b) \quad & \textit{sesquilinearity of scalar product} \\
(a + b) \cdot c = a \cdot c + b \cdot d \quad & \textit{left distributivity of scalar product} \\
a \cdot (b + c) = a \cdot b + a \cdot c \quad & \textit{right distributivity of scalar product} \\
a \cdot a \geqslant 0 \quad & \textit{positivity of scalar product} \\
a \cdot a = 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad a = 0 \quad & \textit{regularity of scalar product}
\end{aligned} \tag{542}$$

for all vectors a, b, c and all scalars r, s. A *complex* inner product space (of finite dimension) is also called a *unitary* or *Hermitean* vector space. If the inner product space is *complete*, it is called, especially in the infinite-dimensional complex case, a *Hilbert space*. The space of all possible states of a quantum system forms a Hilbert space.

Page 876

All inner product spaces are also metric spaces, and thus normed spaces, if the metric is defined by

$$d(a, b) = \sqrt{(a - b) \cdot (a - b)} \,. \tag{543}$$

Only in the context of an inner product spaces we can speak about angles (or phase differences) between vectors, as we are used to in physics. Of course, like in normed spaces, inner product spaces also allows us to speak about the length of vectors and to define a *basis*, the mathematical concept necessary to define a coordinate system.

The *dimension* of a vector space is the number of linearly independent basis vectors. Can you define these terms precisely?

Challenge 1291 ny

Which vector spaces are of importance in physics?

Challenge 1292 ny

ALGEBRAS

The term *algebra* is used in mathematics with three different, but loosely related, meanings. First, it denotes a part of mathematics, as in 'I hated algebra at school'. Secondly, it denotes a set of formal rules that are obeyed by abstract objects, as in the expression 'tensor algebra'. Finally – and this is the only meaning used here – an algebra denotes a *specific* type of mathematical structure.

Intuitively, an algebra is a set of vectors with a vector multiplication defined on it. More precisely, an algebra is a vector space (over a field K) that is also a ring. (The concept is due to Benjamin Peirce (1809–1880), father of Charles Sanders Peirce.) A ring is a set for which an addition and a multiplication is defined – like the integers. Thus, in an algebra, there are (often) *three* types of multiplications:

Page 875

— scalar multiplication: the c-fold multiple of a vector x is another vector $y = cx$;
— the (main) algebraic multiplication: the product of two vectors x and y is another vector $z = xy$;

* Two inequivalent forms of the sesquilinearity axiom exist. The other is $(ra) \cdot (sb) = \overline{r}s(a \cdot b)$. The term *sesquilinear* is derived from Latin and means for 'one-and-a-half-linear'.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

— if the vector space is a inner product space, the scalar product: the scalar product of two algebra elements (vectors) x and y is a scalar $c = x \cdot y$;

A precise definition of an algebra thus only needs to define properties of the (main) multiplication and to specify the number field K. An *algebra* is defined by the following axioms

$$\begin{aligned} x(y+z) = xy + xz \quad , \quad (x+y)z = xz + yz \quad & \textit{distributivity of multiplication} \\ c(xy) = (cx)y = x(cy) \quad & \textit{bilinearity} \end{aligned} \tag{544}$$

for all vectors x, y, z and all scalars $c \in \mathrm{K}$. To stress their properties, algebras are also called *linear* algebras.

For example, the set of all linear transformations of an n-dimensional linear space (such as the translations on a plane, in space or in time) is a linear algebra, if the composition is taken as multiplication. So is the set of observables of a quantum mechanical system.*

An *associative algebra* is an algebra whose multiplication has the additional property that

$$x(yz) = (xy)z \quad \textit{associativity} \; . \tag{546}$$

Most algebras that arise in physics are associative.** Therefore, in mathematical physics, a linear associative algebra is often simply called an algebra.

The set of multiples of the unit 1 of the algebra is called the *field of scalars* scal(A) of the algebra A. The field of scalars is also a subalgebra of A. The field of scalars and the scalars themselves behave in the same way.

We explore a few examples. The set of all polynomials in one variable (or in several variables) forms an algebra. It is commutative and infinite-dimensional. The constant polynomials form the field of scalars.

Challenge 1294 e

The set of $n \times n$ matrices, with the usual operations, also forms an algebra. It is n^2-dimensional. Those diagonal matrices (matrices with all off-diagonal elements equal to zero) whose diagonal elements all have the same value form the field of scalars. How is

* *Linear transformations* are mappings from the vector space to itself, with the property that sums and scalar multiples of vectors are transformed into the corresponding sums and scalar multiples of the transformed vectors. Can you specify the set of all linear transformations of the plane? And of three-dimensional space? And of Minkowski space?

Challenge 1293 s

All linear transformations transform some special vectors, called *eigenvectors* (from the German word *eigen* meaning 'self') into multiples of themselves. In other words, if T is a transformation, e a vector, and

$$T(e) = \lambda e \tag{545}$$

where λ is a scalar, then the vector e is called an *eigenvector* of T, and λ is associated *eigenvalue*. The set of all eigenvalues of a transformation T is called the *spectrum* of T. Physicists did not pay much attention to these mathematical concepts until they discovered quantum theory. Quantum theory showed that observables are transformations in Hilbert space, because any measurement interacts with a system and thus transforms it. Quantum-mechanical experiments also showed that a measurement result for an observable must be an eigenvalue of the corresponding transformation. The state of the system after the measurement is given by the eigenvector corresponding to the measured eigenvalue. Therefore every expert on motion must know what an eigenvalue is.

Page 1028

Page 1087

** Note that a non-associative algebra does not possess a matrix representation.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1295 ny the scalar product of two matrices defined?

The set of all real-valued functions over a set also forms an algebra. Can you specify
Challenge 1296 s the multiplication? The constant functions form the field of scalars.

A *star algebra*, also written $*$-*algebra*, is an algebra over the *complex* numbers for which there is a mapping $* : A \to A,\ x \mapsto x^*$, called an *involution*, with the properties

$$\begin{aligned} (x^*)^* &= x \\ (x+y)^* &= x^* + y^* \\ (cx)^* &= \overline{c}x^* \quad \text{for all} \quad c \in \mathbb{C} \\ (xy)^* &= y^* x^* \end{aligned} \tag{547}$$

valid for all elements x, y of the algebra A. The element x^* is called the *adjoint* of x. Star algebras are the main type of algebra used in quantum mechanics, since quantum-mechanical observables form a $*$-algebra.

A C$*$-*algebra* is a Banach algebra over the complex numbers with an involution $*$ (a function that is its own inverse) such that the norm $\|x\|$ of an element x satisfies

$$\|x\|^2 = x^* x \,. \tag{548}$$

(A Banach algebra is a complete normed algebra; an algebra is *complete* if all Cauchy sequences converge.) In short, C$*$-*algebra* is a nicely behaved algebra whose elements form a continuous set and a complex vector space. The name C comes from 'continuous functions'. Indeed, the *bounded* continuous functions form such an algebra, with a properly
Challenge 1297 s defined norm. Can you find it?

Every C$*$-algebra contains a space of Hermitean elements (which have a real spectrum), a set of normal elements, a multiplicative group of unitary elements and a set of positive elements (with non-negative spectrum).

We should mention one important type of algebra used in mathematics. A *division algebra* is an algebra for which the equations $ax = b$ and $ya = b$ are uniquely solvable in x or y for all b and all $a \neq 0$. Obviously, all type of continuous numbers must be division algebras. Division algebras are thus one way to generalize the concept of a number. One of the important results of modern mathematics states that (finite-dimensional) division algebras can *only* have dimension 1, like the reals, dimension 2, like the complex numbers, dimension 4, like the quaternions, or dimension 8, like the octonions. There is thus no way to generalize the concept of (continuous) 'number' to other dimensions.

And now for some fun. Imagine a ring A which contains a number field K as a subring (or 'field of scalars'). If the ring multiplication is defined in such a way that a general ring element multiplied with an element of K is the same as the scalar multiplication, then A is a vector space, and thus an algebra – *provided* that every element of K commutes with every element of A. (In other words, the subring K must be *central*.)

For example, the quaternions $\mathbb{H}$ are a four-dimensional real division algebra, but although $\mathbb{H}$ is a two-dimensional complex vector space, it is *not* a complex algebra, because i does not commute with j (one has $ij = -ji = k$). In fact, there are no finite-dimensional complex division algebras, and the only finite-dimensional real associative division algebras are $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{C}$ and $\mathbb{H}$.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Now, if you are not afraid of getting a headache, think about this remark: every K-algebra is also an algebra over its field of scalars. For this reason, some mathematicians prefer to define an (associative) K-algebra simply as a ring which contains K as a central subfield.

In physics, it is the algebras related to symmetries which play the most important role. We study them next.

Lie algebras

A Lie algebra is special type of algebra (and thus of vector space). Lie algebras are the most important type of non-associative algebras. A vector space L over the field $\mathbb{R}$ (or $\mathbb{C}$) with an additional binary operation $[\ ,\ ]$, called *Lie multiplication* or the *commutator*, is called a real (or complex) *Lie algebra* if this operation satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} [X, Y] &= -[Y, X] && \textit{antisymmetry} \\ [aX + bY, Z] &= a[X, Z] + b[Y, Z] && \textit{(left-)linearity} \\ [X, [Y,Z]] + [Y, [Z, X]] + [Z, [X, Y]] &= 0 && \textit{Jacobi identity} \end{aligned} \tag{549}$$

for all elements $X, Y, Z \in L$ and for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ (or $\mathbb{C}$). (Lie algebras are named after Sophus Lie.) The first two conditions together imply bilinearity. A Lie algebra is called *commutative* if $[X, Y] = 0$ for all elements X and Y. The *dimension* of the Lie algebra is the dimension of the vector space. A subspace N of a Lie algebra L is called an *ideal** if $[L, N] \subset N$; any ideal is also a *subalgebra*. A *maximal ideal* M which satisfies $[L, M] = 0$ is called the *centre* of L.

Challenge 1298 e

A Lie algebra is called a *linear* Lie algebra if its elements are linear transformations of another vector space V (intuitively, if they are 'matrices'). It turns out that every finite-dimensional Lie algebra is isomorphic to a linear Lie algebra. Therefore, there is no loss of generality in picturing the elements of finite-dimensional Lie algebras as matrices.

The name 'Lie algebra' was chosen because the *generators*, i.e., the infinitesimal elements of every Lie group, form a Lie algebra. Since all important symmetries in nature form Lie groups, Lie algebras appear very frequently in physics. In mathematics, Lie algebras arise frequently because from any associative finite-dimensional algebra (in which the symbol $\cdot$ stands for its multiplication) a Lie algebra appears when we define the *commutator* by

Page 902

$$[X, Y] = X \cdot Y - Y \cdot X \ . \tag{550}$$

(This fact gave the commutator its name.) Lie algebras are non-associative in general; but the above definition of the commutator shows how to build one from an associative algebra.

Since Lie algebras are vector spaces, the elements T_i of a *basis* of the Lie algebra always obey a relation of the form:

$$[T_i, T_j] = \sum_k c_{ij}^k T_k \ . \tag{551}$$

Challenge 1299 ny

* Can you explain the notation $[L, N]$? Can you define what a maximal ideal is and prove that there is only one?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The numbers c_{ij}^k are called the *structure constants* of the Lie algebra. They depend on the choice of basis. The structure constants determine the Lie algebra completely. For example, the algebra of the Lie group SU(2), with the three generators defined by $T_a = \sigma^a/2i$, where the σ^a are the Pauli spin matrices, has the structure constants $C_{abc} = \varepsilon_{abc}$.* Page 882

Classification of Lie algebras

Finite-dimensional Lie algebras are classified as follows. Every finite-dimensional Lie algebra is the (semidirect) sum of a semisimple and a solvable Lie algebra.

A Lie algebra is called *solvable* if, well, if it is not semisimple. Solvable Lie algebras have not yet been classified completely. They are not important in physics.

A *semisimple* Lie algebra is a Lie algebra which has no non-zero solvable ideal. Other equivalent definitions are possible, depending on your taste:

— a semisimple Lie algebra does not contain non-zero Abelian ideals;
— its Killing form is non-singular, i.e., non-degenerate;
— it splits into the direct sum of non-Abelian simple ideals (this decomposition is unique);
— every finite-dimensional linear representation is completely reducible;
— the one-dimensional cohomology of g with values in an arbitrary finite-dimensional g-module is trivial.

Finite-dimensional semisimple Lie algebras have been completely classified. They decompose uniquely into a direct sum of *simple* Lie algebras. Simple Lie algebras can be complex or real.

The simple finite-dimensional *complex* Lie algebras all belong to four infinite classes and to five exceptional cases. The infinite classes are also called *classical*, and are: A_n for $n \geqslant 1$, corresponding to the Lie groups $\mathrm{SL}(n+1)$ and their compact 'cousins' $\mathrm{SU}(n+1)$; B_n for $n \geqslant 1$, corresponding to the Lie groups $\mathrm{SO}(2n+1)$; C_n for $n \geqslant 1$, corresponding to the Lie groups $\mathrm{Sp}(2n)$; and D_n for $n \geqslant 4$, corresponding to the Lie groups $\mathrm{SO}(2n)$.

---

* Like groups, Lie algebras can be represented by matrices, i.e., by linear operators. Representations of Lie algebras are important in physics because many continuous symmetry groups are Lie groups.

The *adjoint representation* of a Lie algebra with basis $a_1 \ldots a_n$ is the set of matrices $\mathrm{ad}(a)$ defined for each element a by

$$[a, a_j] = \sum_c \mathrm{ad}(a)_{cj} a_c \,. \tag{552}$$

The definition implies that $\mathrm{ad}(a_i)_{jk} = c_{ij}^k$, where c_{ij}^k are the structure constants of the Lie algebra. For a real Lie algebra, all elements of $\mathrm{ad}(a)$ are real for all $a \in L$.

Note that for any Lie algebra, a scalar product can be defined by setting

$$X \cdot Y = \mathrm{Tr}(\,\mathrm{ad}X \cdot \mathrm{ad}Y\,) \,. \tag{553}$$

This scalar product is symmetric and bilinear. (Can you show that it is independent of the representation?) The corresponding bilinear form is also called the *Killing form*, after the German mathematician Wilhelm Killing (1847–1923), the discoverer of the 'exceptional' Lie groups. The Killing form is invariant under the action of any automorphism of the Lie algebra L. In a given basis, one has

$$X \cdot Y = \mathrm{Tr}(\,(\mathrm{ad}X) \cdot (\mathrm{ad}Y)\,) = c_{lk}^i c_{si}^k x^l y^s = g_{ls} x^l y^s \tag{554}$$

where $g_{ls} = c_{lk}^i c_{si}^k$ is called the *Cartan metric tensor* of L.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Thus A_n is the algebra of all skew-Hermitean matrices; B_n and D_n are the algebras of the symmetric matrices; and C_n is the algebra of the traceless matrices.

The exceptional Lie algebras are G_2, F_4, E_6, E_7, E_8. In all cases, the index gives the number of roots. The dimensions of these algebras are $A_n : n(n+2)$; B_n and $C_n : n(2n+1)$; $D_n : n(2n-1)$; $G_2 : 14$; $F_4 : 32$; $E_6 : 78$; $E_7 : 133$; $E_8 : 248$.

The simple and finite-dimensional *real* Lie algebras are more numerous; their classification follows from that of the complex Lie algebras. Moreover, corresponding to each
Ref. 779 complex Lie group, there is always one compact real one. Real Lie algebras are not so important in fundamental physics.

The so-called superalgebras (see below) play a role in systems with supersymmetry.

Of the large number of *infinite-dimensional* Lie algebras, only few are important in physics: among them are the *Poincaré algebra*, the *Cartan algebra*, the *Virasoro algebra* and a few other Kac–Moody algebras.

Lie superalgebras

Lie superalgebras arise when the concept of Lie algebra is extended to the case of supersymmetry. A Lie superalgebra contains even and odd elements; the even elements correspond to bosons and the odd elements to fermions. Supersymmetry applies to systems with anticommuting coordinates. Lie superalgebras are a natural generalization of Lie algebras to supersymmetry, and simply add a Z_2-grading.

In detail, a *Lie superalgebra* is a Z_2-graded algebra over a field of characteristic 0 – usually $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$ – with a product $[.,.]$, called the (Lie) *superbracket* or *supercommutator*, that has the properties

$$\begin{aligned} [x, y] &= -(-1)^{|x||y|}[y, x] \\ 0 &= (-1)^{|z||x|}[x, [y, z]] + (-1)^{|x||y|}[y, [z, x]] + (-1)^{|y||z|}[z, [x, y]] \end{aligned} \tag{555}$$

where x, y and z are algebra elements that are 'pure' in the Z_2-grading. The expression $|x|$ denotes the degree of the algebra element x and is either 0 or 1. The second condition is sometimes called the 'super Jacobi identity'. Obviously, the even subalgebra of a Lie superalgebra forms a Lie algebra; in that case the superbracket becomes the usual Lie bracket.

As in the case of Lie algebras, the *simple* Lie superalgebras have been completely classified. They fall into five infinite classes and some special cases, namely

— $A(n, m)$ corresponding to the Lie supergroups $\mathrm{SL}(n+1|m+1)$ and their compact 'cousins' $\mathrm{SU}(N|M)$;
— $B(n, m)$ corresponding to the Lie supergroups $\mathrm{OSp}(2n+1|2m)$;
— $D(n, m)$ corresponding to the Lie supergroups $\mathrm{OSp}(2n|2m)$;
— $P(n)$;
— $Q(n)$;
— the exceptional cases $D_\alpha(2,1)$, $G(3)$, $F(4)$;
— and finally the Cartan superalgebras.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The Virasoro algebra

The *Virasoro algebra* is the infinite algebra of operators L_n satisfying

$$[L_m, L_n] = (m-n)L_{m+n} + \frac{c}{12}(m^3 - m)\delta_{m,-n} \tag{556}$$

where the number c, which may be zero, is called the *central charge*, and the factor 1/12 is introduced by historical convention. This rather specific algebra is important in physics because it is the algebra of conformal symmetries in *two* dimensions.* Can you find a representation in terms of infinite square matrices? Mathematically speaking, the Virasoro algebra is a special case of a Kac–Moody algebra.

Challenge 1300 ny

Kac–Moody algebras

In physics, more general symmetries than Lie groups also appear. This happens in particular when general relativity is taken into account. Because of the symmetries of space-time, the number of generators becomes infinite. The concepts of Lie algebra and of superalgebra have to be extended to take space-time symmetry into account. The corresponding algebras are the Kac–Moody algebras. ('Kac' is pronounced like 'Katz'.) *Kac–Moody algebras* are a particular class of infinite-parameter Lie algebras; thus they have an infinite number of generators. They used to be called *associated affine algebras* or *affine Lie algebras*; sometimes they are also called *Z-graded Lie algebras*. They were introduced independently in 1968 by Victor Kac and Robert Moody. We present some specific examples.

Of basic physical importance are those Kac–Moody algebras associated to a symmetry group $G \otimes C[t]$, where t is some continuous parameter. The generators $M_a^{(n)}$ of the corresponding algebra have two indices, one, a, that indexes the generators of the group G and another, n, that indexes the generators of the group of Laurent polynomials $C[t]$. The generators form a Kac–Moody algebra if they obey the relations:

$$[M_a^{(n)}, M_b^{(m)}] = C_{abc} M_c^{(n+m)} \quad \text{for} \quad n, m = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, \infty. \tag{557}$$

For example, if we take G as SU(2) with its generators $T^n = \sigma^a/2i$, σ^a being the Pauli spin matrices, then the objects

$$M_a^{(n)} = T_a \otimes t^n, \quad \text{e.g.} \quad M_3^{(n)} = \frac{1}{2i}\begin{pmatrix} t^n & 0 \\ 0 & -t^n \end{pmatrix} \tag{558}$$

form a Kac–Moody algebra with the structure constants $C_{abc} = \varepsilon_{abc}$ of SU(2).

Page 457 * Note that, in contrast, the conformal symmetry group in *four* dimensions has 15 parameters, and thus its Lie algebra is finite (15) dimensional.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 413 Which of the two situations can be untied without cutting?

TOPOLOGY – WHAT SHAPES EXIST?

> Topology is group theory.
> The Erlangen program

In a simplified view of topology that is sufficient for physicists, only one type of entity can possess shape: manifolds. *Manifolds* are generalized examples of pullovers: they are locally flat, can have holes, boundaries and can often be turned inside out.

Pullovers are subtle entities. For example, can you turn your pullover inside out while Challenge 1301 s your hands are tied together? (A friend may help you.) By the way, the same feat is also possible with your trousers, while your feet are tied together. Certain professors like to demonstrate this during topology lectures – of course with a carefully selected pair of underpants.

Another good topological puzzle, the handcuff puzzle, is shown in Figure 413. Which Challenge 1302 s of the two situations can be untied without cutting the ropes?

For a mathematician, pullovers and ropes are everyday examples of manifolds, and the operations that are performed on them are examples of deformations. Let us look at some more precise definitions.

Topological spaces

> En Australie, une mouche qui marche au plafond se trouve dans le même sens qu'une vache chez nous.
> Philippe Geluck, *La marque du chat*.

Ref. 781 The study of shapes requires a good definition of a set made of 'points'. To be able to talk about shape, these sets must be structured in such a way as to admit a useful concept of 'neighbourhood' or 'closeness' between the elements of the set. The search for the most general type of set which allows a useful definition of neighbourhood has led to the concept of topological space. The most pedagogical definition is the following, somewhat

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

different from the usual one.

A *topological space* is a finite or infinite set X of elements, called *points*, together with a neighbourhood for each point. A *neighbourhood* N of a point x is a collection of subsets Y_x of X with the properties that

— x is in N;
— if N and M are neighbourhoods, so is $N \cap M$;
— anything containing a neighbourhood of x is itself a neighbourhood of x.

The choice of the subsets is free. All the subsets Y_x, for all points x, that were chosen in the definition are then called *open sets*. (A neighbourhood and an open set are not necessarily the same; but all open sets are also neighbourhoods.)

One also calls a topological space a 'set with a topology'. In effect, a *topology* specifies the systems of 'neighbourhoods' of every point of the set. 'Topology' is also the name of the branch of mathematics that studies topological spaces.

For example, the real numbers together with the open intervals form the *usual* topology of $\mathbb{R}$. If one takes *all* subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ as open sets, one speaks of the *discrete* topology. If one takes *only* the full set X and the empty set as open sets, one speaks of the *trivial* or *indiscrete* topology.

The concept of topological space allows us to define continuity. A mapping from one topological space X to another topological space Y is *continuous* if the inverse image of every open set in Y is an open set in X. You may verify that this definition is not satisfied by a real function that makes a jump. You may also check that the term 'inverse' is necessary in the definition; otherwise a function with a jump would be continuous, as such a function may still map open sets to open sets.*

Challenge 1303 e

We thus need the concept of topological space, or of neighbourhood, if we want to express the idea that there are no jumps in nature. We also need the concept of topological space in order to be able to define limits.

– CS – more on topological spaces to be added – CS –

Of the many special kinds of topological spaces that have been studied, one type is particularly important. A *Hausdorff space* is a topological space in which for any two points x and y there are disjoint open sets U and V such that x is in U and y is in V. A Hausdorff space is thus a space where, no matter how 'close' two points are, they can always be separated by open sets. This seems like a desirable property; indeed, non-Hausdorff spaces are rather tricky mathematical objects. (At Planck energy, it seems that vacuum appears to behave like a non-Hausdorff space; however, at Planck energy, vacuum is not really a space at all. So non-Hausdorff spaces play no role in physics.) A special case of Hausdorff space is well-known: the manifold.

* The Cauchy-Weierstass definition of continuity says that a real function $f(x)$ is continuous at a point a if (1) f is defined on an open interval containing a, (2) $f(x)$ tends to a limit as x tends to a, and (3) the limit is $f(a)$. In this definition, the continuity of f is defined using the intuitive idea that the real numbers form the basic model of a set that has no gaps. Can you see the connection with the general definition given above?

Challenge 1304 ny

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 414 Examples of orientable and non-orientable manifolds of two dimensions: a disc, a Möbius strip, a sphere and a Klein bottle

Manifolds

In physics, the most important topological spaces are differential manifolds. Loosely speaking, a *differential manifold* – physicists simply speak of a *manifold* – is a set of points that looks like $\mathbb{R}^n$ under the microscope – at small distances. For example, a sphere and a torus are both two-dimensional differential manifolds, since they look locally like a plane. Not all differential manifolds are that simple, as the examples of Figure 414 show.

A differential manifold is called *connected* if any two points can be joined by a path lying in the manifold. (The term has a more general meaning in topological spaces. But the notions of connectedness and pathwise connectedness coincide for differential manifolds.) We focus on connected manifolds in the following discussion. A manifold is called *simply connected* if every loop lying in the manifold can be contracted to a point. For example, a sphere is simply connected. A connected manifold which is not simply connected is called *multiply connected*. A torus is multiply connected.

Manifolds can be *non-orientable*, as the well-known Möbius strip illustrates. Non-orientable manifolds have only one surface: they do not admit a distinction between front and back. If you want to have fun, cut a paper Möbius strip into two along a centre line. You can also try this with paper strips with different twist values, and investigate the regularities.

Challenge 1305 e

In two dimensions, closed manifolds (or surfaces), i.e., surfaces that are compact and without boundary, are always of one of three types:

— The simplest type are spheres with n attached handles; they are called *n-tori* or *surfaces of genus n*. They are orientable surfaces with Euler characteristic $2 - 2n$.
— The *projective planes* with n handles attached are non-orientable surfaces with Euler characteristic $1 - 2n$.
— The Klein bottles with n attached handles are non-orientable surfaces with Euler characteristic $-2n$.

Therefore Euler characteristic and orientability describe compact surfaces up to homeomorphism (and if surfaces are smooth, then up to diffeomorphism). Homeomorphisms are defined below.

The two-dimensional compact manifolds or surfaces with boundary are found by re-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 415 Compact (left) and noncompact (right) manifolds of various dimensions



FIGURE 416 Simply connected (left), multiply connected (centre) and disconnected (right) manifolds of one (above) and two (below) dimensions

moving one or more discs from a surface in this list. A compact surface can be embedded in $\mathbb{R}^3$ if it is orientable or if it has non-empty boundary.

In physics, the most important manifolds are space-time and Lie groups of observables. We study Lie groups below. Strangely enough, the topology of space-time is not known. For example, it is unclear whether or not it is simply connected. Obviously, the reason is that it is difficult to observe what happens at large distances form the Earth. However, a similar difficulty appears near Planck scales.

If a manifold is imagined to consist of rubber, connectedness and similar global properties are not changed when the manifold is deformed. This fact is formalized by saying

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 417 Examples of homeomorphic pairs of manifolds



FIGURE 418 The first four two-dimensional compact connected orientable manifolds: 0-, 1-, 2- and 3-tori

that two manifolds are *homeomorphic* (from the Greek words for 'same' and 'shape') if between them there is a continuous, one-to-one and onto mapping with a continuous inverse. The concept of homeomorphism is somewhat more general than that of rubber deformation, as can be seen from Figure 417.

Holes, homotopy and homology

Only 'well-behaved' manifolds play a role in physics: namely those which are orientable and connected. In addition, the manifolds associated with observables, are always compact. The main non-trivial characteristic of connected compact orientable manifolds is that they contain 'holes' (see Figure 418). It turns out that a proper description of the holes of manifolds allows us to distinguish between all different, i.e., non-homeomorphic, types of manifold.

There are three main tools to describe holes of manifolds and the relations among them: homotopy, homology and cohomology. These tools play an important role in the study of gauge groups, because any gauge group defines a manifold.

– CS – more on topology to be added – CS –

In other words, through homotopy and homology theory, mathematicians can *classify* manifolds. Given two manifolds, the properties of the holes in them thus determine whether they can be deformed into each other.

Physicists are now extending these results of standard topology. Deformation is a classical idea which assumes continuous space and time, as well as arbitrarily small action. In nature, however, quantum effects cannot be neglected. It is speculated that quantum effects can transform a physical manifold into one with a *different* topology: for example, a torus into a sphere. Can you find out how this can be achieved? Challenge 1306 d

Topological changes of physical manifolds happen via objects that are generalizations

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

of manifolds. An *orbifold* is a space that is locally modelled by $\mathbb{R}^n$ modulo a finite group. Examples are the tear-drop or the half-plane. Orbifolds were introduced by Satake Ichiro in 1956; the name was coined by William Thurston. Orbifolds are heavily studied in string theory.

TYPES AND CLASSIFICATION OF GROUPS

Page 212 We introduced groups early on because groups play an important role in many parts of physics, from the description of solids, molecules, atoms, nuclei, elementary particles and forces up to the study of shapes, cycles and patterns in growth processes.

Group theory is also one of the most important branches of modern mathematics, and is still an active area of research. One of the aims of group theory is the *classification* of all groups. This has been achieved only for a few special types. In general, one distinguishes between finite and infinite groups. Finite groups are better understood.

Every *finite* group is isomorphic to a subgroup of the symmetric group S_N, for some number N. Examples of finite groups are the crystalline groups, used to classify crystal structures, or the groups used to classify wallpaper patterns in terms of their symmetries. The symmetry groups of Platonic and many other regular solids are also finite groups.

Finite groups are a complex family. Roughly speaking, a general (finite) group can be seen as built from some fundamental bricks, which are groups themselves. These fundamental bricks are called *simple* (finite) groups. One of the high points of twentieth-century mathematics was the classification of the finite simple groups. It was a collaborative effort that took around 30 years, roughly from 1950 to 1980. The complete list of Ref. 780 finite simple groups consists of

1) the *cyclic groups* Z_p of prime group order;

2) the *alternating groups* A_n of degree n at least five;

3) the *classical linear groups*, $\mathrm{PSL}(n;q)$, $\mathrm{PSU}(n;q)$, $\mathrm{PSp}(2n;q)$ and $\mathrm{P}\Omega^{\epsilon}(n;q)$;

4) the *exceptional* or *twisted groups* of Lie type ${}^3\mathrm{D}_4(q)$, $\mathrm{E}_6(q)$, ${}^2\mathrm{E}_6(q)$, $\mathrm{E}_7(q)$, $\mathrm{E}_8(q)$, $\mathrm{F}_4(q)$, ${}^2\mathrm{F}_4(2^n)$, $\mathrm{G}_2(q)$, ${}^2\mathrm{G}_2(3^n)$ and ${}^2\mathrm{B}_2(2^n)$;

5) the 26 *sporadic groups*, namely M_{11}, M_{12}, M_{22}, M_{23}, M_{24} (the Mathieu groups), J_1, J_2, J_3, J_4 (the Janko groups), Co_1, Co_2, Co_3 (the Conway groups), HS, Mc, Suz (the Co_1 'babies'), Fi_{22}, Fi_{23}, Fi'_{24} (the Fischer groups), $\mathrm{F}_1 = \mathrm{M}$ (the Monster), F_2, F_3, F_5, He (= F_7) (the Monster 'babies'), Ru, Ly, and ON.

The classification was finished in the 1980s after over 10 000 pages of publications. The proof is so vast that a special series of books has been started to summarize and explain it. The first three families are infinite. The last family, that of the sporadic groups, is the most peculiar; it consists of those finite simple groups which do not fit into the other families. Some of these sporadic groups might have a role in particle physics: possibly even the largest of them all, the so-called *Monster* group. This is still a topic of research. (The Monster group has about $8.1 \cdot 10^{53}$ elements; more precisely, its order is 808 017 424 794 512 875 886 459 904 961 710 757 005 754 368 000 000 000 or $2^{46} \cdot 3^{20} \cdot 5^9 \cdot 7^6 \cdot 11^2 \cdot 13^3 \cdot 17 \cdot 19 \cdot 23 \cdot 29 \cdot 31 \cdot 41 \cdot 47 \cdot 59 \cdot 71$.)

Of the *infinite* groups, only those with some finiteness condition have been studied. It is only such groups that are of interest in the description of nature. Infinite groups are divided into *discrete* groups and *continuous* groups. Discrete groups are an active area of

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

mathematical research, having connections with number theory and topology. Continuous groups are divided into *finitely generated* and *infinitely generated* groups. Finitely generated groups can be finite-dimensional or infinite-dimensional.

The most important class of finitely generated continuous groups are the Lie groups.

Lie groups

In nature, the Lagrangians of the fundamental forces are invariant under gauge transformations and under continuous space-time transformations. These symmetry groups are examples of Lie groups, which are a special type of infinite continuous group. They are named after the great Norwegian mathematician Sophus Lie (1849–1899). His name is pronounced like 'Lee'.

A (real) *Lie group* is an infinite symmetry group, i.e., a group with infinitely many elements, which is also an analytic manifold. Roughly speaking, this means that the elements of the group can be seen as points on a smooth (hyper-) surface whose shape can be described by an analytic function, i.e., by a function so smooth that it can be expressed as a power series in the neighbourhood of every point where it is defined. The points of the Lie group can be multiplied according to the group multiplication. Furthermore, the coordinates of the product have to be analytic functions of the coordinates of the factors, and the coordinates of the inverse of an element have to be analytic functions of the coordinates of the element. In fact, this definition is unnecessarily strict: it can be proved that a Lie group is just a topological group whose underlying space is a finite-dimensional, locally Euclidean manifold.

A *complex Lie group* is a group whose manifold is complex and whose group operations are holomorphic (instead of analytical) functions in the coordinates.

In short, a Lie group is a well-behaved manifold in which points can be multiplied (and technicalities). For example, the circle $\boldsymbol{T} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\}$, with the usual complex multiplication, is a real Lie group. It is Abelian. This group is also called S^1, as it is the one-dimensional sphere, or U(1), which means 'unitary group of one dimension'. The other one-dimensional Lie groups are the multiplicative group of non-zero real numbers and its subgroup, the multiplicative group of positive real numbers.

So far, in physics, only *linear* Lie groups have played a role – that is, Lie groups which act as linear transformations on some vector space. (The cover of $SL(2,\mathbb{R})$ or the complex compact torus are examples of non-linear Lie groups.) The important linear Lie groups for physics are the Lie subgroups of the general linear group GL(N,K), where K is a number field. This is defined as the set of all non-singular, i.e., invertible, N×N real, complex or quaternionic matrices. All the Lie groups discussed below are of this type.

Every *complex* invertible matrix A can be written in a unique way in terms of a unitary matrix U and a Hermitean matrix H:

$$A = U e^H \,. \tag{559}$$

Challenge 1307 s (H is given by $H = \frac{1}{2} \ln A^\dagger A$, and U is given by $U = A e^{-H}$.)

– CS – more on Lie groups to be added – CS –

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The simple Lie groups U(1) and SO(2,ℝ) and the Lie groups based on the real and complex numbers are Abelian (see Table 79); all others are non-Abelian.

Lie groups are manifolds. Therefore, in a Lie group one can define the distance between two points, the tangent plane (or tangent space) at a point, and the notions of integration and differentiations. Because Lie groups are manifolds, Lie groups have the same kind of structure as the objects of Figures 414, 415 and 416. Lie groups can have any number of dimensions. Like for any manifold, their global structure contains important information; let us explore it.

Connectedness

It is not hard to see that the Lie groups SU(N) are simply connected for all $N = 2, 3 \ldots$; they have the topology of a 2N-dimensional sphere. The Lie group U(1), having the topology of the 1-dimensional sphere, or circle, is multiply connected.

The Lie groups SO(N) are *not* simply connected for any $N = 2, 3 \ldots$. In general, SO(N,K) is connected, and GL(N,ℂ) is connected. All the Lie groups SL(N,K) are connected; and SL(N,ℂ) is simply connected. The Lie groups Sp(N,K) are connected; Sp(2N,ℂ) is simply connected. Generally, all semi-simple Lie groups are connected.

The Lie groups O(N,K), SO(N,M,K) and GL(N,ℝ) are not connected; they contain two connected components.

Note that the Lorentz group is not connected: it consists of four separate pieces. Like the Poincaré group, it is not compact, and neither is any of its four pieces. Broadly speaking, the non-compactness of the group of space-time symmetries is a consequence of the non-compactness of space-time.

Compactness

A Lie group is *compact* if it is closed and bounded when seen as a manifold. For a given parametrization of the group elements, the Lie group is compact if all parameter ranges are closed and finite intervals. Otherwise, the group is called *non-compact*. Both compact and non-compact groups play a role in physics. The distinction between the two cases is important, because representations of compact groups can be constructed in the same simple way as for finite groups, whereas for non-compact groups other methods have to be used. As a result, physical observables, which always belong to a representation of a symmetry group, have different properties in the two cases: if the symmetry group is compact, observables have *discrete* spectra; otherwise they do not.

All groups of internal gauge transformations, such as U(1) and $SU(n)$, form compact groups. In fact, field theory *requires* compact Lie groups for gauge transformations. The only compact Lie groups are T^n, $O(n)$, $U(n)$, $SO(n)$ and $SU(n)$, their double cover $Spin(n)$ and the $Sp(n)$. In contrast, $SL(n,\mathbb{R})$, $GL(n,\mathbb{R})$, $GL(n,\mathbb{C})$ and all others are not compact.

Besides being manifolds, Lie groups are obviously also groups. It turns out that most of their group properties are revealed by the behaviour of the elements which are very close (as points on the manifold) to the identity.

Every element of a compact and connected Lie group has the form $\exp(A)$ for some A. The elements A arising in this way form an algebra, called the *corresponding Lie algebra*. For any linear Lie group, every element of the connected subgroup can be expressed as a

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

finite product of exponentials of elements of the corresponding Lie algebra. In short, Lie algebras express the local properties of Lie groups. That is the reason for their importance in physics.

Page 891

TABLE 79 Properties of the most important real and complex Lie groups

Lie group	Description	Properties[a]	Lie algebra	Description of Lie algebra	Dimension
1. Real groups					real
$\mathbb{R}^n$	Euclidean space with addition	Abelian, simply connected, not compact; $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$	$\mathbb{R}^n$	Abelian, thus Lie bracket is zero; not simple	n
$\mathbb{R}^\times$	non-zero real numbers with multiplication	Abelian, not connected, not compact; $\pi_0 = \mathbb{Z}_2$, no π_1	$\mathbb{R}$	Abelian, thus Lie bracket is zero	1
$\mathbb{R}^{>0}$	positive real numbers with multiplication	Abelian, simply connected, not compact; $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$	$\mathbb{R}$	Abelian, thus Lie bracket is zero	1
$S^1 = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} = U(1) = T = SO(2) = Spin(2)$	complex numbers of absolute value 1, with multiplication	Abelian, connected, not simply connected, compact; $\pi_0 = 0$, $\pi_1 = \mathbb{Z}$	$\mathbb{R}$	Abelian, thus Lie bracket is zero	1
$\mathbb{H}^\times$	non-zero quaternions with multiplication	simply connected, not compact; $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$	$\mathbb{H}$	quaternions, with Lie bracket the commutator	4
S^3	quaternions of absolute value 1, with multiplication, also known as $Sp(1)$; topologically a 3-sphere	simply connected, compact; isomorphic to $SU(2)$, $Spin(3)$ and to double cover of $SO(3)$; $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$	$Im(\mathbb{H})$	quaternions with zero real part, with Lie bracket the commutator; simple and semi-simple; isomorphic to real 3-vectors, with Lie bracket the cross product; also isomorphic to $su(2)$ and to $so(3)$	3
$GL(n, \mathbb{R})$	general linear group: invertible n-by-n real matrices	not connected, not compact; $\pi_0 = \mathbb{Z}_2$, no π_1	$M(n, \mathbb{R})$	n-by-n matrices, with Lie bracket the commutator	n^2

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Lie group	Description	Properties[a]	Lie algebra	Description of Lie algebra	Dimension
$GL^+(n,\mathbb{R})$	n-by-n real matrices with positive determinant	simply connected, not compact; $\pi_0 = 0$, for $n = 2$: $\pi_1 = \mathbb{Z}$, for $n \geq 2$: $\pi_1 = \mathbb{Z}_2$; $GL^+(1,\mathbb{R})$ isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^{>0}$	$M(n,\mathbb{R})$	n-by-n matrices, with Lie bracket the commutator	n^2
$SL(n,\mathbb{R})$	special linear group: real matrices with determinant 1	simply connected, not compact if $n > 1$; $\pi_0 = 0$, for $n = 2$: $\pi_1 = \mathbb{Z}$, for $n \geq 2$: $\pi_1 = \mathbb{Z}_2$; $SL(1,\mathbb{R})$ is a single point, $SL(2,\mathbb{R})$ is isomorphic to $SU(1,1)$ and $Sp(2,\mathbb{R})$	$sl(n,\mathbb{R})$ $= A_{n-1}$	n-by-n matrices with trace 0, with Lie bracket the commutator	$n^2 - 1$
$O(n,\mathbb{R})$ $= O(n)$	orthogonal group: real orthogonal matrices; symmetry of hypersphere	not connected, compact; $\pi_0 = \mathbb{Z}_2$, no π_1	$so(n,\mathbb{R})$	skew-symmetric n-by-n real matrices, with Lie bracket the commutator; $so(3,\mathbb{R})$ is isomorphic to $su(2)$ and to $\mathbb{R}^3$ with the cross product	$n(n-1)/2$
$SO(n,\mathbb{R})$ $= SO(n)$	special orthogonal group: real orthogonal matrices with determinant 1	connected, compact; for $n \geqslant 2$ not simply connected; $\pi_0 = 0$, for $n = 2$: $\pi_1 = \mathbb{Z}$, for $n \geq 2$: $\pi_1 = \mathbb{Z}_2$	$so(n,\mathbb{R})$ $= B_{\frac{n-1}{2}}$ or $D_{\frac{n}{2}}$	skew-symmetric n-by-n real matrices, with Lie bracket the commutator; for $n = 3$ and $n \geqslant 5$ simple and semisimple; SO(4) is semisimple but not simple	$n(n-1)/2$
$Spin(n)$	spin group; double cover of $SO(n)$; Spin(1) is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Q}_2$, Spin(2) to S^1	simply connected for $n \geqslant 3$, compact; for $n = 3$ and $n \geqslant 5$ simple and semisimple; for $n > 1$: $\pi_0 = 0$, for $n > 2$: $\pi_1 = 0$	$so(n,\mathbb{R})$	skew-symmetric n-by-n real matrices, with Lie bracket the commutator	$n(n-1)/2$
$Sp(2n,\mathbb{R})$	symplectic group: real symplectic matrices	not compact; $\pi_0 = 0$, $\pi_1 = \mathbb{Z}$	$sp(2n,\mathbb{R})$ $= C_n$	real matrices A that satisfy $JA + A^T J = 0$ where J is the standard skew-symmetric matrix;[b] simple and semisimple	$n(2n+1)$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Lie group	Description	Properties[a]	Lie algebra	Description of Lie algebra	Dimension
$\mathrm{Sp}(n)$ for $n \geqslant 3$	compact symplectic group: quaternionic $n \times n$ unitary matrices	compact, simply connected; $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$	$\mathrm{sp}(n)$	n-by-n quaternionic matrices A satisfying $A = -A^*$, with Lie bracket the commutator; simple and semisimple	$n(2n+1)$
$\mathrm{U}(n)$	unitary group: complex $n \times n$ unitary matrices	not simply connected, compact; it is *not* a complex Lie group/algebra; $\pi_0 = 0$, $\pi_1 = \mathbb{Z}$; isomorphic to S^1 for $n = 1$	$\mathrm{u}(n)$	n-by-n complex matrices A satisfying $A = -A^*$, with Lie bracket the commutator	n^2
$\mathrm{SU}(n)$	special unitary group: complex $n \times n$ unitary matrices with determinant 1	simply connected, compact; it is *not* a complex Lie group/algebra; $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$	$\mathrm{su}(n)$	n-by-n complex matrices A with trace 0 satisfying $A = -A^*$, with Lie bracket the commutator; for $n \geqslant 2$ simple and semisimple	$n^2 - 1$
2. Complex groups[c]					complex
$\mathbb{C}^n$	group operation is addition	Abelian, simply connected, not compact; $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$	$\mathbb{C}^n$	Abelian, thus Lie bracket is zero	n
$\mathbb{C}^\times$	nonzero complex numbers with multiplication	Abelian, not simply connected, not compact; $\pi_0 = 0$, $\pi_1 = \mathbb{Z}$	$\mathbb{C}$	Abelian, thus Lie bracket is zero	1
$\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{C})$	general linear group: invertible n-by-n complex matrices	simply connected, not compact; $\pi_0 = 0$, $\pi_1 = \mathbb{Z}$; for $n = 1$ isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^\times$	$\mathrm{M}(n, \mathbb{C})$	n-by-n matrices, with Lie bracket the commutator	n^2
$\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})$	special linear group: complex matrices with determinant 1	simply connected; for $n \geqslant 2$ not compact; $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$; $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Spin}(3, \mathbb{C})$ and $\mathrm{Sp}(2, \mathbb{C})$	$\mathrm{sl}(n, \mathbb{C})$	n-by-n matrices with trace 0, with Lie bracket the commutator; simple, semisimple; $\mathrm{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{su}(2, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathbb{C}$	$n^2 - 1$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Lie group	Description	Properties[a]	Lie algebra	Description of Lie algebra	Dimension
$\mathrm{PSL}(2,\mathbb{C})$	projective special linear group; isomorphic to the Möbius group, to the restricted Lorentz group $\mathrm{SO}^+(3,1,\mathbb{R})$ and to $\mathrm{SO}(3,\mathbb{C})$	not compact; $\pi_0 = 0$, $\pi_1 = \mathbb{Z}_2$	$\mathrm{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$	2-by-2 matrices with trace 0, with Lie bracket the commutator; $\mathrm{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{su}(2,\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathbb{C}$	3
$\mathrm{O}(n,\mathbb{C})$	orthogonal group: complex orthogonal matrices	not connected; for $n \geqslant 2$ not compact; $\pi_0 = \mathbb{Z}_2$, no π_1	$\mathrm{so}(n,\mathbb{C})$	skew-symmetric n-by-n complex matrices, with Lie bracket the commutator	$n(n-1)/2$
$\mathrm{SO}(n,\mathbb{C})$	special orthogonal group: complex orthogonal matrices with determinant 1	for $n \geqslant 2$ not compact; not simply connected; $\pi_0 = 0$, for $n = 2$: $\pi_1 = \mathbb{Z}$, for $n \geq 2$: $\pi_1 = \mathbb{Z}_2$; non-Abelian for $n > 2$, $\mathrm{SO}(2,\mathbb{C})$ is Abelian and isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^\times$	$\mathrm{so}(n,\mathbb{C})$	skew-symmetric n-by-n complex matrices, with Lie bracket the commutator; for $n = 3$ and $n \geqslant 5$ simple and semisimple	$n(n-1)/2$
$\mathrm{Sp}(2n,\mathbb{C})$	symplectic group: complex symplectic matrices	not compact; $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$	$\mathrm{sp}(2n,\mathbb{C})$	complex matrices that satisfy $JA + A^T J = 0$ where J is the standard skew-symmetric matrix;[b] simple and semi-simple	$n(2n+1)$

a. The *group of components* π_0 of a Lie group is given; the order of π_0 is the number of components of the Lie group. If the group is trivial (0), the Lie group is connected. The *fundamental group* π_1 of a connected Lie group is given. If the group π_1 is trivial (0), the Lie group is simply connected. This table is based on that in the Wikipedia, at en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Table_of_Lie_groups.

b. The standard skew-symmetric matrix J of rank $2n$ is $J_{kl} = \delta_{k,n+l} - \delta_{k+n,l}$.

c. Complex Lie groups and Lie algebras can be viewed as real Lie groups and real Lie algebras of twice the dimension.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

MATHEMATICAL CURIOSITIES AND FUN CHALLENGES

Mathematics is a passion in itself.

* *

Mathematics provides many counter-intuitive results. Reading a book on the topic, such as Bernard R. Gelbaum & John M.H. Olmsted, *Theorems and Counter-examples in Mathematics*, Springer, 1993, can help you sharpen your mind.

* *

The distinction between one, two and three dimensions is blurred in mathematics. This is well demonstrated in the text Hans Sagan, *Space Filling Curves*, Springer Verlag, 1994.

* *

Show that two operators A and B obey

$$e^A e^B = \exp(A + B + \frac{1}{2}[A, B] \tag{560}$$
$$+ \frac{1}{12}[[A, B], B] - \frac{1}{12}[[A, B], A] \tag{561}$$
$$- \frac{1}{48}[B, [A, [A, B]]] - \frac{1}{48}[A, [B, [A, B]]] \tag{562}$$
$$+ \dots \tag{563}$$

for most operators A and B. This result is often called the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula or BCH formula.

* *

There are at least seven ways to earn a million dollars with mathematical research. The Clay Mathematics Institute at www.claymath.org offers them for major advances in seven topics:

— proving the Birch and Swinnerton–Dyer conjecture about algebraic equations;
— proving the Poincaré conjecture about topological manifolds;
— solving the Navier–Stokes equations for fluids;
— finding criteria distinguishing P and NP numerical problems;
— proving the Riemann hypothesis stating that the nontrivial zeros of the zeta function lie on a line;
— proving the Hodge conjectures;
— proving the connection between Yang–Mills theories and a mass gap in quantum field theory.

On each of these topics, substantial progress can buy you a house.

* *

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1308 ny A theorem of topology says: you cannot comb a hairy football. Can you prove it?

> No man but a blockhead ever wrote except for money.
>
> Samuel Johnson

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Appendix C

UNITS, MEASUREMENTS AND CONSTANTS

Measurements are comparisons with standards. Standards are based on a *unit*. many different systems of units have been used throughout the world. ost standards confer power to the organization in charge of them. Such power can be misused; this is the case today, for example in the computer industry, and was so in the distant past. The solution is the same in both cases: organize an independent and global standard. For units, this happened in the eighteenth century: to avoid misuse by authoritarian institutions, to eliminate problems with differing, changing and irreproducible standards, and – this is not a joke – to simplify tax collection, a group of scientists, politicians and economists agreed on a set of units. It is called the *Système International d'Unités*, abbreviated *SI*, and is defined by an international treaty, the 'Convention du Mètre'. The units are maintained by an international organization, the 'Conférence Générale des Poids et Mesures', and its daughter organizations, the 'Commission Internationale des Poids et Mesures' and the 'Bureau International des Poids et Mesures' (BIPM), which all originated in the times just before the French revolution.

Ref. 782

All SI units are built from seven *base units*, whose official definitions, translated from French into English, are given below, together with the dates of their formulation:

- 'The *second* is the duration of 9 192 631 770 periods of the radiation corresponding to the transition between the two hyperfine levels of the ground state of the caesium 133 atom.' (1967)*
- 'The *metre* is the length of the path travelled by light in vacuum during a time interval of 1/299 792 458 of a second.' (1983)
- 'The *kilogram* is the unit of mass; it is equal to the mass of the international prototype of the kilogram.' (1901)*
- 'The *ampere* is that constant current which, if maintained in two straight parallel conductors of infinite length, of negligible circular cross-section, and placed 1 metre apart in vacuum, would produce between these conductors a force equal to $2 \cdot 10^{-7}$ newton per metre of length.' (1948)
- 'The *kelvin*, unit of thermodynamic temperature, is the fraction 1/273.16 of the thermodynamic temperature of the triple point of water.' (1967)*
- 'The *mole* is the amount of substance of a system which contains as many elementary entities as there are atoms in 0.012 kilogram of carbon 12.' (1971)*
- 'The *candela* is the luminous intensity, in a given direction, of a source that emits monochromatic radiation of frequency $540 \cdot 10^{12}$ hertz and has a radiant intensity in that

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

direction of (1/683) watt per steradian.' (1979)*

Note that both time and length units are defined as certain properties of a standard example of motion, namely light. This is an additional example making the point that the observation of motion as the fundamental type of change is a *prerequisite* for the definition and construction of time and space. By the way, the use of light in the definitions had been proposed already in 1827 by Jacques Babinet.*

From these basic units, all other units are defined by multiplication and division. Thus, all SI units have the following properties:

- SI units form a system with *state-of-the-art precision*: all units are defined with a precision that is higher than the precision of commonly used measurements. Moreover, the precision of the definitions is regularly being improved. The present relative uncertainty of the definition of the second is around 10^{-14}, for the metre about 10^{-10}, for the kilogram about 10^{-9}, for the ampere 10^{-7}, for the mole less than 10^{-6}, for the kelvin 10^{-6} and for the candela 10^{-3}.
- SI units form an *absolute* system: all units are defined in such a way that they can be reproduced in every suitably equipped laboratory, independently, and with high precision. This avoids as much as possible any misuse by the standard-setting organization. (The kilogram, still defined with help of an artefact, is the last exception to this requirement; extensive research is under way to eliminate this artefact from the definition – an international race that will take a few more years. There are two approaches: counting particles, or fixing $\hbar$. The former can be achieved in crystals, the latter using any formula where $\hbar$ appears, such as the formula for the de Broglie wavelength or that of the Josephson effect.)
- SI units form a *practical* system: the base units are quantities of everyday magnitude. Frequently used units have standard names and abbreviations. The complete list includes the seven base units, the supplementary units, the derived units and the admitted units.

The *supplementary* SI units are two: the unit for (plane) angle, defined as the ratio of arc length to radius, is the *radian* (rad). For solid angle, defined as the ratio of the subtended area to the square of the radius, the unit is the *steradian* (sr).

The *derived* units with special names, in their official English spelling, i.e., without capital letters and accents, are:

* The respective symbols are s, m, kg, A, K, mol and cd. The international prototype of the kilogram is a platinum–iridium cylinder kept at the BIPM in Sèvres, in France. For more details on the levels of the caesium atom, consult a book on atomic physics. The Celsius scale of temperature θ is defined as: $\theta/°C = T/K - 273.15$; note the small difference with the number appearing in the definition of the kelvin. SI also states: 'When the mole is used, the elementary entities must be specified and may be atoms, molecules, ions, electrons, other particles, or specified groups of such particles.' In the definition of the mole, it is understood that the carbon 12 atoms are unbound, at rest and in their ground state. In the definition of the candela, the frequency of the light corresponds to 555.5 nm, i.e., green colour, around the wavelength to which the eye is most sensitive.

Ref. 783

* Jacques Babinet (1794–1874), French physicist who published important work in optics.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Name	Abbreviation	Name	Abbreviation
hertz	$Hz = 1/s$	newton	$N = kg\,m/s^2$
pascal	$Pa = N/m^2 = kg/m\,s^2$	joule	$J = Nm = kg\,m^2/s^2$
watt	$W = kg\,m^2/s^3$	coulomb	$C = As$
volt	$V = kg\,m^2/As^3$	farad	$F = As/V = A^2s^4/kg\,m^2$
ohm	$\Omega = V/A = kg\,m^2/A^2s^3$	siemens	$S = 1/\Omega$
weber	$Wb = Vs = kg\,m^2/As^2$	tesla	$T = Wb/m^2 = kg/As^2 = kg/Cs$
henry	$H = Vs/A = kg\,m^2/A^2s^2$	degree Celsius	°C (see definition of kelvin)
lumen	$lm = cd\,sr$	lux	$lx = lm/m^2 = cd\,sr/m^2$
becquerel	$Bq = 1/s$	gray	$Gy = J/kg = m^2/s^2$
sievert	$Sv = J/kg = m^2/s^2$	katal	$kat = mol/s$

We note that in all definitions of units, the kilogram only appears to the powers of 1, 0 and -1. The final explanation for this fact appeared only recently. Can you try to formulate the reason?

Challenge 1309 ny

The *admitted* non-SI units are *minute*, *hour*, *day* (for time), *degree* $1° = \pi/180\,rad$, *minute* $1' = \pi/10\,800\,rad$, *second* $1'' = \pi/648\,000\,rad$ (for angles), *litre* and *tonne*. All other units are to be avoided.

All SI units are made more practical by the introduction of standard names and abbreviations for the powers of ten, the so-called *prefixes*:*

Power	Name		Power	Name		Power	Name		Power	Name	
10^1	deca	da	10^{-1}	deci	d	10^{18}	Exa	E	10^{-18}	atto	a
10^2	hecto	h	10^{-2}	centi	c	10^{21}	Zetta	Z	10^{-21}	zepto	z
10^3	kilo	k	10^{-3}	milli	m	10^{24}	Yotta	Y	10^{-24}	yocto	y
10^6	Mega	M	10^{-6}	micro	μ	unofficial:			Ref. 784		
10^9	Giga	G	10^{-9}	nano	n	10^{27}	Xenta	X	10^{-27}	xenno	x
10^{12}	Tera	T	10^{-12}	pico	p	10^{30}	Wekta	W	10^{-30}	weko	w
10^{15}	Peta	P	10^{-15}	femto	f	10^{33}	Vendekta	V	10^{-33}	vendeko	v
						10^{36}	Udekta	U	10^{-36}	udeko	u

▪ SI units form a *complete* system: they cover in a systematic way the complete set of observables of physics. Moreover, they fix the units of measurement for all other sciences

* Some of these names are invented (yocto to sound similar to Latin *octo* 'eight', zepto to sound similar to Latin *septem*, yotta and zetta to resemble them, exa and peta to sound like the Greek words ἑξάκις and πεντάκις for 'six times' and 'five times', the unofficial ones to sound similar to the Greek words for nine, ten, eleven and twelve); some are from Danish/Norwegian (atto from *atten* 'eighteen', femto from *femten* 'fifteen'); some are from Latin (from *mille* 'thousand', from *centum* 'hundred', from *decem* 'ten', from *nanus* 'dwarf'); some are from Italian (from *piccolo* 'small'); some are Greek (micro is from μικρός 'small', deca/deka from δέκα 'ten', hecto from ἑκατόν 'hundred', kilo from χίλιοι 'thousand', mega from μέγας 'large', giga from γίγας 'giant', tera from τέρας 'monster').

check the greek
check the greek

Translate: I was caught in such a traffic jam that I needed a microcentury for a picoparsec and that my car's fuel consumption was two tenths of a square millimetre.

Challenge 1310 e

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

as well.

- SI units form a *universal* system: they can be used in trade, in industry, in commerce, at home, in education and in research. They could even be used by extraterrestrial civilizations, if they existed.
- SI units form a *coherent* system: the product or quotient of two SI units is also an SI unit. This means that in principle, the same abbreviation, e.g. 'SI', could be used for every unit.

The SI units are not the only possible set that could fulfil all these requirements, but they are the only existing system that does so.*

Remember that since every measurement is a comparison with a standard, any measurement requires matter to realize the standard (yes, even for the speed standard), and radiation to achieve the comparison. The concept of measurement thus assumes that matter and radiation exist and can be clearly separated from each other.

Page 1490

Planck's natural units

Since the exact form of many equations depends on the system of units used, theoretical physicists often use unit systems optimized for producing simple equations. The chosen units and the values of the constants of nature are related. In microscopic physics, the system of *Planck's natural units* is frequently used. They are defined by setting $c = 1$, $\hbar = 1$, $G = 1$, $k = 1$, $\varepsilon_0 = 1/4\pi$ and $\mu_0 = 4\pi$. Planck units are thus defined from combinations of fundamental constants; those corresponding to the fundamental SI units are given in Table 81.** The table is also useful for converting equations written in natural units back to SI units: just substitute every quantity X by X/X_{Pl}.

Challenge 1311 e

TABLE 81 Planck's (uncorrected) natural units

Name	Definition				Value
Basic units					
the Planck length	l_{Pl}	=	$\sqrt{\hbar G/c^3}$	=	$1.616\,0(12) \cdot 10^{-35}$ m
the Planck time	t_{Pl}	=	$\sqrt{\hbar G/c^5}$	=	$5.390\,6(40) \cdot 10^{-44}$ s
the Planck mass	m_{Pl}	=	$\sqrt{\hbar c/G}$	=	21.767(16) µg
the Planck current	I_{Pl}	=	$\sqrt{4\pi\varepsilon_0 c^6/G}$	=	$3.479\,3(22) \cdot 10^{25}$ A
the Planck temperature	T_{Pl}	=	$\sqrt{\hbar c^5/Gk^2}$	=	$1.417\,1(91) \cdot 10^{32}$ K

* Most non-SI units still in use in the world are of Roman origin. The mile comes from *milia passum*, which used to be one thousand (double) strides of about 1480 mm each; today a nautical mile, once defined as minute of arc on the Earth's surface, is exactly 1852 m). The inch comes from *uncia*/*onzia* (a twelfth – now of a foot). The pound (from *pondere* 'to weigh') is used as a translation of *libra* – balance – which is the origin of its abbreviation lb. Even the habit of counting in dozens instead of tens is Roman in origin. These and all other similarly funny units – like the system in which all units start with 'f', and which uses furlong/fortnight as its unit of velocity – are now officially defined as multiples of SI units.

** The natural units x_{Pl} given here are those commonly used today, i.e., those defined using the constant $\hbar$, and not, as Planck originally did, by using the constant $h = 2\pi\hbar$. The electromagnetic units can also be defined with other factors than $4\pi\varepsilon_0$ in the expressions: for example, using $4\pi\varepsilon_0\alpha$, with the *fine structure constant* α, gives $q_{\mathrm{Pl}} = e$. For the explanation of the numbers between brackets, the standard deviations, see page 920.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

NAME	DEFINITION				VALUE
Trivial units					
the Planck velocity	v_{Pl}	=	c	=	0.3 Gm/s
the Planck angular momentum	L_{Pl}	=	$\hbar$	=	$1.1 \cdot 10^{-34}$ Js
the Planck action	S_{aPl}	=	$\hbar$	=	$1.1 \cdot 10^{-34}$ Js
the Planck entropy	S_{ePl}	=	k	=	13.8 yJ/K
Composed units					
the Planck mass density	ρ_{Pl}	=	$c^5/G^2\hbar$	=	$5.2 \cdot 10^{96}$ kg/m^3
the Planck energy	E_{Pl}	=	$\sqrt{\hbar c^5/G}$	=	2.0 GJ = $1.2 \cdot 10^{28}$ eV
the Planck momentum	p_{Pl}	=	$\sqrt{\hbar c^3/G}$	=	6.5 Ns
the Planck power	P_{Pl}	=	c^5/G	=	$3.6 \cdot 10^{52}$ W
the Planck force	F_{Pl}	=	c^4/G	=	$1.2 \cdot 10^{44}$ N
the Planck pressure	p_{Pl}	=	$c^7/G\hbar$	=	$4.6 \cdot 10^{113}$ Pa
the Planck acceleration	a_{Pl}	=	$\sqrt{c^7/\hbar G}$	=	$5.6 \cdot 10^{51}$ m/s^2
the Planck frequency	f_{Pl}	=	$\sqrt{c^5/\hbar G}$	=	$1.9 \cdot 10^{43}$ Hz
the Planck electric charge	q_{Pl}	=	$\sqrt{4\pi\varepsilon_0 c\hbar}$	=	1.9 aC = 11.7 e
the Planck voltage	U_{Pl}	=	$\sqrt{c^4/4\pi\varepsilon_0 G}$	=	$1.0 \cdot 10^{27}$ V
the Planck resistance	R_{Pl}	=	$1/4\pi\varepsilon_0 c$	=	30.0 Ω
the Planck capacitance	C_{Pl}	=	$4\pi\varepsilon_0\sqrt{\hbar G/c^3}$	=	$1.8 \cdot 10^{-45}$ F
the Planck inductance	L_{Pl}	=	$(1/4\pi\varepsilon_0)\sqrt{\hbar G/c^7}$	=	$1.6 \cdot 10^{-42}$ H
the Planck electric field	E_{Pl}	=	$\sqrt{c^7/4\pi\varepsilon_0\hbar G^2}$	=	$6.5 \cdot 10^{61}$ V/m
the Planck magnetic flux density	B_{Pl}	=	$\sqrt{c^5/4\pi\varepsilon_0\hbar G^2}$	=	$2.2 \cdot 10^{53}$ T

The natural units are important for another reason: whenever a quantity is sloppily called 'infinitely small (or large)', the correct expression is 'as small (or as large) as the corresponding corrected Planck unit'. As explained throughout the text, and especially in the final part, this substitution is possible because almost all Planck units provide, within a correction factor of order 1, the extremal value for the corresponding observable – some an upper and some a lower limit. Unfortunately, these correction factors are not yet widely known. The exact extremal value for each observable in nature is obtained when G is substituted by $4G$, $\hbar$ by $\hbar/2$, k by $k/2$ and $4\pi\varepsilon_0$ by $8\pi\varepsilon_0\alpha$ in all Planck quantities. These extremal values, or *corrected Planck units*, are the *true natural units*. To exceed the extremal values is possible only for some extensive quantities. (Can you find out which ones?)

Page 1466

Challenge 1312 s

OTHER UNIT SYSTEMS

A central aim of research in high-energy physics is the calculation of the strengths of all interactions; therefore it is not practical to set the gravitational constant G to unity, as in the Planck system of units. For this reason, high-energy physicists often only set

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

$c = \hbar = k = 1$ and $\mu_0 = 1/\varepsilon_0 = 4\pi$,* leaving only the gravitational constant G in the equations.

In this system, only one fundamental unit exists, but its choice is free. Often a standard length is chosen as the fundamental unit, length being the archetype of a measured quantity. The most important physical observables are then related by

$$\begin{aligned} 1/[l^2] = [E]^2 &= [F] = [B] = [E_{\text{electric}}]\,, \\ 1/[l] = [E] &= [m] = [p] = [a] = [f] = [I] = [U] = [T]\,, \\ 1 &= [v] = [q] = [e] = [R] = [S_{\text{action}}] = [S_{\text{entropy}}] = \hbar = c = k = [\alpha]\,, \\ [l] = 1/[E] &= [t] = [C] = [L] \quad \text{and} \\ [l]^2 = 1/[E]^2 &= [G] = [P] \end{aligned} \tag{564}$$

where we write $[x]$ for the unit of quantity x. Using the same unit for time, capacitance and inductance is not to everybody's taste, however, and therefore electricians do not use this system.**

Often, in order to get an impression of the energies needed to observe an effect under study, a standard energy is chosen as fundamental unit. In particle physics the most common energy unit is the *electronvolt* (eV), defined as the kinetic energy acquired by an electron when accelerated by an electrical potential difference of 1 volt ('protonvolt' would be a better name). Therefore one has $1\,\text{eV} = 1.6 \cdot 10^{-19}\,\text{J}$, or roughly

$$1\,\text{eV} \approx \tfrac{1}{6}\,\text{aJ} \tag{565}$$

which is easily remembered. The simplification $c = \hbar = 1$ yields $G = 6.9 \cdot 10^{-57}\,\text{eV}^{-2}$ and allows one to use the unit eV also for mass, momentum, temperature, frequency, time and length, with the respective correspondences $1\,\text{eV} \equiv 1.8 \cdot 10^{-36}\,\text{kg} \equiv 5.4 \cdot 10^{-28}\,\text{Ns} \equiv 242\,\text{THz} \equiv 11.6\,\text{kK}$ and $1\,\text{eV}^{-1} \equiv 4.1\,\text{fs} \equiv 1.2\,\mu\text{m}$.

Challenge 1314 e

To get some feeling for the unit eV, the following relations are useful. Room temperature, usually taken as 20 °C or 293 K, corresponds to a kinetic energy per particle of 0.025 eV or 4.0 zJ. The highest particle energy measured so far belongs to a cosmic ray with an energy of $3 \cdot 10^{20}$ eV or 48 J. Down here on the Earth, an accelerator able to produce an energy of about 105 GeV or 17 nJ for electrons and antielectrons has been built,

Ref. 787

---

* Other definitions for the proportionality constants in electrodynamics lead to the Gaussian unit system often used in theoretical calculations, the Heaviside–Lorentz unit system, the electrostatic unit system, and the electromagnetic unit system, among others.

Ref. 785

** In the list, l is length, E energy, F force, E_{electric} the electric and B the magnetic field, m mass, p momentum, a acceleration, f frequency, I electric current, U voltage, T temperature, v speed, q charge, R resistance, P power, G the gravitational constant.

The web page www.chemie.fu-berlin.de/chemistry/general/units_en.html provides a tool to convert various units into each other.

Researchers in general relativity often use another system, in which the *Schwarzschild radius* $r_S = 2Gm/c^2$ is used to measure masses, by setting $c = G = 1$. In this case, mass and length have the *same* dimension, and $\hbar$ has the dimension of an area.

Ref. 786

Already in the nineteenth century, George Stoney had proposed to use as length, time and mass units the quantities $l_S = \sqrt{Ge^2/(c^4 4\pi\varepsilon_0)} = 1.4 \cdot 10^{-36}\,\text{m}$, $t_S = \sqrt{Ge^2/(c^6 4\pi\varepsilon_0)} = 4.6 \cdot 10^{-45}\,\text{s}$ and $m_S = \sqrt{e^2/(G4\pi\varepsilon_0)} = 1.9\,\mu\text{g}$. How are these units related to the Planck units?

Challenge 1313 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 82 Some measured visible power (luminous intensity) values

OBSERVATION	LUMINOUS INTENSITY
Candle flame	1 cd
Pocket lamp	2 cd
Parking light of car	10 cd
Full beam of car (with reflector, centre of beam)	60 cd
Cinema lamp	1.5 kcd
Photographic flash	1 Mcd
Lighthouse	2 Mcd
Largest searchlights	80 Mcd

and one able to produce an energy of 10 TeV or 1.6 μJ for protons will be finished soon. Both are owned by CERN in Geneva and have a circumference of 27 km.

The lowest temperature measured up to now is 280 pK, in a system of rhodium nuclei held inside a special cooling system. The interior of that cryostat may even be the coolest point in the whole universe. The kinetic energy per particle corresponding to that temperature is also the smallest ever measured: it corresponds to 24 feV or 3.8 vJ = $3.8 \cdot 10^{-33}$ J. For isolated particles, the record seems to be for neutrons: kinetic energies as low as 10^{-7} eV have been achieved, corresponding to de Broglie wavelengths of 60 nm.

Ref. 788

CURIOSITIES AND FUN CHALLENGES ABOUT UNITS

Not using SI units can be expensive. In 1999, NASA lost a satellite on Mars because some software programmers had used imperial units instead of SI units in part of the code. As a result, the Mars Climate Orbiter crashed into the planet, instead of orbiting it; the loss was around 100 million euro.*

* *

A *gray* is the amount of radioactivity that deposits 1 J on 1 kg of matter. A *sievert* is the unit of radioactivity adjusted to humans by weighting each type of human tissue with a factor representing the impact of radiation deposition on it. Four to five sievert are a lethal dose to humans. In comparison, the natural radioactivity present inside human bodies leads to a dose of 0.2 mSv per year. An average X-ray image implies an irradiation of 1 mSv; a CAT scan 8 mSv.

Ref. 789

* *

Are you confused by the candela? The definition simply says that 683 cd = 683 lm/sr corresponds to 1 W/sr. The candela is thus a unit for light power per (solid) angle, or *luminous intensity*, except that it is corrected for the eye's sensitivity: the candela measures only *visible* power per angle.

* This story revived an old (and false) urban legend that states that only three countries in the world do not use SI units: Liberia, the USA and Myanmar.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 83 Some measured illuminance values

OBSERVATION	ILLUMINANCE
Faint star	0.1 nlx
Sirius	10 µlx
phot (old illuminance unit)	10 µlx
Jupiter	20 µlx
Full moon	0.01 to 0.24 lx
Street at night, low traffic, poor lighting	0.1 to 3 lx
Street at night, high traffic	10 to 30 lx
For reading	50 to 100 lx
Cinema screen	100 lx
Workplace	0.2 to 5 klx
Cloudy day	1 klx
Sunny day	120 klx
Film in cinema projector	5 Mlx
Painful to the eye	100 Mlx

Similarly, 683 lm = 683 cd sr corresponds to 1 W. So both the lumen and the watt measure power, or energy flux, but the lumen measures only the *visible* part of the power or energy flux. This difference is expressed by inserting 'radiant' or 'luminous': thus, the Watt measures *radiant* flux, whereas the lumen measures *luminous* flux.

The factor 683 is historical. An ordinary candle emits a luminous intensity of about a candela. Therefore, at night, a candle can be seen up to a distance of 10 or 20 kilometres. A 100 W incandescent light bulb produces 1700 lm, and the brightest light emitting diodes about 5 lm. Cinema projectors produce around 2 Mlm, and the brightest flashes, like lightning, 100 Mlm.

Challenge 1315 e

The *irradiance* of sunlight is about 1300 W/m^2 on a sunny day; on the other hand, the *illuminance* is only 120 klm/m^2 = 120 klux or 170 W/m^2. (A cloud-covered summer day or a clear winter day produces about 10 klux. Illuminance is essentially what we call 'brightness' in everyday life.) These numbers show that most of the energy from the Sun that reaches the Earth is outside the visible spectrum.

On a glacier, near the sea shore, on the top of a mountain, or in particular weather condition the brightness can reach 150 klux. The brightest lamps, those used during surgical operations, produce 120 klux. Humans need about 30 lux for comfortable reading. Museums are often kept dark because water-based paintings are degraded by light above 100 lux, and oil paintings by light above 200 lux. The full moon produces 0.1 lux, and the sky on a dark moonless night about 1 mlux. The eyes lose their ability to distinguish colours somewhere between 0.1 lux and 0.01 lux; the eye stops to work below 1 nlux. Technical devices to produce images in the dark, such as night goggles, start to work at 1 µlux. By the way, the human body itself *shines* with about 1 plux, a value too small to be detected with the eye, but easily measured with specialized apparatus. The origin of this emission is still a topic of research.

Ref. 790

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

The highest achieved light intensities are in excess of $10^{18}\,W/m^2$, more than 15 orders of magnitude higher than the intensity of sunlight. They are produced by tight focusing of pulsed lasers. The electric field in such light pulses is of the same order as the field inside
Ref. 791 atoms; such a beam therefore ionizes all matter it encounters.

* *

The *luminous density* is a quantity often used by light technicians. Its unit is $1\,cd/m^2$, unofficially called 1 Nit and abbreviated 1 nt. Eyes see purely with rods from $0.1\,\mu cd/m^2$ to $1\,mcd/m^2$; they see purely with cones above $5\,cd/m^2$; they see best between 100 and $50\,000\,cd/m^2$; and they get completely overloaded above $10\,Mcd/m^2$: a total range of 15 orders of magnitude.

* *

The Planck length is roughly the de Broglie wavelength $\lambda_B = h/mv$ of a man walking
Ref. 792 comfortably ($m = 80\,kg$, $v = 0.5\,m/s$); this motion is therefore aptly called the 'Planck stroll.'

* *

The Planck mass is equal to the mass of about 10^{19} protons. This is roughly the mass of a human embryo at about ten days of age.

* *

The second does not correspond to 1/86 400th of the day any more, though it did in the year 1900; the Earth now takes about 86 400.002 s for a rotation, so that the *International Earth Rotation Service* must regularly introduce a leap second to ensure that the Sun is at the highest point in the sky at 12 o'clock sharp.* The time so defined is called *Universal Time Coordinate*. The speed of rotation of the Earth also changes irregularly from day to day due to the weather; the average rotation speed even changes from winter to summer because of the changes in the polar ice caps; and in addition that average decreases over time, because of the friction produced by the tides. The rate of insertion of leap seconds is therefore higher than once every 500 days, and not constant in time.

* *

The most precisely measured quantities in nature are the frequencies of certain millisecond pulsars,** the frequency of certain narrow atomic transitions, and the Rydberg constant of *atomic* hydrogen, which can all be measured as precisely as the second is defined. The caesium transition that defines the second has a finite linewidth that limits the achievable precision: the limit is about 14 digits.

* *

The most precise clock ever built, using microwaves, had a stability of 10^{-16} during a

* Their website at hpiers.obspm.fr gives more information on the details of these insertions, as does maia.usno.navy.mil, one of the few useful military websites. See also www.bipm.fr, the site of the BIPM.

** An overview of this fascinating work is given by J. H. TAYLOR, Pulsar timing and relativistic gravity, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, London A* **341**, pp. 117–134, 1992.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Ref. 793 Ref. 794 running time of 500 s. For longer time periods, the record in 1997 was about 10^{-15}; but values around 10^{-17} seem within technological reach. The precision of clocks is limited for short measuring times by noise, and for long measuring times by drifts, i.e., by systematic effects. The region of highest stability depends on the clock type; it usually lies between 1 ms for optical clocks and 5000 s for masers. Pulsars are the only type of clock for which this region is not known yet; it certainly lies at more than 20 years, the time elapsed at the time of writing since their discovery.

* *

Ref. 795 The shortest times measured are the lifetimes of certain 'elementary' particles. In particular, the lifetime of certain D mesons have been measured at less than 10^{-23} s. Such times are measured using a bubble chamber, where the track is photographed. Can you estimate how long the track is? (This is a trick question – if your length cannot be observed with an optical microscope, you have made a mistake in your calculation.) Challenge 1316 s

* *

The longest times encountered in nature are the lifetimes of certain radioisotopes, over 10^{15} years, and the lower limit of certain proton decays, over 10^{32} years. These times are thus much larger than the age of the universe, estimated to be fourteen thousand million years. Ref. 796

* *

The least precisely measured of the fundamental constants of physics are the gravitational constant G and the strong coupling constant α_s. Even less precisely known are the age of the universe and its density (see Table 86). Page 923

* *

The precision of mass measurements of solids is limited by such simple effects as the adsorption of water. Can you estimate the mass of a monolayer of water – a layer with thickness of one molecule – on a metal weight of 1 kg? Challenge 1317 s

* *

Variations of quantities are often much easier to measure than their values. For example, in gravitational wave detectors, the sensitivity achieved in 1992 was $\Delta l/l = 3 \cdot 10^{-19}$ for lengths of the order of 1 m. In other words, for a block of about a cubic metre of metal it is possible to measure length changes about 3000 times smaller than a proton radius. These set-ups are now being superseded by ring interferometers. Ring interferometers measuring frequency differences of 10^{-21} have already been built; and they are still being improved. Ref. 797 Ref. 798

* *

The Swedish astronomer Anders Celsius (1701–1744) originally set the freezing point of water at 100 degrees and the boiling point at 0 degrees. Later the scale was reversed. However, this is not the whole story. With the official definition of the kelvin and the degree Celsius, at the standard pressure of 1013.25 Pa, water boils at 99.974 °C. Can you explain why it is not 100 °C any more? Ref. 799 Challenge 1318 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

In the previous millennium, thermal energy used to be measured using the unit *calorie*, written as cal. 1 cal is the energy needed to heat 1 g of water by 1 K. To confuse matters, 1 kcal was often written 1 Cal. (One also spoke of a large and a small calorie.) The value of 1 kcal is 4.1868 kJ.

* *

SI units are adapted to humans: the values of heartbeat, human size, human weight, human temperature and human substance are no more than a couple of orders of magnitude near the unit value. SI units thus (roughly) confirm what Protagoras said 25 centuries ago: 'Man is the measure of all things.'

* *

Some units systems are particularly badly adapted to humans. The most infamous is shoe size S. It is a pure number calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{France}} &= 1.5\,\text{cm}^{-1}(l + 1 \pm 1\,\text{cm}) \\ S_{\text{central Europe}} &= 1.5748\,\text{cm}^{-1}(l + 1 \pm 1\,\text{cm}) \\ S_{\text{Anglosaxon men}} &= 1.181\,\text{cm}^{-1}(l + 1 \pm 1\,\text{cm}) - 22 \end{aligned} \tag{566}$$

where l is the length of a foot and the correction length depends on the manufacturing company. In addition, the Anglosaxon formula is not valid for women and children, where the first factor depends, for marketing reasons, both on manufacturer and size itself. The ISO standard requires, unsurprisingly, to use foot length in millimetres.

* *

The table of SI prefixes covers 72 orders of magnitude. How many additional prefixes will be needed? Even an extended list will include only a small part of the infinite range of possibilities. Will the Conférence Générale des Poids et Mesures have to go on forever, defining an infinite number of SI prefixes? Why?

Challenge 1319 s

* *

The French philosopher Voltaire, after meeting Newton, publicized the now famous story that the connection between the fall of objects and the motion of the Moon was discovered by Newton when he saw an apple falling from a tree. More than a century later, just before the French Revolution, a committee of scientists decided to take as the unit of force precisely the force exerted by gravity on a *standard apple*, and to name it after the English scientist. After extensive study, it was found that the mass of the standard apple was 101.9716 g; its weight was called 1 newton. Since then, visitors to the museum in Sèvres near Paris have been able to admire the standard metre, the standard kilogram and the standard apple.*

* To be clear, this is a joke; no standard apple exists. It is *not* a joke however, that owners of several apple trees in Britain and in the US claim descent, by rerooting, from the original tree under which Newton had his insight. DNA tests have even been performed to decide if all these derive from the same tree. The result was, unsurprisingly, that the tree at MIT, in contrast to the British ones, is a fake.

Ref. 800

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 419 A precision experiment and its measurement distribution

Precision and accuracy of measurements

As explained on page 315, *precision* means how well a result is reproduced when the measurement is repeated; *accuracy* is the degree to which a measurement corresponds to the actual value. Lack of precision is due to accidental or *random errors*; they are best measured by the *standard deviation*, usually abbreviated σ; it is defined through

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(x_i - \bar{x})^2 \,, \tag{567}$$

where $\bar{x}$ is the average of the measurements x_i. (Can you imagine why $n-1$ is used in the formula instead of n?) Challenge 1320 s

For most experiments, the distribution of measurement values tends towards a normal distribution, also called *Gaussian distribution*, whenever the number of measurements is increased. The distribution, shown in Figure 419, is described by the expression

$$N(x) \approx \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(x-\bar{x})^2}{2\sigma^2}} \,. \tag{568}$$

The square σ^2 of the standard deviation is also called the *variance*. For a Gaussian distribution of measurement values, 2.35σ is the full width at half maximum. Challenge 1321 e

Lack of accuracy is due to *systematic errors*; usually these can only be estimated. This estimate is often added to the random errors to produce a *total* experimental error, sometimes also called *total uncertainty*. Ref. 801

The following tables give the values of the most important physical constants and particle properties in SI units and in a few other common units, as published in the standard references. The values are the world averages of the best measurements made up to the Ref. 802

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

present. As usual, experimental errors, including both random and estimated systematic errors, are expressed by giving the standard deviation in the last digits; e.g. 0.31(6) means – roughly speaking – 0.31 ± 0.06. In fact, behind each of the numbers in the following tables there is a long story which is worth telling, but for which there is not enough room here.*

What are the limits to accuracy and precision? There is no way, even in principle, to measure a length x to a *precision* higher than about 61 digits, because $\Delta x/x > l_{\mathrm{Pl}}/d_{\mathrm{horizon}} = 10^{-61}$. (Is this valid also for force or for volume?) In the third final of our text, studies of clocks and metre bars strengthen this theoretical limit.

Challenge 1322 ny
Page 1428

But it is not difficult to deduce more stringent practical limits. No imaginable machine can measure quantities with a higher precision than measuring the diameter of the Earth within the smallest length ever measured, about 10^{-19} m; that is about 26 digits of precision. Using a more realistic limit of a 1000 m sized machine implies a limit of 22 digits. If, as predicted above, time measurements really achieve 17 digits of precision, then they are nearing the practical limit, because apart from size, there is an additional practical restriction: cost. Indeed, an additional digit in measurement precision often means an additional digit in equipment cost.

Basic physical constants

In principle, all quantitative properties of matter can be calculated with quantum theory. For example, colour, density and elastic properties can be predicted using the values of the following constants using the equations of the standard model of high-energy physics.

Ref. 802
Page 1290

TABLE 84 Basic physical constants

Quantity	Symbol	Value in SI units	Uncert.[a]
number of space-time dimensions		3 + 1	0 [b]
vacuum speed of light[c]	c	299 792 458 m/s	0
vacuum permeability[c]	μ_0	$4\pi \cdot 10^{-7}$ H/m	0
		= 1.256 637 061 435 ... μH/m	0
vacuum permittivity[c]	$\varepsilon_0 = 1/\mu_0 c^2$	8.854 187 817 620 ... pF/m	0
original Planck constant	h	$6.626\,068\,76(52) \cdot 10^{-34}$ Js	$7.8 \cdot 10^{-8}$
reduced Planck constant	$\hbar$	$1.054\,571\,596(82) \cdot 10^{-34}$ Js	$7.8 \cdot 10^{-8}$
positron charge	e	0.160 217 646 2(63) aC	$3.9 \cdot 10^{-8}$
Boltzmann constant	k	$1.380\,650\,3(24) \cdot 10^{-23}$ J/K	$1.7 \cdot 10^{-6}$
gravitational constant	G	$6.673(10) \cdot 10^{-11}$ Nm^2/kg^2	$1.5 \cdot 10^{-3}$
gravitational coupling constant	$\kappa = 8\pi G/c^4$	$2.076(3) \cdot 10^{-43}$ s^2/kg m	$1.5 \cdot 10^{-3}$
fine structure constant,[d]	$\alpha = \frac{e^2}{4\pi\varepsilon_0\hbar c}$	1/137.035 999 76(50)	$3.7 \cdot 10^{-9}$
e.m. coupling constant	$= g_{\mathrm{em}}(m_e^2 c^2)$	= 0.007 297 352 533(27)	$3.7 \cdot 10^{-9}$

* Some of the stories can be found in the text by N. W. Wise, *The Values of Precision*, Princeton University Press, 1994. The field of high-precision measurements, from which the results on these pages stem, is a world on its own. A beautiful introduction to it is J. D. Fairbanks, B. S. Deaver, C. W. Everitt & P. F. Michaelson, eds., *Near Zero: Frontiers of Physics*, Freeman, 1988.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

QUANTITY	SYMBOL	VALUE IN SI UNITS	UNCERT.[a]
Fermi coupling constant,[d]	$G_F/(\hbar c)^3$	$1.166\,39(1)\cdot 10^{-5}\,\mathrm{GeV}^{-2}$	$8.6\cdot 10^{-6}$
weak coupling constant	$\alpha_w(M_Z) = g_w^2/4\pi$	1/30.1(3)	$1\cdot 10^{-2}$
weak mixing angle	$\sin^2\theta_W(\overline{MS})$	0.231 24(24)	$1.0\cdot 10^{-3}$
weak mixing angle	$\sin^2\theta_W$ (on shell) $= 1-(m_W/m_Z)^2$	0.2224(19)	$8.7\cdot 10^{-3}$
strong coupling constant[d]	$\alpha_s(M_Z) = g_s^2/4\pi$	0.118(3)	$25\cdot 10^{-3}$

a. Uncertainty: standard deviation of measurement errors.
b. Only down to 10^{-19} m and up to 10^{26} m.
c. Defining constant.
d. All coupling constants depend on the 4-momentum transfer, as explained in the section on renormalization. *Fine structure constant* is the traditional name for the electromagnetic coupling constant g_{em} in the case of a 4-momentum transfer of $Q^2 = m_e^2c^2$, which is the smallest one possible. At higher momentum transfers it has larger values, e.g. $g_{em}(Q^2 = M_W^2c^2) \approx 1/128$. The strong coupling constant has higher values at lower momentum transfers; e.g., $\alpha_s(34\,\mathrm{GeV}) = 0.14(2)$.

Page 1194

Why do all these constants have the values they have? The answer is different in each case. For any constant having a dimension, such as the quantum of action $\hbar$, the numerical value has only historical meaning. It is $1.054\cdot 10^{-34}$ Js because of the SI definition of the joule and the second. The question why the value of a dimensional constant is not larger or smaller always requires one to understand the origin of some dimensionless number giving the ratio between the constant and the corresponding natural unit. Understanding the sizes of atoms, people, trees and stars, the duration of molecular and atomic processes, or the mass of nuclei and mountains, implies understanding the ratios between these values and the corresponding natural units. The key to understanding nature is thus the understanding of all ratios, and thus of all dimensionless constants. The story of the most important ratios is told in the concluding part of the adventure.

The basic constants yield the following useful high-precision observations.

TABLE 85 Derived physical constants

QUANTITY	SYMBOL	VALUE IN SI UNITS	UNCERT.
Vacuum wave resistance	$Z_0 = \sqrt{\mu_0/\varepsilon_0}$	376.730 313 461 77... Ω	0
Avogadro's number	N_A	$6.022\,141\,99(47)\cdot 10^{23}$	$7.9\cdot 10^{-8}$
Rydberg constant [a]	$R_\infty = m_e c\alpha^2/2h$	$10\,973\,731.568\,549(83)\,\mathrm{m}^{-1}$	$7.6\cdot 10^{-12}$
conductance quantum	$G_0 = 2e^2/h$	77.480 916 96(28) μS	$3.7\cdot 10^{-9}$
magnetic flux quantum	$\varphi_0 = h/2e$	2.067 833 636(81) pWb	$3.9\cdot 10^{-8}$
Josephson frequency ratio	$2e/h$	483.597 898(19) THz/V	$3.9\cdot 10^{-8}$
von Klitzing constant	$h/e^2 = \mu_0 c/2\alpha$	25 812.807 572(95) Ω	$3.7\cdot 10^{-9}$
Bohr magneton	$\mu_B = e\hbar/2m_e$	9.274 008 99(37) yJ/T	$4.0\cdot 10^{-8}$
cyclotron frequency of the electron	$f_c/B = e/2\pi m_e$	27.992 4925(11) GHz/T	$4.0\cdot 10^{-8}$
classical electron radius	$r_e = e^2/4\pi\varepsilon_0 m_e c^2$	2.817 940 285(31) fm	$1.1\cdot 10^{-8}$
Compton wavelength	$\lambda_c = h/m_e c$	2.426 310 215(18) pm	$7.3\cdot 10^{-9}$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Quantity	Symbol	Value in SI units	Uncert.
of the electron	$\lambda\!\!\!^{-}_{\mathrm{c}} = \hbar/m_{\mathrm{e}}c = r_{\mathrm{e}}/\alpha$	0.386 159 264 2(28) pm	$7.3 \cdot 10^{-9}$
Bohr radius [a]	$a_\infty = r_{\mathrm{e}}/\alpha^2$	52.917 720 83(19) pm	$3.7 \cdot 10^{-9}$
nuclear magneton	$\mu_{\mathrm{N}} = e\hbar/2m_{\mathrm{p}}$	$5.050\,783\,17(20) \cdot 10^{-27}$ J/T	$4.0 \cdot 10^{-8}$
proton–electron mass ratio	$m_{\mathrm{p}}/m_{\mathrm{e}}$	1 836.152 667 5(39)	$2.1 \cdot 10^{-9}$
Stefan–Boltzmann constant	$\sigma = \pi^2 k^4/60\hbar^3 c^2$	56.704 00(40) nW/m^{2}K^4	$7.0 \cdot 10^{-6}$
Wien's displacement constant	$b = \lambda_{\max} T$	2.897 768 6(51) mmK	$1.7 \cdot 10^{-6}$
bits to entropy conversion const.		10^{23} bit = 0.956 994 5(17) J/K	$1.7 \cdot 10^{-6}$
TNT energy content		3.7 to 4.0 MJ/kg	$4 \cdot 10^{-2}$

a. For infinite mass of the nucleus.

Challenge 1323 s

Some properties of nature at large are listed in the following table. (If you want a challenge, can you determine whether any property of the universe itself is listed?)

TABLE 86 Astrophysical constants

Quantity	Symbol	Value
gravitational constant	G	$6.672\,59(85) \cdot 10^{-11}$ m^3/kg s^2
cosmological constant	Λ	$c.\,1 \cdot 10^{-52}$ m^{-2}
tropical year 1900 [a]	a	31 556 925.974 7 s
tropical year 1994	a	31 556 925.2 s
mean sidereal day	d	$23^h 56' 4.090\,53''$
light year	al	9.460 528 173 ... Pm
astronomical unit [b]	AU	149 597 870.691(30) km
parsec	pc	30.856 775 806 Pm = 3.261 634 al
age of the universe [c]	t_0	$4.333(53) \cdot 10^{17}$ s = $13.73(0.17) \cdot 10^9$ a
(determined from space-time, via expansion, using general relativity)		
age of the universe [c]	t_0	over $3.5(4) \cdot 10^{17}$ s = $11.5(1.5) \cdot 10^9$ a
(determined from matter, via galaxies and stars, using quantum theory)		
Hubble parameter [c]	H_0	$2.3(2) \cdot 10^{-18}$ s^{-1} = $0.73(4) \cdot 10^{-10}$ a^{-1}
	$H_0 = h_0 \cdot 100$ km/sMpc = $h_0 \cdot 1.0227 \cdot 10^{-10}$ a^{-1}	
reduced Hubble parameter [c]	h_0	0.71(4)
deceleration parameter	$q_0 = -(\ddot{a}/a)_0/H_0^2$	−0.66(10)
universe's horizon distance [c]	$d_0 = 3ct_0$	$40.0(6) \cdot 10^{26}$ m = 13.0(2) Gpc
universe's topology		unknown
number of space dimensions		3, for distances up to 10^{26} m
critical density	$\rho_{\mathrm{c}} = 3H_0^2/8\pi G$	$h_0^2 \cdot 1.878\,82(24) \cdot 10^{-26}$ kg/m^3
of the universe		$= 0.95(12) \cdot 10^{-26}$ kg/m^3
(total) density parameter [c]	$\Omega_0 = \rho_0/\rho_{\mathrm{c}}$	1.02(2)
baryon density parameter [c]	$\Omega_{\mathrm{B0}} = \rho_{\mathrm{B0}}/\rho_{\mathrm{c}}$	0.044(4)
cold dark matter density parameter [c]	$\Omega_{\mathrm{CDM0}} = \rho_{\mathrm{CDM0}}/\rho_{\mathrm{c}}$	0.23(4)
neutrino density parameter [c]	$\Omega_{\nu 0} = \rho_{\nu 0}/\rho_{\mathrm{c}}$	0.001 to 0.05

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Quantity	Symbol	Value
dark energy density parameter [c]	$\Omega_{X0} = \rho_{X0}/\rho_c$	0.73(4)
dark energy state parameter	$w = p_X/\rho_X$	−1.0(2)
baryon mass	m_b	$1.67 \cdot 10^{-27}$ kg
baryon number density		0.25(1) /m^3
luminous matter density		$3.8(2) \cdot 10^{-28}$ kg/m^3
stars in the universe	n_s	$10^{22\pm1}$
baryons in the universe	n_b	$10^{81\pm1}$
microwave background temperature [d]	T_0	2.725(1) K
photons in the universe	n_γ	10^{89}
photon energy density	$\rho_\gamma = \pi^2 k^4/15T_0^4$	$4.6 \cdot 10^{-31}$ kg/m^3
photon number density		410.89 /cm^3 or 400 /cm^3 $(T_0/2.7\,\mathrm{K})^3$
density perturbation amplitude	$\sqrt{S}$	$5.6(1.5) \cdot 10^{-6}$
gravity wave amplitude	$\sqrt{T}$	$< 0.71\sqrt{S}$
mass fluctuations on 8 Mpc	σ_8	0.84(4)
scalar index	n	0.93(3)
running of scalar index	$\mathrm{d}n/\mathrm{d}\ln k$	-0.03(2)
Planck length	$l_{Pl} = \sqrt{\hbar G/c^3}$	$1.62 \cdot 10^{-35}$ m
Planck time	$t_{Pl} = \sqrt{\hbar G/c^5}$	$5.39 \cdot 10^{-44}$ s
Planck mass	$m_{Pl} = \sqrt{\hbar c/G}$	21.8 µg
instants in history [c]	t_0/t_{Pl}	$8.7(2.8) \cdot 10^{60}$
space-time points inside the horizon [c]	$N_0 = (R_0/l_{Pl})^3 \cdot (t_0/t_{Pl})$	$10^{244\pm1}$
mass inside horizon	M	$10^{54\pm1}$ kg

a. Defining constant, from vernal equinox to vernal equinox; it was once used to define the second. (Remember: π seconds is about a nanocentury.) The value for 1990 is about 0.7 s less, corresponding to a slowdown of roughly 0.2 ms/a. (Watch out: why?) There is even an empirical formula for the change of the length of the year over time.

Challenge 1324 s

Ref. 803

b. Average distance Earth–Sun. The truly amazing precision of 30 m results from time averages of signals sent from Viking orbiters and Mars landers taken over a period of over twenty years.

c. The index 0 indicates present-day values.

d. The radiation originated when the universe was 380 000 years old and had a temperature of about 3000 K; the fluctuations ΔT_0 which led to galaxy formation are today about $16 \pm 4\,\mu\mathrm{K} = 6(2) \cdot 10^{-6}\ T_0$.

Page 577

Warning: in the final part of this text it is shown that many of the constants in Table 86 are *not* physically sensible quantities. They have to be taken with many grains of salt. The more specific constants given in the following table are all sensible, though.

TABLE 87 Astronomical constants

Quantity	Symbol	Value
Earth's mass	M	$5.972\,23(8) \cdot 10^{24}$ kg

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Quantity	Symbol	Value
Earth's gravitational length	$l = 2GM/c^2$	8.870(1) mm
Earth radius, equatorial [a]	R_{eq}	6378.1367(1) km
Earth's radius, polar [a]	R_p	6356.7517(1) km
Equator–pole distance [a]		10 001.966 km (average)
Earth's flattening [a]	e	1/298.25231(1)
Earth's av. density	ρ	5.5 Mg/m^3
Earth's age		4.55 Ga = 143 Ps
Moon's radius	R_{mv}	1738 km in direction of Earth
Moon's radius	R_{mh}	1737.4 km in other two directions
Moon's mass	M_m	$7.35 \cdot 10^{22}$ kg
Moon's mean distance [b]	d_m	384 401 km
Moon's distance at perigee [b]		typically 363 Mm, hist. minimum 359 861 km
Moon's distance at apogee [b]		typically 404 Mm, hist. maximum 406 720 km
Moon's angular size [c]		average 0.5181° = 31.08′, minimum 0.49°, maximum - shortens line 0.55°
Moon's average density	ρ	3.3 Mg/m^3
Sun's mass	$M_\odot$	$1.988\,43(3) \cdot 10^{30}$ kg
Sun's gravitational length	$l_\odot = 2GM_\odot/c^2$	2.953 250 08 km
Sun's luminosity	$L_\odot$	384.6 YW
solar radius, equatorial	$R_\odot$	695.98(7) Mm
Sun's angular size		0.53° average; minimum on fourth of July (aphelion) 1888″, maximum on fourth of January (perihelion) 1952″
Sun's average density	ρ	1.4 Mg/m^3
Sun's average distance	AU	149 597 870.691(30) km
Sun's age		4.6 Ga
solar velocity around centre of galaxy	$v_{\odot g}$	220(20) km/s
solar velocity against cosmic background	$v_{\odot b}$	370.6(5) km/s
distance to galaxy centre		8.0(5) kpc = 26.1(1.6) kal
Milky Way's age		13.6 Ga
Milky Way's size		*c.* 10^{21} m or 100 kal
Milky Way's mass		10^{12} solar masses, *c.* $2 \cdot 10^{42}$ kg
Jupiter's mass	$M_{♃}$	$1.90 \cdot 10^{27}$ kg
Jupiter's radius, equatorial	$R_{♃}$	71.398 Mm
Jupiter's radius, polar	$R_{♃}$	67.1(1) Mm
Jupiter's average distance from Sun	$D_{♃}$	778 412 020 km
most distant galaxy known	1835 IR1916	$13.2 \cdot 10^9$ al = $1.25 \cdot 10^{26}$ m, red-shift 10

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

a. The shape of the Earth is described most precisely with the World Geodetic System. The last edition dates from 1984. For an extensive presentation of its background and its details, see the www.wgs84.com website. The International Geodesic Union refined the data in 2000. The radii and the flattening given here are those for the 'mean tide system'. They differ from those of the 'zero tide system' and other systems by about 0.7 m. The details constitute a science in itself.

b. Measured centre to centre. To find the precise position of the Moon at a given date, see the www.fourmilab.ch/earthview/moon_ap_per.html page. For the planets, see the page www.fourmilab.ch/solar/solar.html and the other pages on the same site.

c. Angles are defined as follows: 1 degree = $1^\circ = \pi/180$ rad, 1 (first) minute = $1' = 1^\circ/60$, 1 second (minute) = $1'' = 1'/60$. The ancient units 'third minute' and 'fourth minute', each 1/60th of the preceding, are not in use any more. ('Minute' originally means 'very small', as it still does in modern English.)

Useful numbers

Ref. 804

π	$3.14159\,26535\,89793\,23846\,26433\,83279\,50288\,41971\,69399\,37510_5$
e	$2.71828\,18284\,59045\,23536\,02874\,71352\,66249\,77572\,47093\,69995_9$
γ	$0.57721\,56649\,01532\,86060\,65120\,90082\,40243\,10421\,59335\,93992_3$
$\ln 2$	$0.69314\,71805\,59945\,30941\,72321\,21458\,17656\,80755\,00134\,36025_5$
$\ln 10$	$2.30258\,50929\,94045\,68401\,79914\,54684\,36420\,76011\,01488\,62877_2$
$\sqrt{10}$	$3.16227\,76601\,68379\,33199\,88935\,44432\,71853\,37195\,55139\,32521_6$

If the number π is *normal*, i.e., if all digits and digit combinations in its decimal expansion appear with the same limiting frequency, then every text ever written or yet to be written, as well as every word ever spoken or yet to be spoken, can be found coded in its sequence. The property of normality has not yet been proven, although it is suspected to hold. Does this mean that all wisdom is encoded in the simple circle? No. The property is nothing special: it also applies to the number 0.12345678910111213141516171819202 1... and many others. Can you specify a few examples?

Challenge 1325 s

By the way, in the graph of the exponential function e^x, the point $(0,1)$ is the only point with two rational coordinates. If you imagine painting in blue all points on the plane with two rational coordinates, the plane would look quite bluish. Nevertheless, the graph goes through only one of these points and manages to avoid all the others.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Appendix D

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON MOTION

> No place affords a more striking conviction of the vanity of human hopes than a public library.
>
> Samuel Johnson

> In a consumer society there are inevitably two kinds of slaves: the prisoners of addiction and the prisoners of envy.
>
> Ivan Illich*

In the text, outstanding books introducing neighbouring domains are presented in footnotes. The bibliographies at the end of each part collect general material in order to satisfy further curiosity about what is encountered in this mountain ascent. All citations can also be found by looking up the author's name in the index. To find additional information, either libraries or the internet can help.

In a library, review articles of recent research appear in journals such as *Reviews of Modern Physics*, *Reports on Progress in Physics*, *Contemporary Physics* and *Advances in Physics*. Good pedagogical introductions are found in the *American Journal of Physics*, the *European Journal of Physics* and *Physik in unserer Zeit*. Another useful resource is *Living Reviews in Relativity*, found at www.livingreviews.org.

Overviews on research trends occasionally appear in magazines such as *Physics World*, *Physics Today*, *Europhysics Journal*, *Physik Journal* and *Nederlands tijdschrift voor natuurkunde*. For coverage of all the sciences together, the best sources are the magazines *Nature*, *New Scientist*, *Naturwissenschaften*, *La Recherche* and the cheap but excellent *Science News*.

Research papers appear mainly in *Physics Letters B*, *Nuclear Physics B*, *Physical Review D*, *Physical Review Letters*, *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, *General Relativity and Gravitation*, *International Journal of Modern Physics* and *Modern Physics Letters*. The newest results and speculative ideas are found in conference proceedings, such as the *Nuclear Physics B Supplements*. Research articles also appear in *Fortschritte der Physik*, *Zeitschrift für Physik C*, *La Rivista del Nuovo Cimento*, *Europhysics Letters*, *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, *Foundations of Physics*, *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* and *Journal of Physics G*. There is also the purely electronic *New Journal of Physics*, which can be found at the www.njp.org website.

Papers on the description of motion without time and space which appear *after* this text is published can be found via the *Scientific Citation Index*. It is published in printed

* Ivan Illich (b. 1926 Vienna, d. 2002 Bremen), Austrian theologian and social and political thinker.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 88 The structure of the Arxiv preprint archive for physics and related topics at arxiv.org

Topic	Abbreviation
general relativity and quantum cosmology	gr-qc
astrophysics	astro-ph
experimental nuclear physics	nucl-ex
theoretical nuclear physics	nucl-th
theoretical high-energy physics	hep-th
computational high-energy physics	hep-lat
phenomenological high-energy physics	hep-ph
experimental high-energy physics	hep-ex
quantum physics	quant-ph
general physics	physics
condensed matter physics	cond-mat
nonlinear sciences	nlin
mathematical physics	math-ph
mathematics	math
computer science	CoRR
quantitative biology	q-bio

To receive preprints by email, send an email to an address of the form gr-qc@arxiv.org (or the corresponding abbreviation in place of 'gr-qc'), with a subject line consisting simply of the word 'help', without the quotes.

form and as compact disc, and allows, one to search for all publications which cite a given paper. Then, using the bimonthly *Physics Abstracts*, which also exists in both paper and electronic form, you can look up the abstract of the paper and check whether it is of interest.

But by far the simplest and most efficient way to keep in touch with ongoing research on motion is to use the *internet*, the international computer network. To anybody with a personal computer connected to a telephone, most theoretical physics papers are available free of charge, as *preprints*, i.e., before official publication and checking by referees, at the arxiv.org website. Details are given in Table 88. A service for finding subsequent preprints that cite a given one is also available.

In the last decade of the twentieth century, the internet expanded into a combination of library, media store, discussion platform, order desk, brochure collection and time waster. Today, commerce, advertising and – unfortunately – crime of all kind are also an integral part of the web. With a personal computer, a modem and free browser software, one can look for information in millions of pages of documents. The various parts of the documents are located in various computers around the world, but the user does not need to be aware of this.*

* Several decades ago, the provocative book by Ivan Illich, *Deschooling Society*, Harper & Row, 1971,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

To start using the web, ask a friend who knows.* Searching the web for authors, organizations, books, publications, companies or simple keywords using search engines can be a rewarding or a time-wasting experience. A selection of interesting servers are given below.

TABLE 89 Some interesting servers on the world-wide web

Topic	Website address or 'URL'
General topics	
Wikipedia	www.wikipedia.org
Information search engines	www.altavista.com
	www.metager.de
	www.google.com
	www.yahoo.com
Search old usenet articles	groups.google.com
Frequently asked questions on physics and other topics	www.faqs.org
Libraries	www.konbib.nl
	portico.bl.uk
	www.theeuropeanlibrary.org
	www.hero.ac.uk/uk/niss/niss_library4008.cfm
	www.bnf.fr
	www.grass-gis.de/bibliotheken
	www.loc.gov
Physics	

listed four basic ingredients for any educational system:

1. access to *resources* for learning, e.g. books, equipment, games, etc. at an affordable price, for everybody, at any time in their life;

2. for all who want to learn, access to *peers* in the same learning situation, for discussion, comparison, cooperation and competition;

3. access to *elders*, e.g. teachers, for their care and criticism towards those who are learning;

4. exchanges between students and *performers* in the field of interest, so that the latter can be models for the former. For example, there should be the possibility to listen to professional musicians and reading the works of specialist writers. This also gives performers the possibility to share, advertise and use their skills.

Illich develops the idea that if such a system were informal – he then calls it a 'learning web' or 'opportunity web' – it would be superior to formal, state-financed institutions, such as conventional schools, for the development of mature human beings. These ideas are deepened in his following works, *Deschooling Our Lives*, Penguin, 1976, and *Tools for Conviviality*, Penguin, 1973.

Today, any networked computer offers one or more of the following: *email* (electronic mail), FTP (file transfer to and from another computer), access to *Usenet* (the discussion groups on specific topics, such as particle physics), and the powerful *world-wide web*. (Roughly speaking, each of those includes the ones before.) In a rather unexpected way, all these facilities of the internet have transformed it into the backbone of the 'opportunity web' discussed by Illich. However, as in any school, it strongly depends on the user's discipline whether the internet actually does provide a learning web.

* It is also possible to use both the internet and to download files through FTP with the help of email only. But the tools change too often to give a stable guide here. Ask your friend.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Topic	Website address or 'URL'
Research preprints	arxiv.org – see page 928
	www.slac.stanford.edu/spires
Particle data	pdg.web.cern.ch/pdg
Physics news, weekly	www.aip.org/physnews/update
Physics news, daily	www.innovations-report.de/berichte/physik.php
Physics problems by Yakov Kantor	star.tau.ac.il/QUIZ
Physics problems by Henry Greenside	www.phy.duke.edu/~hsg/physics-challenges/challenges.html
Physics 'question of the week'	www.physics.umd.edu/lecdem/outreach/QOTW/active
Physics 'miniproblem'	www.nyteknik.se/miniproblemet
Official SI unit site	www.bipm.fr
Unit conversion	www.chemie.fu-berlin.de/chemistry/general/units.html
'Ask the experts'	www.sciam.com/askexpert_directory.cfm
Abstracts of papers in physics journals	www.osti.gov
Science News	www.sciencenews.org
Nobel Prize winners	www.nobel.se/physics/laureates
Pictures of physicists	www.if.ufrj.br/famous/physlist.html
Gravitation news	www.phys.lsu.edu/mog.html
Living Reviews in Relativity	www.livingreviews.org
Information on relativity	math.ucr.edu/home/baez/relativity.html
Relativistic imaging and films	www.tat.physik.uni-tuebingen.de/~weiskopf
Physics organizations	www.cern.ch
	www.hep.net
	www.nikhef.nl
	www.het.brown.edu/physics/review/index.html
Physics textbooks on the web	www.plasma.uu.se/CED/Book
	www.biophysics.org/education/resources.htm
	www.lightandmatter.com
	www.motionmountain.eu
Three beautiful French sets of notes on classical mechanics and particle theory	feynman.phy.ulaval.ca/marleau/notesdecours.htm
The excellent *Radical Freshman Physics* by David Raymond	www.physics.nmt.edu/~raymond/teaching.html
Physics course scripts from MIT	ocw.mit.edu/OcwWeb/Physics/index.html
Physics lecture scripts in German and English	www.akleon.de
'World lecture hall'	www.utexas.edu/world/lecture

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Topic	Website address or 'URL'
Engineering data and formulae	www.efunda.com
Wissenschaft in die Schulen	www.wissenschaft-schulen.de
Mathematics	
'Math forum' internet resource collection	mathforum.org/library
Biographies of mathematicians	www-history.mcs.st-andrews.ac.uk/BiogIndex.html
Purdue math problem of the week	www.math.purdue.edu/academics/pow
Macalester College maths problem of the week	mathforum.org/wagon
Mathematical formulae	dlmf.nist.gov
Functions	functions.wolfram.com
Symbolic integration	www.integrals.com
Weisstein's World of Mathematics	mathworld.wolfram.com
Curiosities	
Minerals	webmineral.com
	www.mindat.org
ESA	sci.esa.int
NASA	www.nasa.gov
Hubble space telescope	hubble.nasa.gov
Sloan Digital Sky Survey	skyserver.sdss.org
The 'cosmic mirror'	www.astro.uni-bonn.de/~dfischer/mirror
Solar system simulator	space.jpl.nasa.gov
Observable satellites	liftoff.msfc.nasa.gov/RealTime/JPass/20
Astronomy picture of the day	antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/astropix.html
The Earth from space	www.visibleearth.nasa.gov
From Stargazers to Starships	www.phy6.org/stargaze/Sintro.htm
Current solar data	www.n3kl.org/sun
Optical illusions	www.sandlotscience.com
Petit's science comics	www.jp-petit.com
Physical toys	www.e20.physik.tu-muenchen.de/~cucke/toylinke.htm
Physics humour	www.dctech.com/physics/humor/biglist.php
Literature on magic	www.faqs.org/faqs/magic-faq/part2
Algebraic surfaces	www.mathematik.uni-kl.de/~hunt/drawings.html
Making paper aeroplanes	www.pchelp.net/paper_ac.htm
	www.ivic.qc.ca/~aleexpert/aluniversite/klinevogelmann.html
Small flying helicopters	pixelito.reference.be
Ten thousand year clock	www.longnow.org

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Topic	Website address or 'URL'
Gesellschaft Deutscher Naturforscher und Ärzte	www.gdnae.de
Pseudoscience	suhep.phy.syr.edu/courses/modules/PSEUDO/pseudo_main.html
Crackpots	www.crank.net
Mathematical quotations	math.furman.edu/mwoodard/~mquot.html
The 'World Question Center'	www.edge.org/questioncenter.html
Plagiarism	www.plagiarized.com
Hoaxes	www.museumofhoaxes.com

Do you want to study physics without actually going to university? Nowadays it is possible to do so via email and internet, in German, at the University of Kaiserslautern.* In the near future, a nationwide project in Britain should allow the same for English-speaking students. As an introduction, use the latest update of this physics text!

> Das Internet ist die offenste Form der geschlossenen Anstalt.**
>
> Matthias Deutschmann

> Si tacuisses, philosophus mansisses.***
>
> After Boethius.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* See the www.fernstudium-physik.de website.

** 'The internet is the most open form of a closed institution.'

*** 'If you had kept quiet, you would have remained a philosopher.' After the story Boethius tells in *De consolatione philosophiae*, 2.7, 67 ff.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

> [...] moi, qui trouve toujours tous les livres trop longs, et surtout les miens [...]
>
> Voltaire, *Lettre à M. Cideville.**

557 Julian Schwinger, L. L. DeRaad, K. A. Milton & W. Y. Tsai, *Classical Electrodynamics*, Perseus, 1998. An excellent text on the topic by one of its greatest masters.

See also the beautiful problem book by André Butoli & Jean-Marc Lévy-Leblond, *La physique en questions – électricité et magnétisme*, Vuibert, 1999. Cited on pages 669 and 710.

558 See the website of the Particle Data Group, the world's reference, at pdg.web.cern.ch. See also H. Jeon & M. Longo, Search for magnetic monopoles trapped in matter, *Physical Review Letters* **75**, pp. 1443–1447, 1995. See also A. S. Goldhaber & W. P. Trower, Resource letter MM-1: magnetic monopoles, *American Journal of Physics* **58**, pp. 429–439, 1990. Cited on page 671.

559 R. Edwards, Filling station fires spark cars' recall, *New Scientist*, pp. 4–5, 4 March 1995. Cited on page 671.

560 S. Desmet, F. Orban & F. Grandjean, On the Kelvin electrostatic generator, *European Journal of Physics* **10**, pp. 118–122, 1989. You can also find construction plans for it in various places on the internet. Cited on page 673.

561 For an etching of Franklin's original ringing rod, see E. P. Krider, Benjamin Franklin and lightning rods, *Physics Today* **59**, pp. 42–48, 2006. Cited on page 674.

562 W. Rueckner, An improved demonstration of charge conservation, *American Journal of Physics* **75**, pp. 861–863, 2007. Cited on page 675.

563 For more details on various electromagnetic units, see the standard text by J. D. Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics*, 3rd edition, Wiley, 1998. Cited on page 678.

564 See the old but beautiful papers by Richard C. Tolman & T. Dale Stewart, The electromotive force produced by the acceleration of metals, *Physical Review* **8**, pp. 97–116, 1916, Richard C. Tolman & T. Dale Stewart, The mass of the electric carrier in copper, silver and aluminium, *Physical Review* **9**, pp. 164–167, 1917, and the later but much more precise experiment by C. F. Kettering & G. G. Scott, Inertia of the carrier of electricity in copper and aluminum, *Physical Review* **66**, pp. 257–267, 1944. (Obviously the American language dropped the 'i' from aluminium during that period.) The first of these papers is also a review of the preceding attempts, and explains the experiment in detail. The last paper shows what had to be taken into consideration to achieve sufficient precision. Cited on page 680.

* '[...] me, who always finds all books too long, first of all my own [...]'.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

565 This effect has first been measured by S. J. Barnett, A new electron-inertia effect and the determination of m/e for the free electron in copper, *Philosophical Magazine* **12**, p. 349, 1931. Cited on page 681.

566 See for example C. Schiller, A. A. Koomans, van Rooy, C. Schönenberger & H. B. Elswijk, Decapitation of tungsten field emitter tips during sputter sharpening, *Surface Science Letters* **339**, pp. L925–L930, 1996. Cited on page 681.

567 L. I. Schiff & M. V. Barnhill, Gravitational-induced electric field near a metal, *Physical Review* **151**, pp. 1067–1071, 1966. F. C. Witteborn & W. M. Fairbank, Experimental comparison of the gravitational force on freely falling electrons and metallic electrons, *Physical Review Letters* **19**, pp. 1049–1052, 1967. Cited on page 682.

568 J. Lepak & M. Crescimanno, Speed of light measurement using ping, electronic preprint available at arxiv.org/abs/physics/0201053. Cited on page 682.

569 This story was told by the *Wall Street Journal* in December 2006; see online.wsj.com/article_print/SB116615315551251136.html. Cited on page 682.

570 Pierre de Maricourt, *Tractatus de magnete*, 1269. Cited on page 684.

571 R. Wiltschko & W. Wiltschko, *Magnetic Orientation in Animals*, Springer, Berlin, 1995. Cited on page 684.

572 The ratio of angular L to magnetic M moment is

$$\frac{L}{M} = \frac{2m}{e} \cdot \frac{1}{g} \,, \tag{569}$$

where e is the electron charge and m its mass. Both L and M are measurable. The first measurements were published with a g-value of 1, most probably because the authors expected the value. In later experiments, de Haas found other values. Measurements by other researchers gave values nearer to 2 than to 1, a fact that was only understood with the discovery of spin. The original publications are A. Einstein & W. J. de Haas, Proefondervinderlijk bewijs voor het bestaan der moleculaire stroomen van Ampère, *Konninklijke Akademie der Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Verslagen* **23**, p. 1449, 1915, and A. Einstein & W. J. de Haas, Experimental proof of the existence of Ampère's molecular currents, *Konninklijke Akademie der Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Proceedings* **18**, p. 696, 1916. Cited on page 687.

573 S. J. Barnett, Magnetization by rotation, *Physical Review* **6**, pp. 171–172, 1915, and S. J. Barnett, Magnetization by rotation, *Physical Review* **6**, pp. 239–270, 1915. Cited on page 687.

574 See J. D. Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics*, 3rd edition, Wiley, 1998, or also R. F. Harrington, *Time Harmonic Electromagnetic Fields*, McGraw–Hill, 1961. Cited on pages 691 and 710.

575 The best book on the brain is Eric R. Kandel, James H. Schwartz & Thomas M. Jessell, *Principles of Neural Science*, fifth edition, McGraw-Hill, 2000. The suhep.phy.syr.edu/courses/modules/MM/Biology/biology2.html website gives an introduction into brain physiology. Cited on page 691.

576 N. Salingaros, Invariants of the electromagnetic field and electromagnetic waves, *American Journal of Physics* **53**, pp. 361–363, 1985. Cited on page 692.

577 de la Torre, $V \leqslant c$ in 1820?, *European Journal of Physics* **20**, pp. L23–L24, March 1999. Cited on page 692.

578 J. A. Heras, Can Maxwell's equations be obtained from the continuity equation?, *American Journal of Physics* **75**, pp. 652–657, 2007. Cited on pages 705 and 796.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

579 A similar summary is the basis of Friedrich W. Hehl & Yuri N. Obukov, *Foundations of Classical Electrodynamics – Charge, Flux and Metric*, Birkhäuser 2003. Cited on page 705.

580 R. H. Tyler, S. Maus & H. Lühr, Magnetic signal due to ocean tidal flow identified in satellite observations, *Science* **299**, pp. 239–241, 2003. The films derived from the data can be found on the www.tu-bs.de/institute/geophysik/spp/publikationen.html website. Cited on page 699.

581 H. Montgomery, Unipolar induction: a neglected topic in the teaching of electromagnetism, *European Journal of Physics* **20**, pp. 271–280, 1999. Cited on page 700.

582 On the geodynamo status, see the article by P. H. Roberts & G. A. Glatzmaier, Geodynamo theory and simulations, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **72**, pp. 1081–1123, 2000. An older article is R. Jeanloz & B. Romanowicz, Geophysical dynamics at the center of the Earth, *Physics Today* pp. 22–27, August 1997. Cited on pages 700 and 780.

583 J. Yang, F. Lu, L. W. Kostiuk & D. Y. Kwok, Electrokinetic microchannel battery by means of electrokinetic and microfluidic phenomena, *Journal of Micromechanics and Microengineering* **13**, pp. 963–970, 2003. Cited on page 702.

584 Oleg D. Jefimenko, A relativistic paradox seemingly violating conservation of momentum law in electromagnetic systems, *European Journal of Physics* **20**, pp. 39–44, 1999. Of course, the missing momentum goes into the electromagnetic field. Given that the electromagnetic momentum is given by the vector potential, are you able to check whether everything comes out right? Cited on page 709.

Challenge 1326 ny

585 H. Van Dam & E. P. Wigner, Classical relativistic mechanics of interacting point particles, *Physical Review* **136B**, pp. 1576–1582, 1965. Cited on page 709.

586 Mark D. Semon & John R. Taylor, Thoughts on the magnetic vector potential, *American Journal of Physics* **64**, pp. 1361–1369, 1996. Cited on pages 710 and 712.

587 Jean Sivardière, Simple derivation of magnetic vector potentials, *European Journal of Physics* **14**, pp. 251–254, 1993. Cited on page 711.

588 T. T. Wu & C. N. Yang, 1975, Concept of nonintegrable phase factors and global formulation of gauge fields, *Physical Review D* **12**, pp. 3845–3857, Cited on page 713.

589 An electrodynamics text completely written with (mathematical) forms is Kurt Meetz & Walter L. Engl, Elektromagnetische Felder – mathematische und physikalische Grundlagen, Springer, 1980. Cited on page 714.

590 J. Travis, Twirl those organs into place – getting to the heart of how a heart knows left from right, *Science News* **156**, 21 August, 1999. A good book on asymmetries in nature is H. Brunner, *Rechts oder links*, Wiley–Vch, 1999. Cited on page 717.

591 See for example the discussion by M. C. Corballis & I. L. Beale, On telling left from right, *Scientific American* **224**, pp. 96–104, March 1971. Cited on page 718.

592 Wolfgang Rindler, *Essential Relativity – Special, General, and Cosmological*, revised 2nd edition, Springer Verlag, 1977, page 247. There is also the beautiful paper by M. Le Bellac & J.-M. Lévy-Leblond, Galilean electrodynamics, *Nuovo Cimento B* **14**, p. 217, 1973, that explains the possibilities but also the problems appearing when trying to define the theory non-relativistically. Cited on page 719.

593 L.-C. Tu, J. Luo & G. T. Gilles, The mass of the photon, *Reports on Progress of Physics* **68**, pp. 77–130, 2005. Cited on pages 719 and 720.

594 The system for typing by thought alone is described in many papers, such as B. Blankertz, F. Losch, M. Krauledat, G. Dornhege, G. Curio &

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

K.-R. Müller, The Berlin Brain-Computer Interface: accurate performance from first session in BCI-naïve subjects, *IEEE Transactions on biomedial engineering* **55**, pp. 2452–2462, 2008. See the website www.bbci.de for more information. Cited on page 721.

595 For a captivating account on the history of the ideas on light, see David Park, *The Fire Within the Eye: a Historical Essay on the Nature and Meaning of Light*, Princeton University Press, 1997. For an example of the complex history of optics, see the famous text by Alhazen or Ibn al-Haytham, *Book of Optics* 1021. However, no Arabic website allows to read the text, and the Arabic Wikipedia articles on the topic are much shorter than the French or English ones. Indeed, like most ancient Middle-East thinkers, Alhazen is better known in Europe than in his home region. A Latin translation of the Book of Optics can be read at the imgbase-scd-ulp.u-strasbg.fr/displayimage.php?album=44&pos=0 website of the Université de Strasbourg. Cited on page 723.

596 See the text by Raymond L. Lee & Alistair B. Fraser, *The Rainbow Bridge: Rainbows in Art, Myth, and Science*, Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000. A chapter can be found at the www.nadn.navy.mil/Oceanography/RainbowBridge/Chapter_8.html website. Cited on page 726.

597 The beautiful slit experiment was published by E. A. Montie, E. C. Cosman, 't Hooft, van der Mark & C. W. J. Beenakker, Observation of the optical analogue of quantized conductance of a point contact, *Nature* **350**, pp. 594–595, 18 April 1991, and in the longer version E. A. Montie, E. C. Cosman, 't Hooft, van der Mark & C. W. J. Beenakker, Observation of the optical analogue of the quantised conductance of a point contact, *Physica B* **175**, pp. 149–152, 1991. The result was also publicized in numerous other scientific magazines. Cited on pages 727 and 1370.

598 A recent measurement of the frequency of light is presented in Th. Udem, A. Huber, B. Gross, J. Reichert, M. Prevedelli, M. Weitz & T. W. Hausch, Phase-coherent measurement of the hydrogen 1S–2S transition frequency with an optical frequency interval divider chain, *Physical Review Letters* **79**, pp. 2646–2649, 6 October 1997. Another is C. Schwob, L. Jozefowski, de Beauvoir, L. Hilico, F. Nez, L. Julien, F. Biraben, O. Acef & A. Clairon, Optical frequency measurement of the 2S-12D transitions in hydrogen and deuterium: Rydberg constant and Lamb shift determinations, *Physical Review Letters* **82**, pp. 4960–4963, 21 June 1999. Cited on page 728.

599 The discoverors of two such methods were awarded the 2005 Nobel Prize for physics. Cited on page 728.

600 The best introduction to mirages are the web pages by Andrew Young at mintaka.sdsu.edu/GF/mintaka/mirintro.html. He explains the many types that exist: inferior mirages, superior mirages, mock mirages, Wegener-type mirages, etc., and also gives many references, clearly showing which ones give correct and which one give incorrect explanations. There is no modern review article on the topic yet. For a curious aspect, see G. Horváth, J. Gál & R. Wehner, Why are water-seeking insects not attracted by mirages? The polarization pattern of mirages, *Naturwissenschaften* **83**, pp. 300–303, 1997. Cited on page 730.

601 W. K. Haidinger, Über das direkte Erkennen des polarisierten Lichts, *Poggendorf's Annalen* **63**, pp. 29–39, 1844, W. K. Haidinger, Beobachtung des Lichtpolarisationsbüschels in geradlinig polarisiertem Lichte, *Poggendorf's Annalen* **68**, pp. 73–87, 1846, W. K. Haidinger, Dauer des Eindrucks der Polarisationsbüschel auf der Netzhaut, *Poggendorf's Annalen* **93**, pp. 318–320, 1854. Cited on page 730.

602 See the chapter on polarization brushes in Marcel G. J. Minnaert, *Light and Colour in the Outdoors*, Springer, 1993, or the original book series, Marcel G. J. Minnaert, *De natuurkunde van 't vrije veld*, Thieme & Cie, 1937. For more details, see G. P. Mission,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Form and behaviour of Haidinger's brushes, *Ophthalmology and Physiological Optics* **137**, pp. 392–396, 1993, or J. Grebe-Ellis, Zum Haidinger-Büschel, 2002, at www.physik.hu-berlin.de/ger/gruppen/didaktik/forschung/optik/grebe_ellis_dpg2002.pdf. On the birefringence of the eye, see L. Bour, Een eigenaardige speling der natuur, *Nederlands tijdschrift voor natuurkunde* **67**, pp. 362–364, December 2001. In particular, a photograph of the eye using linear polarized illumination and taken through an analyser shows a black *cross* inside the pupil. Cited on page 730.

603 K. L. Kelly, Color designations for colored lights, *Journal of the Optical Society of America* **33**, pp. 627–632, 1943. Cited on page 733.

604 The standard reference on the propagation of light is Max Born & Emil Wolf, *Principles of Optics – Electromagnetic Theory of Propagation, Interference and Diffraction of Light*, Pergamon Press, 6th edition, 1998. Cited on page 737.

605 E. J. J. Kirchner, De uitvinding van het telescoop in 1608: gewoon twee lenzen, *nederlands tijdschrift voor natuurkunde* **74**, pp. 356–361, 2008. Cited on page 739.

606 A fascinating overview about what people have achieved in this domain up to now is given by Peter Manly, *Unusual Telescopes*, Cambridge University Press, 1991, and Henry C. King, *The History of the Telescope*, Dover, 2003. Cited on page 740.

607 An introduction to the topic of the 22° halo, the 46° halo, Sun dogs, and the many other arcs and bows that can be seen around the Sun, see the beautifully illustrated paper by R. Greenler, Lichterscheinungen, Eiskristalle und Himmelsarchäologie, *Physikalische Blätter* **54**, pp. 133–139, 1998, or the book Robert Greenler, *Rainbows, Halos, and Glories*, Cambridge University Press, 1980. Cited on page 741.

608 Read it online at fermi.imss.fi.it/rd/bdv?/bdviewer/bid=000000300682. Cited on page 741.

609 James E. Faller & Joseph Wampler, The lunar laser reflector, *Scientific American* pp. 38–49, March 1970. Cited on page 741.

610 Neil Armstrong of Apollo 11, Jim Lovell of Apollo 8 and Apollo 13, and Jim Irwin of Apollo 15 extensively searched for it and then made negative statements, as told in *Science News* p. 423, 24 & 31 December 1994. From the space shuttle however, which circles only a few hundred kilometres above the Earth, the wall *can* be seen when the Sun is low enough such that the wall appears wider through its own shadow, as explained in *Science News* **149**, p. 301, 1996. Cited on page 742.

611 More mirage photographs, even mirage movies, can be found on www.polarimage.fi/mirages/mirages.htm and virtual.finland.fi/netcomm/news/showarticle.asp?intNWSAID=25722. Cited on page 742.

612 M. Shih, M. Segev & G. Salamo, *Physical Review Letters* **78**, pp. 2551–2554, 1997. See also the more readable paper by Mordechai Segev & George Stegeman, Self-trapping of optical beams: spatial solitons, *Physics Today* **51**, pp. 42–48, August 1998. Cited on page 743.

613 The first correct explanation of the light mill was given by Osborne Reynolds, On certain dimensional properties of matter in the gaseous state, *Royal Society Philosophical Transactions* Part 2, 1879. The best discussion is the one given on the web by Phil Gibbs, in the frequently asked question list of the usenet news group sci.physics; it is available at the www.desy.de/user/projects/Physics/light-mill.html website. Cited on page 746.

614 P. Lebedew, Untersuchungen über die Druckkräfte des Lichtes, *Annalen der Physik* **6**, pp. 307–458, 1901. Lebedew confirmed Kepler's result that light pressure is the basis for the change of direction of the tails of comets when they circle around the Sun. Cited on page 746.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.net Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

615 P. Galajda & P. Ormos, *Applied Physics Letters* **78**, p. 249, 2001. Cited on page 746.

616 A short overview is given by Miles Padgett & Les Allen, Optical tweezers and spanners, *Physics World* pp. 35–38, September 1997. The original papers by Ashkin's group are A. Ashkin, J. M. Dziedzic, J. E. Bjorkholm & S. Chu, Observation of a gradient force optical trap for dielectric particles, *Optics Letters* **11**, p. 288, 1986, and A. Askin, J. M. Dziedzic & T. Yamane, Optical trapping and manipulation of single cells using infrared laser beams, *Nature* **330**, p. 769, 1987. A pedagogical explanation on optical spanners, together with a way to build one, can be found in D. N. Moothoo, J. Arlt, R. S. Conroy, F. Akerboom, A. Voit & K. Dholakia, Beth's experiment using optical tweezers, *American Journal of Physics* **69**, pp. 271–276, 2001, and in S. P. Smith, S. R. Bhalotra, A. L. Brody, B. L. Brown, E. K. Boyda & M. Prentiss, Inexpensive optical tweezers for undergraduate laboratories, *American Journal of Physics* **67**, pp. 26–35, 1999. Cited on page 746.

617 R. A. Beth, Mechanical detection and measurement of the angular momentum of light, *Physical Review* **50**, p. 115, 1936. For modern measurements, see N. B. Simpson, K. Dholakia, L. Allen & M. J. Padgett, Mechanical equivalence of spin and orbital angular momentum of light:an optical spanner, *Optics Letters* **22**, pp. 52–54, 1997, and M. E. J. Friese, T. A. Nieminen, N. R. Heckenberg & H. Rubinsztein-Dunlop, Optical torque controlled by elliptical polarization, *Optics Letters* **23**, pp. 1–3, 1998. See also J. H. Poynting, The wave motion of a revolving shaft, and a suggestion as to the angular momentum in a beam of circularly polarised light, *Proceedings of the Royal Society London A* **82**, pp. 560–567, 1908. Cited on page 747.

618 A. Valenzuela, G. Haerendel, H. Föppl, F. Melzner, H. Neuss, E. Rieger, J. Stöcker, O. Bauer, H. Höfner & J. Loidl, The AMPTE artificial comet experiments, *Nature* **320**, pp. 700–703, 1986. Cited on page 747.

619 See the Latin text by Dietrich von Freiberg *De iride et radialibus impressionibus*, *c.* 1315. Cited on page 748.

620 J. Walker, Multiple rainbows from single drops of water and other liquids, *American Journal of Physics* **44**, pp. 421–433, 1976, and his How to create and observe a dozen rainbows in a single drop of water, *Scientific American* **237**, pp. 138–144, 1977. See also K. Sassen, Angular scattering and rainbow formation in pendant drops, *Journal of the Optical Society of America* **69**, pp. 1083–1089, 1979. Cited on page 749.

621 The resulting colouring of the Sun's rim is shown clearly on Andrew Young's web page mintaka.sdsu.edu/GF/explain/simulations/std/rims.html. His website mintaka.sdsu.edu/GF offers the best explanation of the green flash, including the various types that exist (explained at mintaka.sdsu.edu/GF/papers/Zenit/glance.html), how to observe it, and the numerous physical effects involved. Detailed simulations and extensive material is available. See also his paper A. T. Young, Sunset science – III. Visual adaptation and green flashes,*Journal of the Optical Society of America A* **17**, pp. 2129–2139, 2000. Cited on page 750.

622 There are also other ways to see the green ray, for longer times, namely when a mirage appears at sunset. An explanation with colour photograph is contained in M. Vollmer, Gespiegelt in besonderen Düften ...– Oasen, Seeungeheuer und weitere Spielereien der Fata Morgana, *Physikalische Blätter* **54**, pp. 903–909, 1998. Cited on page 750.

623 See the wonderful website by Les Cowley on atmospheric optics, www.atoptics.co.uk. Or the book David K. Lynch & William Livingston,*Color and Light in Nature*, second edition, Cambridge University Press, 2001. They updated and expanded the fascination for colours in nature, such as, for example, the halos around the Moon and the Sun, or the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

colour of shadows,, that was started by the beautiful and classic book by Marcel Minnaert mentioned on page 89. Cited on page 750.

624 This famous discovery is by Brent Berlin & Paul Kay, *Basic Color Terms: Their Universality and Evolution*, University of California Press, 1969. Their ongoing *world colour survey* is eagerly awaited. Of course there are also ongoing studies to find possible exceptions; the basic structure is solid, as shown in the conference proceedings C. L. Hardin & Luisa Maffi, *Colour Categories in Thought and Language*, Cambridge University Press, 1997. Cited on page 751.

625 For a thorough discussion of the various velocities connected to wave trains, see the classic text by Louis Brillouin, *Wave Propagation and Group Velocity*, Academic Press, New York, 1960. It expands in detail the theme discussed by Arnold Sommerfeld, Über die Fortpflanzung des Lichtes in dispergierenden Medien, *Annalen der Physik,* 4th series, **44**, pp. 177–202, 1914. See also Arnold Sommerfeld, *Optik*, Dietrichssche Verlagsbuchandlung, Wiesbaden 1950, section 22. An English translation Arnold Sommerfeld, *Lectures on Theoretical Physics: Optics*, 1954, is also available. Cited on pages 753 and 754.

626 Changing the group velocity in fibres is now even possible on demand, as shown by M. González-Herráez, K.-Y. Song & L. Thévenaz, Optically controlled slow and fast light in optical fibers using stimulated Brillouin scattering, *Applied Physics Letters* **87**, p. 081113, 2005. They demonstrate group velocities from $0.24c$ to plus infinity and beyond, to negative values. Cited on page 754.

Another experiment was carried out by S. Chu & S. Wong, Linear pulse propagation in an absorbing medium, *Physical Review Letters* **48**, pp. 738–741, 1982. See also S. Chu & D. Styer, Answer to question #52. Group velocity and energy propagation, *American Journal of Physics* **66**, pp. 659–661, 1998. Another example was described in 1993 by the group of Raymond Chiao for the case of certain nonlinear materials in R. Chiao, P. G. Kwait & A. M. Steinberg, Faster than light?, *Scientific American* **269**, p. 52, August 1993, and R. Y. Chiao, A. E. Kozhekin & G. Kurizki, Tachyonlike excitations in inverted two-level media, *Physical Review Letters* **77**, pp. 1254–1257, 1996. On still another experimental set-up using anomalous dispersion in caesium gas, see L. J. Wang, A. Kuzmich & A. Dogarin, Gain-assisted superluminal light propagation, *Nature* **406**, pp. 277–279, 20 July 2000.

627 Y. P. Terletskii, *Paradoxes in the Theory of Relativity*, Plenum Press, 1968. Cited on page 754.

628 See the excellent explanation by Kirk T. McDonald, Negative group velocity, *American Journal of Physics* **69**, pp. 607–614, 2001. Cited on page 754.

629 The prediction of negative refraction is due to V. G. Veselago, The electrodynamics of substances with simultaneously negative values of ε and μ, *Soviet Physics Uspekhi* **10**, p. 509, 1968. (The original paper in Russian is from 1967.) The explanation with different refraction directions was published by P. M. Valanju, R. M. Walser & A. P. Valanju, Wave refraction in negative-index media: always positive and very inhomogeneous, *Physical Review Letters* **88**, p. 187401, 8 May 2002. Also Fermat's principle is corrected, as explained in V. G. Veselago, About the wording of Fermat's principle for light propagation in media with negative refraction index, arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat/0203451. Cited on page 755.

630 The first example of material system with a negative refraction index were presented by David Smith and his team. R. A. Schelby, D. R. Smith & S. Schultz, Experimental verification of a negative index of refraction, *Science* **292**, p. 77-79, 2001. More recent examples are A. A. Houck, J. B. Brock & I. L. Chuang, Experimental observations

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

of a left-handed material that obeys Snell's law, *Physical Review Letters* **90**, p. 137401, 2003, C. G. Parazzoli, R. B. Greegor, K. Li, B. E. C. Koltenbah & M. Tanielian, Experimental verification and simulation of negative index of refraction using Snell's law, *Physical Review Letters* **90**, p. 107401, 2003. S. Foteinopoulou, E. N. Economou & C. M. Soukoulis, Refraction in media with a negative refractive index, *Physical Review Letters* **90**, p. 107402, 2003. Cited on page 755.

631 S. A. Ramakrishna, Physics of negative refractive index materials, *Reorts on Progress of Physics* **68**, pp. 449–521, 2005. Cited on pages 755 and 756.

632 J. Pendry, Negegative refraction makes a perfect lens, *Physical Review Letters* **85**, p. 3966, 2000. See also J. B. Pendry, D. Schurig & D. R. Smith, Controlling electromagnetic fields, *Science* **312**, pp. 1780–1782, 2006, and D. Schurig, J. J. Mock, B. J. Justice, S. A. Cummer, J. B. Pendry, A. F. Starr & D. R. Smith, Metamaterial electromagnetic cloak at microwave frequencies, *Science* **314**, pp. 977–980, 2006. Cited on page 756.

633 On metamaterials, see A. Lai, C. Caloz & T. Itoh, Composite rightleft-handed transmission metamaterials, *IEEE Microwave Magazine* **5**, pp. 34–50, September 2004. Cited on page 756.

634 M. Zedler & P. Russer, Investigation on the Dispersion Relation of a 3D LC-based Metamaterial with an Omnidirectional Left-Handed Frequency Band, *2006 International Microwave Symposium Digest, San Francisco* pp. 1477–1479, 2006. M. Zedler, C. Caloz & P. Russer, A 3D Isotropic left-handed metamaterial based on the rotated transmission line matrix (TLM) scheme, *IEEE Transactions on Microwave Theory and Techniques* 2007. Cited on page 756.

635 G. Nimtz, A. Enders & H. Spieker, *Journal de Physique I (Paris)* **4**, p. 565, 1994. Unfortunately, Nimtz himself seems to believe that he transported energy or signals faster than light; he is aided by the often badly prepared critics of his quite sophisticated experiments. See A. Enders & G. Nimtz, *Physikalische Blätter* **49**, p. 1119, Dezember 1993, and the weak replies in *Physikalische Blätter* **50**, p. 313, April 1994. See also A. M. Steinberg, *Journal de Physique I (Paris)* **4**, p. 1813, 1994, A. M. Steinberg, P. G. Kwiat & R. Y. Chiao, *Physical Review Letters* **71**, pp. 708–711, 1993, and A. Ranfagni, P. Fabeni, G. P. Pazzi & D. Mugnai, *Physical Review E* **48**, p. 1453, 1993. Cited on page 757.

636 A summary of all evidence about the motion of the aether is given by R. S. Shankland, S. W. McCuskey, F. C. Leone & G. Kuerti, New analysis of the interferometer observations of Dayton C. Miller, *Review of Modern Physics* **27**, pp. 167–178, 1955. An older text is H. Witte, *Annalen der Physik* **26**, p. 235, 1908. Cited on page 758.

637 The history of the concept of vacuum can be found in the book by E. Grant, *Much Ado About Nothing*, Cambridge University Press, 1981, and in the extensive reference text by Edmund T. Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume 1: *The Classical Theories*, Volume 2: *The Modern Theories*, Tomash Publishers, American Institute of Physics 1951, 1987. Cited on page 758.

The various *aether models* – gears, tubes, vortices – proposed in the nineteenth century were dropped for various reasons. Since many models used to explain electric and magnetic fields as motion of some entities, it was concluded that the speed of light would depend on electric or magnetic fields. One type of field was usually described by linear motion of the entities, the other by rotatory or twisting motion; both assignments are possible. As a consequence, aether must be a somewhat strange fluid that flows perfectly, but that resists rotation of volume elements, as McCullogh deduced in 1839. However, experiments show

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

that the speed of light in vacuum does not depend on electromagnetic field intensity. Vortices were dropped because real world vortices were found out to be unstable. All models received their final blow when they failed to meet the requirements of special relativity.

638 This happened to Giovanni Bellini (*c.* 1430–1516) the great Venetian Renaissance painter, who even put this experience into writing, thus producing one of the greatest 'gaffes' ever. If you take a photograph of the effect with a remotely controlled camera, you can prove that your camera is holy as well. Cited on page 760.

639 S. R. Wilk, How retroreflectors really work, *Optics & Photonics News,* pp. 6–7, December 1993. Cited on page 760.

640 W. H. Ehrenstein & B. Lingelbach, Das Hermann–Gitter, *Physik in unserer Zeit* **6**, pp. 263–268, 2002. The journal also shows a colour variation of these lattices. Cited on page 760.

641 The eye sensitivity myth is debunked in detail by B. H. Soffer & D. K. Lynch, Some paradoxes, errors, and resolutions concerning the spectral optimization of human vision, *American Journal of Physics* **67**, pp. 946–953, 1999. Cited on page 763.

642 David R. Williams, Supernormal Vision, *Science News* **152**, pp. 312–313, 15 November 1997. See also www.cvs.rochester.edu/people/d_williams/d_williams.html as well as the photographs at www.cvs.rochester.edu/people/~aroorda/ao_research.html of the interior of living human eyes. Their last publication is A. Roorda, A. Metha, P. Lennie & D. R. Williams, Packing arrangement of the three cone classes in the primate retina, *Vision Research* **41**, pp. 1291–1306, 2001. Cited on page 763.

643 S. W. Hell, Strategy for far-field optical imaging and writing without diffraction limit, *Physics Letters A* **326**, pp. 140–145, 2004, see also V. Westphal & S. W. Hell, Nanoscale resolution in the focal plane of an optical microscope, *Physical Review Letters* **94**, p. 143903, 2005, and V. Westphal, J. Seeger, T. Salditt & S. W. Hell, Stimulated emission depletion microscopy on lithographic microstructures, *Journal of Physics B* **38**, pp. S695–S705, 2005. Cited on page 768.

644 A. D. Erlykin & A. W. Wolfendale, The origin of cosmic rays, *European Journal of Physics* **20**, pp. 409–418, 1999, Cited on page 774.

645 D. Singleton, Electromagnetic angular momentum and quantum mechanics, *American Journal of Physics* **66**, pp. 697–701, 1998, Cited on page 722.

646 A. Yazdani, D. M. Eigler & N. D. Lang, Off-resonance conduction through atomic wires, *Science* **272**, pp. 1921–1924, 28 June 1996. For aluminium, gold, lead, niobium, as well as the influence of chemical properties, see Elke Scheer, The signature of chemical valence in the electric conduction through a single-atom contact, *Nature* **394**, pp. 154–157, 9 July 1998. Cited on page 703.

647 See L. Kowalski, A myth about capacitors in series, *The Physics Teacher* **26**, pp. 286–287, 1988, and A. P. French, Are the textbook writers wrong about capacitors?, *The Physics Teacher* **31**, pp. 156–159, 1993. Cited on page 703.

648 This problem was suggested by Vladimir Surdin. Cited on page 770.

649 See for example, J. M. Aguirregabiria, A. Hernandez & M. Rivas, Velocity fields inside a conducting sphere near a slowly moving charge, *American Journal of Physics* **62**, pp. 462–466, 1994. Cited on page 794.

650 Philip Cohen, Open wide, this won't hurt a bit, *New Scientist* p. 5, 3 February 1996. Cited on page 794.

651 Such a claim was implicitly made by D. Mugnai, A. Ranfagni & R. Ruggieri, Observation of superluminal behaviors in wave propagation, *Physical Review Letters* **84**,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

p. 4830, 2000. An excellent explanation and rebuttal was given by W. A. Rodrigues, D. S. Thober & A. L. Xavier, Causal explanation for observed superluminal behavior of microwave propagation in free space, arxiv.org/abs/physics/0012032. Cited on page 771.

652 J. E. Avron, E. Berg, D. Goldsmith & A. Gordon, Is the number of photons a classical invariant?, *European Journal of Physics* **20**, pp. 153–159, 1999. Cited on page 795.

653 If you want to see more on how the world looks for the different types of colour blind, have a look at the webexhibits.org/causesofcolor/2.html or the www.vischeck.com/examples web pages. Cited on page 771.

654 If you want to read more on the topic, have a look at the classic text by Warren J. Smith, *Modern Optical Engineering : the Design of Optical Systems*, 3rd edition, McGraw-Hill, 2000. Cited on pages 744 and 772.

655 Most of the world's experts in lightning are Russian. Two good books are Vladimir A. Rakov & Martin A. Uman, *Lightning: Physics and Effects*, Cambridge University Press, 2003, and Eduard M. Bazelyon & Yuri P. Raizer, *Lightning Physics and Lightning Protection*, Institute of Physics Publishing, 2000. Cited on page 776.

656 About the life-long passion that drove Luke Howard, see the book by Richard Hamblyn, *The Invention of Clouds*, Macmillan 2001. Cited on page 776.

657 J. Latham, The electrification of thunderstorms, *Quartely Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* **107**, pp. 277–289, 1981. For a more recent and wider review, see Earle R. Williams, The tripole structure of thunderstorms, *Journal of Geophysical Research* **94**, pp. 13151–13167, 1989. See also the book by the National Research Council Staff, *The Earth's Electrical Environment*, Studies in Geophysics, National Academy Press, 1986. Cited on page 776.

658 A. V. Gurevich & K. P. Zybin, Runaway breakdown and the mysteries of lightning, *Physics Today* **58**, pp. 37–43, May 2005. Cited on page 776.

659 To learn more about atmospheric currents, you may want to have a look at the popularizing review of the US work by E. A. Bering, A. A. Few & J. R. Benbrook, The global electric circuit, *Physics Today* **51**, pp. 24–30, October 1998, or the more technical overview by E. Bering, *Reviews of Geophysics* (supplement) **33**, p. 845, 1995. Cited on page 777.

660 The use of Schumann resonances in the Earth–ionosphere capacitor for this research field is explained in K. Schlegel & M. Füllerkrug, Weltweite Ortung von Blitzen, *Physik in unserer Zeit* **33**, pp. 257–261, 2002. Cited on page 778.

661 J.R. Dwyer, M.A. Uman, H.K. Rassoul, M. Al-Dayeh, E.L. Caraway, J. Jerauld, V.A. Rakov, D.M. Jordan, K.J. Rambo, V. Corbin &B. Wright, Energetic radiation produced by rocket-triggered lightning, *Science* **299**, pp. 694–697, 2003. Cited on page 778.

662 J. R. Dwyer, A fundamental limit on electric fields in air, *Geophysical Research Letters* **30**, p. 2055, 2003. Cited on page 778.

663 B. M. Smirnov, Physics of ball lightning, *Physics Reports* **224**, pp. 151–236, 1993. See also D. Finkelstein & J. Rubinstein, Ball lightning, *Physical Review* **135**, pp. 390–396, 1964. For more folklore on the topic, just search the world wide web. Cited on page 778.

664 G. D. Shabanov, The optical properties of long-lived luminous formations, *Technical Physics Letters* **28**, pp. 164–166, 2002, A. I. Egorov & S. I. Stepanov, Long-lived plasmoids produced in humid air as analogues of ball lightning, *Technical Physics* **47**, pp. 1584–1586, 2002, A. E. Egorov, S. I. Stepanov & G. D. Shabanov, *Physics Uspekhi* Laboratory demonstration of ball lightning, **47**, pp. 99–101, 2004, and

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

G. D. Shabanov & B. Yu. Sokolovskii, Macroscopic separation of charges in a pulsed electric discharge, *Plasma Physics Reports* **31**, pp. 512–518, 2005. (All these are English translations of earlier Russian papers.) See the websites biod.pnpi.spb.ru/pages_ru/Stepanov/index.html stealthtank.narod.ru, balllightning.narod.ru/hvewd.html and www.ipp.mpg.de/ippcms/eng/presse/pi/05_06_pi.html, for more details and more spectacular films. Cited on page 779.

665 G. Silva Paiva, A. C. Pavão, E. Alpes de Vasconcelos, O. Mendes & da Silva, Production of ball-lightning-like luminous balls by electrical discharges in silicon, *Physics Review Letters* **98**, p. 048501, 2007. Cited on page 779.

666 For a recent summary, see S. Parrott, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9711027. See also T. A. Abbott & D. J. Griffiths, Acceleration without radiation, *American Journal of Physics* **53**, pp. 1203–1211, 1985. See also A. Kovetz & G. E. Tauber, Radiation from an accelerated charge and the principle of equivalence, *American Journal of Physics* **37**, pp. 382–385, 1969. Cited on page 780.

667 de Almeida & A. Saa, The radiation of a uniformly accelerated charge is beyond the horizon: a simple derivation, *American Journal of Physics* **74**, pp. 154–158, 2006. Cited on page 780.

668 J. Zhang, X. D. Song, Y. C. Li, P. G. Richards, X. L. Sun & F. Waldhauser, Inner core differential motion confirmed by earthquake doublet waveform doublets, *Science* **309**, pp. 1357–1360, 2005. Cited on page 781.

669 This is deduced from the $g-2$ measurements, as explained in his Nobel Prize talk by Hans Dehmelt, Experiments with an isolated subatomic particle at rest, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **62**, pp. 525–530, 1990, and in Hans Dehmelt, Is the electron a composite particle?, *Hyperfine Interactions* **81**, pp. 1–3, 1993. Cited on page 781.

670 A good and short introduction is the paper F. Rohrlich, The self-force and radiation reaction, *American Journal of Physics* **68**, pp. 1109–1112, 2000. Cited on page 782.

671 C. G. Tsagas, Magnetic tension and the geometry of the universe, *Physical Review Letters* **86**, pp. 5421–5424, 2001. An overview of the topic is C. G. Tsagas, Geometrical aspects of cosmic magnetic fields, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0112077. Cited on page 782.

672 An excellent review is E. H. Brandt, Levitation in Physics, *Science* **243**, pp. 349–355, 1989. Cited on pages 782 and 786.

673 See the article by R. Tuckermann, S. Bauerecker & B. Neidhart, Levitation in Ultraschallfeldern – Schwebende Tröpfchen, *Physik in unserer Zeit* **32**, pp. 69–75, February 2001. Liquid drops up to 1 g have been levitated in this way. Cited on page 782.

674 F. C. Moon & P. Z. Chang, *Superconducting Levitation – Applications to Bearings and Magnetic Transportation*, Wiley & Sons, 1994. Cited on pages 783 and 785.

675 W. T. Scott, Who was Earnshaw?, *American Journal of Physics* **27**, pp. 418–419, 1959. Cited on page 783.

676 The trick is to show that $\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{E} = 0$, $\operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{E} = 0$, thus $E\nabla^2 E = 0$ and, from this, $\nabla^2 E^2 \geqslant 0$; there are thus no local electric field maxima in the absence of free charges. The same proof works for the magnetic field. However, bodies with dielectric constants *lower* than their environment *can* be levitated in static electric fields. An example is gas bubbles in liquids, as shown by T. B. Jones & G. W. Bliss, Bubble dielectrophoresis, *Journal of Applied Physics* **48**, pp. 1412–1417, 1977. Cited on page 783.

677 See A. K. Geim, M. D. Simon, M. I. Boamfa & L. O. Heflinger, Magnet levitation at your fingertips, *Nature* **400**, pp. 323–324, 1999. Cited on page 784.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

678 B. Scharlau, V. Nordmeier & H. J. Schlichting, Magnetische Levitation, in Deutsche Physikalische Gesellschaft, (editor) *Didaktik der Physik*, Lehmanns, 2003. Cited on page 784.

679 The first photographs of a single *ion* were in W. Neuhauser, M. Hohenstatt, P. E. Toschek & H. Dehmelt, Localized visible Ba^+ mono-ion oscillator, *Physical Review A* **22**, pp. 1137–1140, 1980. See also D. J. Wineland & W. M. Itano, *Physics Letters A* **82**, p. 75, 1981, as well as F. Dietrich & H. Walter, *Physical Review Letters* **58**, p. 203, 1987.

For single *atoms*, see photographs in Z. Hu & H. J. Kimble, *Optics Letters* **1**, p. 1888, 1994, F. Ruschewitz, D. Bettermann, J. L. Peng & W. Ertmer, *Europhysics Letters* **34**, p. 651, 1996, D. Haubrich, H. Schadwinkel, F. Strauch, B. Ueberholz, R. Wynands & D. Meschede, *Europhysics Letters* **34**, p. 663, 1996. Cited on page 785.

680 See for example Mark Buchanan, And God said...let there be levitating strawberries, flying frogs and humans that hover over Seattle, *New Scientist* pp. 42–43, 26 July 1997, or C. Wu, Floating frogs, *Science News* **152**, pp. 632–363, 6 December 1997, and C. Wu, Molecular magnetism takes off, *Physics World* April 1997, page 28. The experiments by Andre Geim, Jan Kees Maan, Humberto Carmona and Peter Main were made public by P. Rodgers, *Physics World* **10**, p. 28, 1997. Some of the results can be found in M. V. Berry & A. K. Geim, Of flying frogs and levitrons, *European Journal of Physics* **18**, pp. 307–313, 1997. See also their www-hfml.sci.kun.nl/hfml/levitate.html website. Cited on page 785.

681 The well-known toy allows levitation without the use of any energy source and is called the 'Levitron'. It was *not* invented by Bill Hones of Fascination Toys & Gifts in Seattle, as the www.levitron.com website explains. The toy is discussed by Ron Edge, Levitation using only permanent magnets, *Physics Teacher* **33**, p. 252, April 1995. It is also discussed in M. V. Berry, The Levitron^{TM}: an adiabatic trap for spins, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A* **452**, pp. 1207–1220, 1996, (of Berry's phase fame) as well as by M. D. Simon, L. O. Heflinger & S. L. Ridgeway, Spin stabilized magnetic levitation, *American Journal of Physics* **65**, pp. 286–92, 1997, and by T. B. Jones, M. Washizu & R. Gans, Simple theory for the Levitron, *Journal of Applied Physics* **82**, pp. 883–889, 1997. Cited on page 786.

682 The drill trick and the building of a Levitron are described in the beautiful lecture script by Josef Zweck, *Physik im Alltag*, Skript zur Vorlesung im WS 1999/2000 der Universität Regensburg. Cited on page 786.

683 The prediction about quantized levitation is by Stephen B. Haley, Length quantization in levitation of magnetic microparticles by a mesoscopic superconducting ring, *Physical Review Letters* **74**, pp. 3261–3264, 1995. The topic is discussed in more detail in Stephen B. Haley, Magnetic levitation, suspension, and superconductivity: macroscopic and mesoscopic, *Physical Review B* **53**, p. 3506, 1996, reversed in order with Stephen B. Haley, Quantized levitation of superconducting multiple-ring systems, *Physical Review B* **53**, p. 3497, 1996, as well as Stephen B. Haley, Quantized levitation by multiply-connected superconductors, LT-21 Proceedings, in *Czechoslovak Journal of Physics* **46**, p. 2331, 1996. In 1998, there was not yet an experimental confirmation (Stephen Haley, private communication). Cited on page 786.

684 Detailed descriptions of many of these effects can be found in the excellent overview edited by Manfred von Ardenne, Gerhard Musiol & Siegfried Reball, *Effekte der Physik und ihre Anwendungen*, Harri Deutsch, 2004. Cited on page 786.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

685 R. Buddakian, K. Weninger, R. A. Hiller & Seth J. Putterman, Picosecond discharges and stick–slip friction at a moving meniscus of mercury in glass, *Nature* **391**, pp. 266–268, 15 January 1998. See also *Science News* **153**, p. 53, 24 January 1998. Cited on page 787.

686 Henk Swagten & Reinder Coehoorn, Magnetische tunneljuncties, *Nederlands tijdschrift voor natuurkunde* **64**, pp. 279–283, November 1998. Cited on page 787.

687 H. Ohno, D. Chiba, F. Matsukura, T. Omiya, E. Abe, T. Dietl, Y. Ohno & K. Ohtani, Electric-field control of ferromagnetism, *Nature* **408**, pp. 944–946, 21-28 December 2000. Cited on page 787.

688 This effect was discovered by Geert Rikken, Bart van Tiggelen & Anja Sparenberg, Lichtverstrooiing in een magneetveld, *Nederlands tijdschrift voor natuurkunde* **63**, pp. 67–70, maart 1998. Cited on page 789.

689 Vitalij Pecharsky & Karl A. Gschneidner, Giant magnetocaloric effect in Gd5(Si2Ge2), *Physical Review Letters* **78**, pp. 4494–4497, 1995, and, from the same authors, Tunable magnetic regenerator alloys with a giant magnetocaloric effect for magnetic refrigeration from ~20 to ~2990 K, *Applied Physics Letters* **70**, p. 3299, 1997. Cited on page 789.

690 J. Weissmüller, R. N. Viswanath, D. Kramer, P. Zimmer, R. Würschum & H. Gleiter, Charge-induced reversible strain in a metal, *Science* **300**, pp. 312–315, 11 April 2003. Cited on page 789.

691 A. Ajdari, Electro-osmosis on inhomogeneously charged surfaces, *Physical Review Letters* **75**, pp. 755–758, 1995. Cited on page 790.

692 M. J. Aitken, *Thermoluminescence Dating*, Academic Press, 1985. The precision of the method is far worse that C14 dating, however, as shown by H. Huppertz, *Thermolumineszenzdatierung: eine methodologische Analyse aufgrund gesicherter Befunde*, Peter Lang Verlag, 2000. Cited on page 791.

693 This effect was discovered by J. N. Huiberts, R. Griessen, J. H. Rector, R. J. Wijngarden, J. P. Dekker, D. G. de Groot & N. J. Koeman, Yttrium and lanthanum hydride films with switchable optical properties, *Nature* **380**, pp. 231–234, 1996. A good introduction is R. Griessen, Schaltbare Spiegel aus Metallhydriden, *Physikalische Blätter* **53**, pp. 1207–1209, 1997. Cited on page 792.

694 See any book on thermostatics, such as Linda Reichl, *A Modern Course in Statistical Physics*, Wiley, 2nd edition, 1998. Cited on page 793.

695 The Sun emits about $4 \cdot 10^{26}$ W from its mass of $2 \cdot 10^{30}$ kg, about 0.2 mW/kg; a person with an average mass of 75 kg emits about 100 W (you can check this in bed at night), i.e., about 500 times more. Cited on page 793.

696 See its www.cie.co.at/cie website. Cited on page 768.

697 P. D. Jones, M. New, D. E. Parker, S. Martin & I. G. Rigor, Surface air temperature and its changes over the past 150 years, *Reviews of Geophysics* **37**, pp. 173–199, May 1999. Cited on page 768.

698 Pictures of objects in a red hot oven and at room temperature are shown in C. H. Bennett, Demons, engines and the second law, *Scientific American* **255**, pp. 108–117, November 1987. Cited on page 769.

699 Bill McGuire, *A Guide to the End of the World: Everything You Never Wanted to Know*, Oxford University Press, 2002. On past disasters, see introduction by Tony Hallam, *Catastrophes and Lesser Calamities – the Causes of Mass Extinctions*, Oxford University Press, 2004. Cited on page 800.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

700 See for example the beautiful textbook by Stephen C. Stearns & Rolf F. Hoekstra, *Evolution: An Introduction*, Oxford University Press, 2000. For fascinating story of evolution for non-specialists, see Richard Fortey, *Life – An Unauthorized Biography*, Harper Collins, 1997, or also Menno Schilthuizen, *Frogs, Flies & Dandelions – the Making of Species*, Oxford University Press/ 2001. See also Stephen J. Gould, *The Panda's thumb*, W.W. Norton & Co., 1980, one of the several interesting and informative books on evolutionary biology by the best writer in the field. An informative overview over the results of evolution, with the many-branched family tree that it produced, is given on the phylogeny.arizona.edu/tree website. About the results of evolution for human beings, see the informative text by K. Kusch & S. Kusch, *Der Mensch in Zahlen*, Spektrum Akademischer Verlag, 2nd edn., 2000. The epochal work by Charles Darwin, *On the Origin of Species*, can be found on the web, e.g. on the entisoft.earthlink.net/origspec.htm and on the www.darwin-online.org.uk websites. Cited on page 805.

701 A simple description is Malcolm Ross Macdonald, *The Origin of Johnny*, Jonathan Cape, 1976. See also Bas Haring, *Kaas en de evolutietheorie*, Houtekiet, 2001. Cited on page 805.

702 Richard Bandler, *Using Your Brain for a Change*, Real People Press, p. 18, 1985. Cited on page 805.

703 There is disagreement among experts about the precise timing of this experience. Some say that only birth itself is that moment. However, there are several standard methods to recall memories of early life, even of the time before birth; one is described and used by J. K. Stettbacher, *Making Sense of Suffering*, Penguin, New York, 1991, translated from the German original. Even more impressive examples are given by N. J. Mayer, *Der Kainkomplex – neue Wege der systemischen Familientherapie*, Integral Verlag, 1998. Cited on page 805.

704 Sanjida O'Connell, *Mindreading – How We Learn to Love and Lie*, Arrow, 1998. This interesting book describes the importance of lying in the development of a human being, and explains the troubles those people have who cannot read other minds and thus cannot lie, such as autistics. Cited on pages 807 and 840.

705 The approach to describe observations as related parts is called structuralism; the starting point for this movement was de Saussure's *Cours de linguistique générale* (see the footnote on page 817). A number of thinkers have tried to use the same approach in philosophy, mythology and literature theory, though with little success. An overview of the (modest) success of structuralism in linguistics and its failure in other fields is given by L. Jackson, *The Poverty of Structuralism: Literature and Structuralist Theory*, Longman, 1991. The author argues that when one reduces systems to interactions, one neglects the specific content and properties of the elements of the system, and this approach prevents a full understanding of the system under discussion. Cited on page 807.

706 For a view of the mental abilities different from that of Piaget (described on page 807), a presently much discussed author is the Soviet experimental psychologist Lev Vigotsky, whose path-breaking ideas and complicated life are described, e.g., in Lev Vigotsky, *Mind in Society*, Harvard University Press, 1978, or in René van der Veer & Jaan Valsiner, *Understanding Vigotsky: a Quest for Synthesis*, Blackwell Publishers, 1994. More extensive material can be found in the extensive work by René van der Veer & Jaan Valsinger, *The Vigotsky Reader*, Blackwell, 1994. Cited on page 807.

707 A somewhat unconventional source for more details is the beautiful text by Bruno Bettelheim, The Uses of Enchantment: the Meaning and Importance of Fairy Tales, Knopf, 1976. Cited on page 808.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

708 A simple introduction is MANFRED SPITZER, *Lernen – Gehirnforschung und Schule des Lebens*, Elsevier, 2007. Cited on page 808.

709 Quoted in V. HARLEN, R. RAPPMANN & P. SCHATA, *Soziale Plastik – Materialien zu Joseph Beuys*, Achberger Verlag, 1984, p. 61. Cited on page 808.

710 The problems appearing when one loses the ability to classify or to memorise are told in the beautiful book by the neurologist OLIVER SACKS, *The Man Who Mistook His Wife for a Hat*, Picador, 1985, which collects many case studies he encountered in his work. More astonishing cases are collected in his equally impressive text *An Anthropologist on Mars*, Picador, 1995.

See also the beautiful text DONALD D. HOFFMAN, *Visual Intelligence – How We Create What We See*, W.W. Norton & Co., 1998, and the ari.ss.uci.edu/cogsci/personnel/hoffman.html website associated to it. Cited on pages 808 and 811.

711 For a passionate introduction to the connections between language and the brain from a Chomskian perspective, see the bestselling book by STEVEN PINKER, *The Language Instinct – How the Mind Creates Language*, Harper Perennial, 1994. The green idea sentence is discussed in a chapter of the book. Cited on pages 808, 845, and 862.

712 An introduction to neurology is JOSEPH LEDOUX, *Synaptic Self: How Our Brains Become Who We Are*, Viking Press, 2002. Cited on page 808.

713 An overview of the status of the research into the origin of bipedalism is given by B. WOOD, Four legs good, two legs better, *Nature* **363**, pp. 587–588, 17 June 1983. Cited on page 808.

714 A good introduction into the study of classifiers is JAMES A. ANDERSON, *An Introduction to Neural Networks*, MIT Press, 1995. An introduction to computer science is given in GLENN BROOKSHEAR, *Computer Science, An Overview*, 6th edition, Addison Wesley, 2000, or in RICK DECKER & STUART HIRSHFIELD, *The Analytical Engine: An Introduction to Computer Science Using the Internet*, Brooks/Cole Publishers, 1998. Cited on page 808.

715 More about the connection between entropy and computers can be found in the classic paper by R. LANDAUER, Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process, *IBM Journal of Research and Development* **5**, pp. 183–191, 1961, and in C. H. BENNETT & R. LANDAUER, The fundamental physical limits of computation, *Scientific American* **253**, pp. 48–56, 1985. Cited on page 813.

716 W. H. ZUREK, Thermodynamic cost of computation, algorithmic complexity and the information metric, *Nature* **341**, pp. 119–124, 14 August 1989. Cited on page 813.

717 L. SZILARD, Über die Entropieverminderung in einem thermodynamischen System bei Eingriffen intelligenter Wesen, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **53**, p. 840, 1929. This classic paper can also be found in English translation in the collected works by Leo Szilard. Cited on page 813.

718 J.J. Hopfield/ *Nature* **376**, pp. 33–36, 1995. This paper by one of the fathers of the field presents one possibility by which the *timing* of nerve signals, instead of the usually assumed firing frequency, could also carry information. Cited on page 813.

719 The details of the properties of the firing patterns of neurons are nicely described in the article by M. MAHOWALD & R. DOUGLAS, A silicon neuron, *Nature* **354**, pp. 515–518, 19/26 December 1991, in which they show how to simulate a neuron's electrical behaviour using a silicon circuit. Cited on page 813.

720 A. MECHELLI, J. T. CRINION, U. NOPPENEY, J. O'DOBERTY, J. ASHBURNER, R. S. FRACKOWIAK & C. J. PRICE, Neurolinguistics: structural plasticity in the bilingual brain, *Nature* **431**, p. 757, 2004. Cited on page 814.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

721 The discussion whether the brain is or is not superior to a computer is nicely summarised by G. Vollmer, Algorithmen, Gehirne, Computer – Was sie können und was sie nicht können, Teil I und Teil II, *Naturwissenschaften* **78**, p. 481, 1991, and **78**, pp. 533–542, 1991. Cited on page 815.

722 However, the language with the largest available dictionary is Dutch, with the 40 volumes of the Wordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal, which appeared between 1864 and 1998. It has almost 400 000 entries. Cited on page 818.

723 The list and the remark on discovery on concepts is due to a personal communication from Anna Wierzbicka. A longer list is published in her book *Semantics, Primes and Universals*, Oxford University Press, 1996. Cited on pages 819 and 838.

724 W. S. Hatcher, *Foundations of Mathematics*, W.B. Saunders Co., Philadelphia, 1968. There is also the article by P. J. Cohen & R. Hersch, Non-Cantorian set theory, *Scientific American* **217**, pp. 104–116, 1967. Cohen was the mathematician who in 1963 proved that the negation of the continuum hypothesis could be added to the axioms of set theory and still produce a consistent theory; he calls such sets *non-Cantorian*. Cited on page 824.

725 See the beautiful article by I. Stewart, Fair shares for all, *New Scientist*, pp. 42–46, 17 June 1995. Cited on page 824.

726 The proof of the independence of the continuum hypothesis came in two parts. First, Kurt Gödel proved in 1940 that an axiom can be consistently added to ZFC set theory so that the continuum hypothesis is correct. Then, in 1963, Paul Cohen proved that an axiom can be consistently added to ZFC set theory so that the continuum hypothesis is false. Cited on page 826.

727 Rudy Rucker, *Infinity and the Mind – the Science and Philosophy of the Infinite*, Bantam, Toronto, 1983. Cited on page 826.

728 This general division of mathematics is nicely explained in the text by Pierre Basieux, *Die Architektur der Mathematik – Denken in Strukturen*, Rororo, 2000. Cited on page 827.

729 The issue is treated in Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, in question 52 of the first part. The complete text, several thousand pages, can be found on the www.newadvent.org website. We come back to it in the part on quantum theory, in the section on the Pauli exclusion principle. It seems that the whole question goes back to Peter (the) Lombard, *Liber Sententiarum c.* 1150. Cited on page 828.

Page 1069

730 B. C. Gallivan, How to fold paper in half twelve times: an "impossible challenge" solved and explained, Histrical Society of Pomona Valley, 2002, also found at www.osb.net/Pomona/12times.htm. See also www.sciencenews.org/20040124/mathtrek.asp. Cited on page 828.

731 I. Stewart, Daisy, daisy, give me your answer, do, *Scientific American*, pp. 76–79, January 1995. This pedagogical article explains how the growth of plants usually leads to flowers whose number of petals is from the Fibonacci series 1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, 21, 34, 55, 89, 144, etc. (The figure on page 193 is an example.) Deviations from this ideal case are also explained. The original work are two articles by S. Douady & Y. Couder, La physique des spirales végétales, *La Recherche* **24**, pp. 26–36, 1993, and Phyllotaxis as a self-organized growth process, in *Growth Patterns in Physical Sciences and Biology*, edited by J.M. Garcia-Ruiz & al., Plenum Press, 1993. Cited on page 828.

732 H. Davson, *The Eye*, Academic Press, 1962. Cited on page 829.

733 See the akbar.marlboro.edu/~mahoney/cube/NxN.txt website. Cited on page 829.

734 An introduction to the surreal numbers is given by the article by Polly Shulman, Infinity plus one, and other surreal numbers, *Discover*, pp. 99–105, December 1995. There is also

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

the text by D. Knuth, *Surreal Numbers: How two ex-Students Turned on to Pure Mathematics and Found Total Happiness*, Addison Wesley, 1974, or www-cs-faculty.stanford.edu/~knuth/sn.html. The usually quoted references on the topic include John H. Conway, *On Numbers and Games*, Academic Press, 1976, E. R. Berlekamp, J. H. Conway & R. K. Guy, *Winning Ways for Your Mathematical Plays, Volume I: Games in General*, Academic Press, 1982, and H. Gonshor, *An Introduction to Surreal Numbers*, Cambridge University Press, 1986. Cited on pages 830 and 831.

735 This beautiful problem is discussed by Ian Stewart, A bundling fool beats the wrap, *Scientific American,* pp. 109–111, June 1993. In four dimensions, the answer is known to lie somewhere between 50 000 and 100 000, whereas the five-dimensional answer is conjectured to be 'never'. Cited on page 832.

736 A. Pais, *Niels Bohr's Times: in Physics, Philosophy and Polity*, Oxford University Press, 1991, page 176. Cited on page 832.

737 Eugene Wigner, *Symmetries and Reflections*, Indiana University Press, 1962. Cited on page 832.

738 Alfred Tarski, *Introduction to Modern Logic*, Dover, 1946. See also the famous children's book by the mathematician and photographer Lewis Carroll, *Alice in Wonderland*. Cited on page 833.

739 Gˆran Wikell, The layout of digits on pushbutton telephones – a review of the literature, *Tele* 34, pp. 34–42, 1982. Cited on page 834.

740 A clear overview of philosophy of science, often called *epistemology*, without unnecessary detail, is given by Robert Blanché, L'Epistémologie, Presses Universitaires de France, 1972. Cited on page 836.

741 About the different aspects of falsifiability of general statements it is commonplace to cite the work by the epitemologist Karl Popper (1902–1994), especially his long and boring book *Logik der Forschung*, first published in 1934. The reason for this boredom is that Popper's work is simply a warming-up of Pierre Duhem's ideas. Cited on page 841.

742 For a good way of making blood that liquefies, see L. Garlaschelli, F. Ramaccini & S. Della Scala, Working bloody miracles, *Nature* 353, p. 507, 1991. The *Grand dictionnaire universel du XIXe siècle*, by Pierre Larousse, also contains a recipe; it was again shown to the public in the 1980s by Henri Broch. A wonderful and classic text is Harry Houdini, *Miracle Mongers and their Methods*, Prometheus Books, Buffalo, 1981. The original, written in 1920, by the world famous magician named 'The Great Houdini', is also available on the etext.lib.virginia.edu/toc/modeng/public/HouMirM.html website. The milk drinking Indian statues were common around the world in 1994 and 1995. About healers, see James Randi, *Flim-flam!*, Prometheus Books, Buffalo, New York, 1987, and the exquisite book by Hans Conrad Zander, *Warum ich Jesus nicht leiden kann*, Rowohlt, 1994. Cited on page 842.

743 Roger Penrose, *The Road to Reality: A Complete Guide to the Laws of the Universe*, Jonathan Cape, 2004, page 378. Cited on page 859.

744 John Horgan, *The End of Science – Facing the Limits of Knowledge in the Twilight of the Scientific Age*, Broadway Books, 1997, pp. 31–32, and chapter 2, note 2. Cited on pages 844 and 860.

745 For an opinion completely contrary to the one described here, see the book by Gregory J. Chaitin, *The Limits of Mathematics*, Springer Verlag, 1997, which can also be found on the author's website www.cs.auckland.ac.nz/CDMTCS/chaitin/lm.html, along

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

with his other works. Chaitin has devoted most of his life to the questions discussed in the section, especially on computability. Cited on page 845.

746 See the book by J. Barwise & J. Etchemendy, *The Liar*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1987. Cited on page 845.

747 This definition (statement 4.11) and many other statements about science are in the beautiful and rightly famous text by Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus logico-philosophicus*, Edition Suhrkamp, 1963. It gives a condensed summary of the basis of science, thought and language in a collection of highly structured and numbered sentences. Cited on pages 849 and 853.

748 See M. Dresden, The Klopsteg memorial lecture, *American Journal of Physics* **66**, pp. 468–482, 1998. Cited on page 849.

749 Well-known books are e.g. Friedrich Kohlrausch, *Praktische Physik*, Teubner, 24. Auflage, 1996. Cited on page 850.

750 Results are described e.g. in L. Bergmann & C. Schäfer, *Lehrbuch der Experimentalphysik*, Band I, II, III und IV, W. de Gruyter. Cited on page 850.

751 Landolt-Börnstein, edited by K.-H. Hellwege & O. Madelung, *Zahlenwerte und Funktionen aus Naturwissenschaften und Technik*, Neue Serie, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1984. This series of more than one hundred volumes contains all important observations in the domain of physics. Cited on page 850.

752 The origin of this incorrect attribution is the book by Gerhard Szczesny, *Brecht, Leben des Galilei – Dichtung und Wirklichkeit*, Ullstein, Berlin 1966, p. 6. The statement has never been made by Galilei; this issue has been discussed at length in specialist circles, e.g. by F. Kleinert, "Messen was meßbar ist" - Über ein angebliches Galilei-Zitat, *Berichte zur Wissenschaftgeschichte* **11**, p. 221, 1988, or on the internet by Peter Jaencke. Cited on page 850.

753 The strange and sometimes dangerous consequences of beliefs can be found e.g. in Martin Gardner, *Fads and Fallacies*, Dover, 1957, and in James Randi, *Faith Healers*, Prometheus Books, 1989. The million dollar prize for showing any paranormal or supernormal effect is available from his www.randi.org website. Cited on page 854.

754 See the nice collection of cranks on the www.crank.net website. Cited on page 854.

755 As an example, the opposite view on the emergence of properties is strongly defended by P. Jensen, Particle physics and our everyday world, *Physics Today* pp. 58–59, July 1998. Cited on page 855.

756 See page 133 of the bibliography by John Bowlby, *Charles Darwin*, Pimlico, 1991. Cited on page 856.

757 A beautiful introduction to Greek philosophy is Eduard Zeller, *Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy*, Dover, 1980, a reprint of a book published in 1928. Among others, it gives a clear exposition of the philosophy of Democritus and the other presocratics. Cited on page 860.

758 The famous quote is found at the beginning of chapter XI, 'The Physical Universe', in Arthur Eddington, *The Philosophy of Physical Science*, Cambridge, 1939. Cited on page 860.

759 Giuseppe Fumagalli, *Chi l'ha detto?*, Hoepli, Milano, 1983. Cited on page 862.

760 See Jean-Paul Dumont, *Les écoles présocratiques*, Folio Essais, Gallimard, p. 653, 1991. Cited on page 862.

761 For a beautiful text on fractals, see the footnote on page 58. Cited on page 864.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

762 As has been pointed out by René Descartes. Cited on page 866.

763 The famous carbon ^{12}C resonance was found by Willy Fowler, as described in Margaret Burbridge, G.R. Burbridge, W.A. Fowler & F. Hoyle, Synthesis of the elements in stars, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **29**, pp. 547–560, 1957. Cited on page 869.

764 An extensive overview of the topic is given in the thick book by John D. Barrow & Frank J. Tipler, *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle*, Oxford University Press, 1986. The term itself is due to Brandon Carter, who coined it in 1973 and presented it in a symposium devoted to the 500th anniversary of Nicolaus Copernicus. For more literature, see Yuri I. Balashov, Resource Letter AP-1: the anthropic principle, *American Journal of Physics* **59**, pp. 1069–1076, 1991. Cited on page 869.

765 Voltaire, *Candide ou l'optimisme*, 1759. See the footnote on page 200. The book is so good that it was still being seized by the US customs in 1930, and the US post office refused to transport it as late as 1944. For more details, search for 'banned books online' on the world-wide web. Cited on page 870.

766 The number of books on consciousness is large and the contents not always interesting, and often not based on fact, as shown by Karl R. Popper & John Eccles, *The Self and its Brain – an Argument for Interactionism*, Rutledge, 1993. Cited on page 870.

767 See e.g. the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Macropaedia, in the entry on animal behaviour. Cited on page 871.

768 A straight and informative introduction to the work and ideas of Joseph Beuys (in German) is by Renate Georgi, Joseph Beuys, RAAbits Kunst, Raabe Fachverlag, September 1996. Cited on page 871.

769 Two studies, one by R.P. Ebstein & al., Dopamine D4 receptor (D4DR) exon III polymorphism associated with human personality trait of novelty seeking, *Nature Genetics* **12**, pp. 78–80, January 1996, and another study by J. Benjamin & al., Population and familial association between the D4 dopamine receptor gene and measures of novelty seeking, *Nature Genetics* **12**, pp. 81–84, January 1996, found that people with a special form of the D4 dopamine receptor gene, or D4DR, are more prone to novelty seeking than people with the usual form. The D4DR gene regulates the formation of dopamine receptors, a chemical messenger in the brain that has been a candidate for some time for a substance involved in the propensity for novelty seeking. Cited on page 872.

770 See Jacques Hadamard, *The Mathematician's Mind – The Psychology of Invention in the Mathematical Field*, Princeton Science Library, 1996. For a modern perspective, see Pierre de Gennes, *Fragile Objects: Soft Matter, Hard Science, and the Thrill of Discovery*, Springer, 1996. where de Gennes criticizes certain educational systems that put too much stress on mathematics, thus destroying creativity. Cited on page 872.

771 For example, one needs the courage to face envy. About this topic see the classic text by Helmut Schoeck, *Der Neid*, 1966, published in English as *Envy: A Theory of Social Behavior*, 1969. It is the standard work in the field. Cited on page 873.

772 A good reference is the *Encyclopedia of Mathematics*, in 10 volumes, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1988–1993. It explains most concepts used in mathematics. Spending an hour with it looking up related keywords is an efficient way to get an introduction into any part of mathematics, especially into the vocabulary and the main connections. Cited on page 875.

773 S.L. Altman, *Rotations, Quaternions and Double Groups*, Clarendon Press, 1986, and also S.L. Altman, Hamilton, Rodriguez and the quaternion scandal, *Mathematical Magazine* **62**, pp. 291–308, 1988. See also J.C. Hart, G.K. Francis & L.H. Kauffman, Visualzing quaternion rotation, *ACM Transactions on Graphics* **13**, pp. 256–276, 1994. The latter

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

can be downloaded in several places via the internet. Cited on page 881.

774 An excellent introduction into number systems in mathematics, including nonstandard numbers, quaternions, octonions, p-adic numbers and surreal numbers, is the book H.-D. Ebbinghaus, H. Hermes, F. Hirzebruch, M. Koecher, K. Mainzer, J. Neukirch, A. Prestel & R. Remmert, *Zahlen*, 3rd edition, Springer Verlag, 1993. It is also available in English, under the title *Numbers*, Springer Verlag, 1990. Cited on pages 876 and 885.

775 A. Waser, *Quaternions in Electrodynamics*, 2001. The text can be downloaded from various websites. Cited on pages 878 and 883.

776 See the fine book by Louis H. Kauffman, *Knots and Physics*, World Scientific, 2nd edition, 1994, which gives a clear and visual introduction to the mathematics of knots and their main applications to physics. Cited on page 881.

777 Gaussian integers are explored by G. H. Hardy & E. M. Wright, *An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers*, 5th edition, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1979, in the sections 12.2 'The Rational Integers, the Gaussian Integers, and the Integers', pp. 178–180, and 12.6 'Properties of the Gaussian Integers' pp. 182–183. For challenges relating to Gaussian integers, look at www.mathpuzzle.com/Gaussians.html. Cited on page 885.

778 About transfinite numbers, see the delightful paperback by Rudy Rucker, *Infinity and the Mind – the Science and Philosophy of the Infinite*, Bantam, 1983. Cited on page 885.

779 M. Flato, P. Sally & G. Zuckerman (editors), *Applications of Group Theory in Physics and Mathematical Physics*, Lectures in applied mathematics, volume 21, American Mathematical Society, 1985. This interesting book was written before the superstring revolution, so that the topic is missing from the otherwise excellent presentation. Cited on page 893.

780 An introduction to the classification theorem is R. Solomon, On finite simple groups and their classification, *Notices of the AMS* **42**, pp. 231–239, 1995, also available on the web as www.ams.org/notices/199502/solomon.ps Cited on page 900.

781 For an introduction to topology, see for example Mikio Nakahara, *Geometry, Topology and Physics*, IOP Publishing, 1990. Cited on page 895.

782 Le Système International d'Unités, Bureau International des Poids et Mesures, Pavillon de Breteuil, Parc de Saint Cloud, 92310 Sèvres, France. All new developments concerning SI units are published in the journal *Metrologia*, edited by the same body. Showing the slow pace of an old institution, the BIPM launched a website only in 1998; it is now reachable at www.bipm.fr. See also the www.utc.fr/~tthomass/Themes/Unites/index.html website; this includes the biographies of people who gave their names to various units. The site of its British equivalent, www.npl.co.uk/npl/reference, is much better; it provides many details as well as the English-language version of the SI unit definitions. Cited on page 909.

783 The bible in the field of time measurement is the two-volume work by J. Vanier & C. Audoin, *The Quantum Physics of Atomic Frequency Standards*, Adam Hilge, 1989. A popular account is Tony Jones, *Splitting the Second*, Institute of Physics Publishing, 2000.

The site opdafl.obspm.fr/www/lexique.html gives a glossary of terms used in the field. On length measurements, see ... On precision electric current measurements, see ... On mass and atomic mass measurements, see page 443. On high-precision temperature measurements, see page 349. Cited on page 910.

784 The unofficial prefixes were first proposed in the 1990s by Jeff K. Aronson of University of Oxford, and might come into general usage in the future. Cited on page 911.

785 For more details on electromagnetic unit systems, see the standard text by John David Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics*, 3rd edition, Wiley, 1998. Cited on page 914.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

786 G. J. Stoney, On the physical units of nature, *Philosophical Magazine* **11**, pp. 381–391, 1881. Cited on page 914.

787 D.J. Bird & al., Evidence for correlated changes in the spectrum and composition of cosmic rays at extremely high energies, *Physical Review Letters* **71**, pp. 3401–3404, 1993. Cited on page 914.

788 P. J. Hakonen, R. T. Vuorinen & J. E. Martikainen, Nuclear antiferromagnetism in rhodium metal at positive and negative nanokelvin temperatures, *Physical Review Letters* **70**, pp. 2818–2821, 1993. See also his article in *Scientific American*, January 1994. Cited on page 915.

789 G. Charpak & R. L. Garwin, The DARI, *Europhysics News* **33**, pp. 14–17, January/February 2002. Cited on page 915.

790 Measured values and ranges for physical quantities are collected in Horst Völz & Peter Ackermann, *Die Welt in Zahlen*, Spektrum Akademischer Verlag, 1996. Cited on page 916.

791 See e.g. K. Codling & L. J. Frasinski, Coulomb explosion of simple molecules in intense laser fields, *Contemporary Physics* **35**, pp. 243–255, 1994. Cited on page 917.

792 A. Zeilinger, The Planck stroll, *American Journal of Physics* **58**, p. 103, 1990. Can you find another similar example? Cited on page 917.

Challenge 1327 e

793 The most precise clock built in 2004, a caesium fountain clock, had a precision of one part in 10^{15}. Higher precision has been predicted to be possible soon, among others by M. Takamoto, F.-L. Hong, R. Higashi & H. Katori, An optical lattice clock, *Nature* **435**, pp. 321–324, 2005. Cited on page 918.

794 J. Bergquist, ed., *Proceedings of the Fifth Symposium on Frequency Standards and Metrology*, World Scientific, 1997. Cited on page 918.

795 See the information on $D_s^{\pm}$ mesons from the particle data group at pdg.web.cern.ch/pdg. Cited on page 918.

796 About the long life of tantalum 180, see D. Belic & al., Photoactivation of $^{180}Ta^{m}$ and its implications for the nucleosynthesis of nature's rarest naturally occurring isotope, *Physical Review Letters* **83**, pp. 5242–5245, 20 December 1999. Cited on page 918.

797 See the review by L. Ju, D. G. Blair & C. Zhao, The detection of gravitational waves, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **63**, pp. 1317–1427, 2000. Cited on page 918.

798 See the clear and extensive paper by G. E. Stedman, Ring laser tests of fundamental physics and geophysics, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **60**, pp. 615–688, 1997. Cited on page 918.

799 Following a private communication by Richard Rusby, this is the value of 1997, whereas it was estimated as 99.975 °C in 1989, as reported by Gareth Jones & Richard Rusby, Official: water boils at 99.975 °C, *Physics World* **2**, pp. 23–24, September 1989, and R. L. Rusby, Ironing out the standard scale, *Nature* **338**, p. 1169, March 1989. For more details on temperature measurements, see page 349. Cited on page 918.

800 J. Short, Newton's apples fall from grace, *New Scientist*, **2098**, p. 5, 6 September 1997. More details can be found in R. G. Keesing, The history of Newton's apple tree, *Contemporary Physics* **39**, pp. 377–391, 1998. Cited on page 919.

801 The various concepts are even the topic of a separate international standard, ISO 5725, with the title *Accuracy and precision of measurement methods and results*. A good introduction is John R. Taylor, *An Introduction to Error Analysis: the Study of Uncertainties in Physical Measurements*, 2nd edition, University Science Books, Sausalito, 1997. Cited on page 920.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

802 P. J. Mohr & B. N. Taylor, CODATA recommended values of the fundamental physical constants: 1998, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **59**, p. 351, 2000. This is the set of constants resulting from an international adjustment and recommended for international use by the Committee on Data for Science and Technology (CODATA), a body in the International Council of Scientific Unions, which brings together the International Union of Pure and Applied Physics (IUPAP), the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC) and other organizations. The website of IUPAC is www.iupac.org. Cited on pages 920 and 921.

803 The details are given in the well-known astronomical reference, Kenneth Seidelmann, *Explanatory Supplement to the Astronomical Almanac*, 1992. Cited on page 924.

804 For information about the number π, as well as about other constants, the website oldweb.cecm.sfu.ca/pi/pi.html provides lots of data and references. It also has a link to the overview at mathworld.wolfram.com/Pi.html and to many other sites on the topic. Simple formulae for π are

$$\pi + 3 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{n\, 2^n}{\binom{2n}{n}} \tag{570}$$

or the beautiful formula discovered in 1996 by Bailey, Borwein and Plouffe

$$\pi = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{16^n} \left(\frac{4}{8n+1} - \frac{2}{8n+4} - \frac{1}{8n+5} - \frac{1}{8n+6} \right) . \tag{571}$$

The site also explains the newly discovered methods for calculating specific binary digits of π without having to calculate all the preceding ones. By the way, the number of (consecutive) digits known in 1999 was over 1.2 million million, as told in *Science News* **162**, p. 255, 14 December 2002. They pass all tests of randomness, as the mathworld.wolfram.com/PiDigits.html website explains. However, this property, called *normality*, has never been proven; it is the biggest open question about π. It is possible that the theory of chaotic dynamics will lead to a solution of this puzzle in the coming years.

Another method to calculate π and other constants was discovered and published by D. V. Chudnovsky & G. V. Chudnovsky, The computation of classical constants, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (USA)* **86**, pp. 8178–8182, 1989. The Chudnowsky brothers have built a supercomputer in Gregory's apartment for about 70 000 euros, and for many years held the record for calculating the largest number of digits of π. They have battled for decades with Kanada Yasumasa, who held the record in 2000, calculated on an industrial supercomputer. New formulae to calculate π are still occasionally discovered.

For the calculation of Euler's constant γ see also D. W. DeTemple, A quicker convergence to Euler's constant, *The Mathematical Intelligencer*, pp. 468–470, May 1993.

Challenge 1328 r
Challenge 1329 s

Note that little is known about the basic properties of some numbers; for example, it is still not known whether $\pi + e$ is a rational number or not! (It is believed that it is not.) Do you want to become a mathematician? Cited on page 926.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



CHALLENGE HINTS AND SOLUTIONS

Challenge 996, page 674: The liquid drops have to detach from the flow exactly inside the metal counter-electrodes. There is always a tiny charge somewhere on the metal structures (due to cosmic rays, rubbing, previous charging, etc.). In Figure 420, this initial charge is the positive charge drawn on the lower left and upper right metal structure. When the water droplets form, they get a charge that is opposite to that of the metal surrounding the region where they form. The negative droplets fall into the other metal structure. Through the negative charge accumulating there, the positive charge in the first structure increases. When the charge on the metal structure increases, the charge separation in the droplets is more efficient. In other words, water droplet formation inside the metal structures *amplifies* any initial charge. After a while, the charge value and the associated voltage are so high that it leads to a loud bang (if everything is dry, including the air.) Then the process starts again. In fact, a vaguely similar charge separation mechanism leads to cloud charging and to lightning. If you want to build a Kelvin generator at home, have a look at the de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kelvin-Generator web page, or search for other internet site on the topic.

To avoid the sparks in the fuel tanks of its cars, Opel simply earthed the metal tube at the tank inlet; they had forgotten to ensure electric contact between the tube and the rest of the car.

The explosion of fuel can also occur if you pour fuel into your car from a metal container. Several times, fuel thieves were 'punished' by an explosion triggered by static electricity when they tried to pour stolen fuel into their own car.

On every airport you can see how the problem is avoided: before even attaching the fuel tube to an aeroplane, the worker attaches a conducting cable to connect the truck (or the tank) to the aeroplane.

Challenge 997, page 674: We look at the two spark through a rapidly rotating mirror. In this way, small timing differences lead to position differences of the two sparks. In the 19th century, the speed values measured in this way varied between 6000 km/s and way over 100 000 km/s, because the speed depends on the effective capacitance and inductivity of wire and set-up. Only if these effects can be neglected is the measured speed the same as that of light in vacuum, namely around 300 000 km/s. In modern cables, the speed is often around a third of this value.

Page 682

Challenge 998, page 674: A lot of noise appeared while the metal pendulum banged wildly between the two fixed bells.

Challenge 999, page 677: No.

Challenge 1001, page 678: The field at a distance of 1 m from an electron is 1.4 nV/m.

Challenge 1002, page 678: A simple geometrical effect: anything flowing out homogeneously from a sphere diminishes with the square of the distance.

Challenge 1003, page 679: One has $F = \alpha\hbar c N_A^2/4R^2 = 3 \cdot 10^{12}$ N, an enormous force, corresponding to the weight of 300 million tons. It shows the enormous forces that keep matter together. Obviously, there is no way to keep 1 g of positive charge together, as the repulsive forces among the charges would be even larger.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 420 The key process in the Kelvin generator: charge separation during droplet formation

Challenge 1004, page 680: To show the full equivalence of Coulomb's and Gauss's 'laws', first show that it holds for a single point charge. Then expand the result for more than one point charge. That gives Gauss's 'law' in integral form, as given just before this challenge.

To deduce the integral form of Gauss's 'law' for a single point charge, one has to integrate over the closed surface. The essential point here is to note that the integration can be carried out for an inverse square dependence only. This dependence allows to transform the scalar product between the local field and the area element into a normal product between the charge and the solid angle Ω:

$$\boldsymbol{E}\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{A} = \frac{q\mathrm{d}A\cos\theta}{4\pi\varepsilon_0 r^2} = \frac{q\mathrm{d}\Omega}{4\pi\varepsilon_0}\,. \tag{572}$$

In case that the surface is closed the integration is then straightforward.

To deduce the differential form of (the static) Gauss's 'law', namely

$$\nabla\boldsymbol{E} = \frac{\rho}{\varepsilon_0}\,, \tag{573}$$

make use of the definition of the charge density ρ and of the purely mathematical relation

$$\int_{\mathrm{closedsurface}} \boldsymbol{E}\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{A} = \int_{\mathrm{enclosedvolume}} \nabla\boldsymbol{E}\,\mathrm{d}V\,, \tag{574}$$

This mathematical relation, valid for any vector field $\boldsymbol{E}$, is called *Gauss's theorem*. It simply states that the flux is the volume integral of the divergence.

To deduce the full form of Gauss's law, including the time-derivative of the magnetic field, include relativistic effects by changing viewpoint to a moving observer.

Challenge 1006, page 680: No; batteries only separate charges and pump them around.

Challenge 1007, page 680: Uncharged bodies can attract each other if they are made of charged constituents neutralizing each other, and if the charges are constrained in their mobility. The charge fluctuations then lead to attraction. Most molecules interact among each other in this way; such forces are also at the basis of surface tension in liquids and thus of droplet formation.

Challenge 1009, page 682: The ratio q/m of electrons and that of the free charges inside metals is not exactly the same.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1011, page 683: Find out a way to test the issue, perform the experiment, and publish it!

Challenge 1012, page 684: If you can, publish the result. Researchers have tried to put people on the ocean during clouded days, have tried experiments in dark rooms, but nothing has been found so far. The experiences of people in magnetic resonance imaging equipment is inconclusive so far.

Challenge 1014, page 689: No.

Challenge 1016, page 690: The correct version of Ampère's 'law' is

$$\nabla \times \boldsymbol{B} - \frac{1}{c^2}\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{E}}{\partial t} = \mu_0 \boldsymbol{j} \tag{575}$$

whereas the expression mentioned in the text misses the term $\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{E}}{\partial t}$.

For another way to state the difference, see Richard P. Feynman, Robert B. Leighton & Matthew Sands, *The Feynman Lectures on Physics*, volume II, Addison Wesley, p. 21-1, 1977.

Challenge 1017, page 691: Only boosts with relativistic speeds mix magnetic and electric fields to an appreciable amount.

Challenge 1019, page 691: The dual field $*\boldsymbol{F}$ is defined on page 707.

Challenge 1021, page 692: Scalar products of four vectors are always, by construction, Lorentz invariant quantities.

Challenge 1024, page 693: Almost all neutral particles are made of charged ones. So the argument holds for them as well. There is only one exception: neutrinos. For them, the argument is not valid.

Challenge 1025, page 693: The signal speed in metals is higher than the electron speed, namely around the speed of light. This speed determines the magnetic field strength.

Page 773

Challenge 1026, page 695: The illumination of the sun changes the ionization in the upper atmosphere and provokes convection in the ionosphere. The tides move the ions in the ocean and in the atmosphere. These currents lead to magnetic fields which can be seen in sensitive compass needles.

Page 699

Challenge 1027, page 695: If you find such an effect and are able to demonstrate it, publish it in a didactic journal.

Challenge 1028, page 695: Usually, the cables of high voltage lines are too warm to be comfortable.

Challenge 1029, page 695: Blond children tend to have the thinnest hair, thus giving the greatest effect. Dry weather is needed to avoid that the moisture in the air discharges the head thus preventing the hair to raise at all.

Challenge 1030, page 695: Move them to form a T shape.

Challenge 1032, page 696: For three and more switches, on uses inverters; an inverter is a switch with two inputs and two outputs which in one position, connects first and second input to first and second output respectively, and in the other position connects the first input to the second output and vice versa. (There are other possibilities, though; wires can be saved using electromagnetic relay switches.)

Challenge 1034, page 697: It is possible; however, the systems so far are not small and are dangerous for human health. The idea to collect solar power in deep space and then beam it to the Earth as microwaves has often been aired. Finances and dangers have blocked it so far.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1036, page 697: Glue two mirrors together at a right angle. Or watch yourself on TV using a video camera.

Challenge 1037, page 698: This is again an example of combined triboluminescence and triboelectricity. See also the websites scienceworld.wolfram.com/physics/Triboluminescence.html and www.geocities.com/RainForest/9911/tribo.htm.

Challenge 1039, page 699: Pepper is lighter than salt, and thus reacts to the spoon before the salt does.

Challenge 1040, page 700: For a wavelength of 546.1 nm (standard green), that is a bit over 18 wavelengths.

Challenge 1041, page 700: The angular size of the Sun is too large; diffraction plays no role here.

Challenge 1042, page 700: Just use a high speed camera.

Challenge 1043, page 700: The current flows perpendicularly to the magnetic field and is thus deflected. It pulls the whole magnet with it.

Challenge 1044, page 701: Light makes seven turns of the Earth in one second.

Challenge 1045, page 701: At 10 pc=32.6 al, the Sun would have apparent magnitude 4.7. At 20 pc=65.2 al, it would appear 4 times fainter, thus about 1.5 magnitudes more, therefore with an apparent visual magnitude of about 6.2. This is near the limit magnitude of the eye. The actual limiting magnitude of the eye is neither constant nor universal, so the distance of 50 light years is not a sharo limit. The limiting magnitude, – like the night vision, or *scotopic sensitvity* – depends on the partial pressure of oxygen in the atmosphere the observer is breathing, on the clarity of the air, on the zenith distance, and, above all, on the degree of dark adaptation. An eye exposed to the full brightness of the night sky in a very dark location far from light pollution is still not completely dark-adapted. You can easily see 7th-magnitude stars by blocking off most of the sky and just looking at a little patch of it. Some observers, under ideal conditions, have reliably reported seeing stars near 8th magnitude.

Challenge 1047, page 702: The most simple equivalent to a coil is a rotating mass being put into rotation by the flowing water. A transformer would then be made of two such masses connected through their axis.

Challenge 1050, page 702: The charged layer has the effect that almost only ions of one charge pass the channels. As a result, charges are separated on the two sides of the liquid, and a current is generated.

Challenge 1053, page 703: Leakage currents change the picture. The long term voltage ratio is given by the leakage resistance ratio $V_1/V_2 = R_1/R_2$, as can be easily verified in experiments.

Challenge 1061, page 709: Some momentum is carried away by the electromagnetic field.

Challenge 1062, page 710: Field lines and equipotential surfaces are always orthogonal to each other. Thus a field line cannot cross an equipotential surface twice.

Challenge 1073, page 716: The argument is the same as for the increase in entropy: reverse processes are possible, but the probability is so low that they do not appear in practice. The extremely low probability is due to the fluctuations induced by the environment.

Challenge 1074, page 717: Just draw a current through a coil with its magnetic field, then draw the mirror image of the current and redraw the magnetic field.

Challenge 1075, page 717: Other asymmetries in nature include the helicity of the DNA molecules making up the chromosomes and many other molecules in living systems, the right hand preference of most humans, the asymmetry of fish species which usually stay flat on the bottom of the seas.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1076, page 718: This is not possible at all using gravitational or electromagnetic systems or effects. The only way is to use the weak nuclear interaction, as shown in the chapter on the nucleus.

Page 1275

Challenge 1077, page 718: The Lagrangian does not change if one of the three coordinates is changed by its negative value.

Challenge 1078, page 718: The image flips up: a 90 degree rotation turns the image by 180 degrees.

Challenge 1079, page 718: Imagine E and B as the unite vectors of two axes in complex space. Then any rotation of these axes is also a generalized duality symmetry.

Challenge 1080, page 719: The fine structure constant is changed to its inverse value. Thus 1/137.036 becomes 137.036. This implies that the particle and the vacuum concept change completely. It is possible, nowadays, to make sense of this so-called *strong-coupling* situation; that is the reason for the general interest of theoreticians into dualities.

Challenge 1081, page 721: The angular momentum was put into the system when it was formed. If we bring a point charge from infinity along a straight line to its final position close to a magnetic dipole, the magnetic force acting on the charge is not directed along the line of motion. It therefore creates a non-vanishing torque about the origin. See J. M. Aguirregabiria & A. Hernandez, The Feynman paradox revisited, *European Journal of Physics* 2, pp. 168–170, 1981.

Challenge 1082, page 722: Show that even though the radial magnetic field of a spherical wave is vanishing by definition, Maxwell's equations would require it to be different from zero. Since electromagnetic waves are transversal, it is also sufficient to show that it is impossible to comb a hairy sphere without having a (double) vortex or two simple vortices. Despite these statements, quantum theory changes the picture somewhat: the emission probability of a photon from an excited atom in a degenerate state is spherically symmetric exactly.

Challenge 1086, page 722: The emitted radiation is strongly suppressed because the size of the dipole (the plug) is much smaller than the wavelength of the field.

Challenge 1088, page 726: In every case of interference, the energy is redistributed into other directions. This is the general rule; sometimes it is quite tricky to discover this other direction.

Challenge 1089, page 726: The author regularly sees about 7 lines; assuming that the distance is around 20 μm, this makes about 3 μm per line. The wavelength must be smaller than this value and the frequency thus larger than 100 THz. The actual values for various colours are given in the table of the electromagnetic spectrum.

Challenge 1091, page 727: He noted that when a prism produces a rainbow, a thermometer placed in the region after the colour red shows a temperature rise.

Challenge 1092, page 729: Birefringence appears when the refraction is polarization dependent. Only two linear independent polarizations are possible, thus there is no trirefringence in nature. This holds true also for crystals which have three different indices of refraction in three directions!

Challenge 1093, page 730: Light reflected form a water surface is partly polarized. Mirages are not.

Challenge 1097, page 735: Figure 421 shows the transverse field E_t drawn in red. We assume that the charge moves at a small initial velocity v_0 and decelerates to zero velocity during a time t_0. After a time T has elapsed, the radiation pulse has travelled a distance $R = cT$, where $T \ll t_0$. The figure shows that the transverse field E_t is related to the radial field E_r by

$$\frac{E_t}{E_r} = \frac{v_0 T \sin\theta}{c t_0} = \frac{aR \sin\theta}{c^2} \,. \tag{576}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 421 Calculating the transverse field of an accelerated charge

Inserting Coulomb's expression for the radial field one gets

$$E_t = \frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0 c^2}\frac{a\sin\theta}{R} \,. \tag{577}$$

The magnitude of the transversal field depends on the angle θ; this is clearly visible in Figure 363 on page 736.

Challenge 1098, page 737: Such an observer would experience a wavy but static field, which cannot exist, as the equations for the electromagnetic field show.

Challenge 1099, page 737: You would never die. Could you reach the end of the universe?

Challenge 1100, page 738: Syrup shows an even more beautiful effect in the following setting. Take a long transparent tube closed at one end and fill it with syrup. Shine a red helium–neon laser into the tube from the bottom. Then introduce a linear polarizer into the beam: the light seen in the tube will form a spiral. By rotating the polarizer you can make the spiral advance or retract. This effect, called the *optical activity* of sugar, is due to the ability of sugar to rotate light polarization and to a special property of plants: they make only one of the two mirror forms of sugar.

Challenge 1101, page 739: The thin lens formula is

$$\frac{1}{d_o} + \frac{1}{d_i} = \frac{1}{f} \,. \tag{578}$$

It is valid for diverging and converging lenses, as long as their own thickness is negligible. The strength of a lens can thus be measured with the quantity $1/f$. The unit $1\,\mathrm{m}^{-1}$ is called a *diopter*; it is used especially for reading glasses. Converging lenses have positive, diverging lenses negative values.

However, the thin lens formula is only an approximation, and is never used in lens design. It is a relic of old textbooks. Modern lens designers always use Gaussian optic for calculations. (See, for example, Francis A. Jenkins & Harvey E. White, *Fundamentals of Optics*, McGraw-Hill, 1957.)

Challenge 1103, page 740: A light microscope is basically made of two converging lenses. One lens – or lens system – produces an enlarged real image and the second one produces an enlarged virtual image of the previous real image. Figure 422 also shows that microscopes always turn images upside down. Due to the wavelength of light, light microscopes have a maximum resolution

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 422 One lens made the first microscope (length *c.* 8 cm, to be held close to the eye) but two converging lenses make a modern microscope

of about 1 µm. Note that the magnification of microscopes is unlimited; what is limited is their resolution. This is exactly the same behaviour shown by digital images. The *resolution* is simply the size of the smallest possible pixel that makes sense.

Challenge 1105, page 741: The dispersion at the lens leads to different apparent image positions, as shown in Figure 423. For more details on the dispersion in the human eye and the ways of using it to create three-dimensional effects, see the article by C. Ucke & R. Wolf, Durch Farbe in die dritte Dimension, *Physik in unserer Zeit* **30**, pp. 50–53, 1999.

Challenge 1106, page 741: The 1 mm beam would return 1000 times as wide as the 1 m beam. A perfect 1 m-wide beam of green light would be 209 m wide on the Moon; can you deduce this result from the (important) formula that involves distance, wavelength, initial diameter and final diameter? Try to guess this beautiful formula first, and then deduce it. In reality, the values are a few times larger than the theoretical minimum thus calculated. See the www.csr.utexas.edu/mlrs and ilrs.gsfc.nasa.gov websites.

Challenge 1107, page 741: It is often said that evolution tuned the number of cones in the eye to the maximum resolution with open pupil; the experts on the subject however maintain that there are somewhat larger numbers of cones.

Challenge 1108, page 741: The answer should lie between one or two dozen kilometres, assuming ideal atmospheric circumstances.

Challenge 1113, page 745: A surface of 1 m^2 perpendicular to the light receives about 1 kW of radiation. It generates the same pressure as the weight of about 0.3 mg of matter. That generates 3 µPa for black surfaces, and the double for mirrors.

Challenge 1115, page 746: The shine side gets twice the momentum transfer as the black side, and thus should be pushed backwards.

Challenge 1118, page 747: A polarizer can do this.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 423 The relation between the colour effect and the lens dispersion

Challenge 1121, page 748: The interference patterns change when colours are changed. Rainbows also appear because different colours are due to different frequencies.

Challenge 1123, page 748: The full rainbow is round like a circle. You can produce one with a garden hose, if you keep the hose in your hand while you stand on a chair, with your back to the evening Sun. (Well, one small part is missing; can you imagine which part?) The circle is due to the spherical shape of droplets. If the droplets were of different shape, *and* if they were all aligned, the rainbow would have a different shape than a simple circle.

Challenge 1128, page 753: Film a distant supernova explosion and check whether it happens at the same time for each colour separately.

Challenge 1130, page 754: The first part of the forerunner is a feature with the shortest possible effective wavelength; thus it is given by taking the limit for infinite frequency.

Challenge 1131, page 755: The light is pulsed; thus it is the energy velocity.

Challenge 1132, page 755: Inside matter, the energy is transferred to atoms, then back to light, then to the next atoms, etc. That takes time and slows down the propagation.

Challenge 1134, page 758: This is true even in general relativity, when the bending of the vacuum is studied.

Challenge 1135, page 758: Almost no light passes; the intensity of the little light that is transmitted depends exponentially on the ratio between wavelength and hole diameter. One also says that after the hole there is an evanescent wave.

Challenge 1138, page 760: Not really; a Cat's-eye uses two reflections at the sides of a cube. A living cat's eye has a large number of reflections. The end effect is the same though: light returns back to the direction it came from.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1139, page 760: There is a blind spot in the eye; that is a region in which images are not perceived. The brain than assumes that the image at that place is the same than at its borders. If a spot falls exactly inside it, it disappears.

Challenge 1141, page 763: The eye and brain surely do not switch the up and the down direction at a certain age. Besides, where does the idea come from that babys see upside-down?

Challenge 1142, page 764: The eye and vision system subtract patterns that are constant in time.

Challenge 1144, page 765: In fact, there is no way that a hologram of a person can walk around and frighten a real person. A hologram is always transparent; one can always see the background through the hologram. A hologram thus always gives an impression similar to what moving pictures usually show as ghosts.

Challenge 1145, page 768: The average temperature of the Earth is thus 287 K. The energy from the Sun is proportional to the fourth power of the temperature. The energy is spread (roughly) over half the Earth's surface. The same energy, at the Sun's surface, comes from a much smaller surface, given by the same angle as the Earth subtends there. We thus have $E \sim 2\pi R_{\text{Earth}}^2 T_{\text{Earth}}^4 = T_{\text{Sun}}^4 R_{\text{Earth}}^2 \alpha^2$, where α is half the angle subtended by the Sun. As a result, the temperature of the Sun is estimated to be $T_{\text{Sun}} = (T_{\text{Earth}}^4/\alpha^2)^{0.25} = 4\,\text{kK}$.

Challenge 1149, page 769: Because the maximum of a spectrum in wavelengths and in frequencies is not the same, thus does *not* and cannot follow $c = f\lambda$.

Challenge 1152, page 769: At high temperature, all bodies approach black bodies. The colour is more important than other colour effects. The oven and the objects have the same temperature. Thus they cannot be distinguished from each other. To do so nevertheless, illuminate the scene with powerful light and then take a picture with small sensitivity. Thus one always needs bright light to take pictures of what happens inside fires.

Challenge 1153, page 770: The green surface seen at a low high angle is larger than when seen vertically, where the soil is also seen; the soil is covered by the green grass in low angle observation.

Challenge 1154, page 771: It is indeed true. Modern telescopes have a large surface collecting light (up to 50 m^2) and have extremely sensitive detectors. The number of photons emitted by a match lit on the moon into the direction of a large telescope (how many?) is sufficient to trigger the detector.

Challenge 1155, page 771: Of course not, as the group velocity is not limited by special relativity. The energy velocity is limited, but is not changed in this experiments.

Challenge 1157, page 771: The Prussian explorer Alexander von Humboldt extensively checked this myth in the nineteenth century. He visited many mine pits and asked countless mine workers in Mexico, Peru and Siberia about their experiences. He also asked numerous chimney-sweeps. Neither him nor anybody else had ever seen the stars during the day.

Challenge 1158, page 773: See challenge 638.

Challenge 1159, page 774: The electrons move slowly, but the speed of electrical signals is not given by the electron speed, but by the time at which the electrons move. Imagine long queue of cars (representing electrons) waiting in front of a red traffic light. All drivers look at the light. As soon as it turns green, everybody starts driving. Even though the driving speed might be only 10 m/s, the speed of traffic flow onset was that of light. It is this latter speed which is the speed of electrical signals.

Water pipes tell the same story. A long hose provides water almost in the same instant as the tap is opened, even if the water takes a long time to arrive from the tap to the end of the hose. The speed with which the water reacts is gives by the speed for pressure waves in water. Also for

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

water hoses the signal speed, roughly given by the sound speed in water, is much higher than the speed of the water flow.

Challenge 1160, page 774: One can measure current fluctuations, or measure smallest charges, showing that they are always multiples of the same unit. The latter method was used by Millikan.

Challenge 1163, page 775: Earth's potential would be $U = -q/(4\pi\varepsilon_o R) = 60\,\mathrm{MV}$, where the number of electrons in water must be taken into account.

Challenge 1164, page 775: There is always a measurement error when measuring field values, even when measuring a 'vanishing' electromagnetic field.

Challenge 1165, page 777: The human body is slightly conducting and changes the shape of the field and thus effectively short circuits it. Usually, the field cannot be used to generate energy, as the currents involved are much too small. (Lightning bolts are a different story, of course. They are due – very indirectly – to the field of the Earth, but they are too irregular to be used consistently. Franklin's lightning rod is such an example.)

Challenge 1166, page 777: The field at the surface of a sphere of radius r is given by $E = Q/4\pi\varepsilon_0 r^2$. Inserting $E = 200\,\mathrm{V/m}$, one gets $Q = 0.9\,\mathrm{MC}$.

Challenge 1167, page 780: If you find a method that is different from the known estimates, publish it.

Challenge 1169, page 782: This should be possible in the near future; but both the experiment, which will probably measure brain magnetic field details, and the precise check of its seriousness will not be simple.

Challenge 1175, page 786: All the illusions of the flying act look as if the magician is hanging on lines, as observed by many, including the author. (Photographic flashes are forbidden, a shimmery background is set up to render the observation of the lines difficult, no ring is ever actually pulled over the magician, the aquarium in which he floats is kept open to let the fishing lines pass through, always the same partner is 'randomly' chosen from the public, etc.) Information from eyewitnesses who have actually seen the fishing lines used by David Copperfield explains the reasons for these set-ups. The usenet news group alt.magic.secrets, in particular Tilman Hausherr, was central in clearing up this issue in all its details, including the name of the company that made the suspension mechanism.

Challenge 1177, page 786: Any new one is worth a publication.

Challenge 1178, page 790: Sound energy is also possible, as is mechanical work.

Challenge 1179, page 792: Space-time deformation is not related to electricity; at least at everyday energies. Near Planck energies, this might be different, but nothing has been predicted yet.

Challenge 1181, page 793: Ideal absorption is blackness (though it can be redness or whiteness at higher temperatures).

Challenge 1182, page 793: Indeed, the Sun emits about $4 \cdot 10^{26}\,\mathrm{W}$ from its mass of $2 \cdot 10^{30}\,\mathrm{kg}$, about $0.2\,\mathrm{mW/kg}$. The adult human body (at rest) emits about 100 W (you can check this in bed at night), thus about $1.2\,\mathrm{W/kg}$. This is about 6000 times more than the Sun.

Challenge 1183, page 793: The charges in a metal rearrange in a way that the field inside remains vanishing. This makes cars and aeroplanes safe against lightning. Of course, if the outside field varies so quickly that the rearrangement cannot follow, fields *can* enter the Faraday cage. (By the way, also fields with long wavelengths penetrate metals; remote controls regularly use frequencies of 25 kHz to achieve this.) However, one should wait a bit before stepping out of a car after lightning has hit, as the car is on rubber wheels with low conduction; waiting gives the charge time to flow into the ground.

For gravity and solid cages, mass rearrangement is not possible, so that there is no gravity shield.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 424 How to get electrical shocks from a 4.5 V battery

Challenge 1187, page 795: This is a touchy topic. It is not clear whether 50 Hz fields are dangerous to humans. There is a high probability that they are not; but the issue is not settled.

Challenge 1188, page 795: The number of photons times the quantum of action $\hbar$.

Challenge 1190, page 796: The charging stops because a negatively charged satellite repels electrons and thus stops any electron collecting mechanism. Electrons are captured more frequently than ions because it is easier for them than for ions to have an inelastic collision with the satellite, due to their larger speed at a given temperature.

Challenge 1191, page 796: Any loss mechanism will explain the loss of energy, such as electrical resistance or electromagnetic radiation. After a fraction of a second, the energy will be lost. This little problem is often discussed on the internet.

Challenge 1193, page 796: Use the wire as shown in Figure 424. *If* the oscillation is properly tuned in frequency, and *if* the contact detaches properly at the tip, and *if* you touch the two contacts with a strong grip, you will get a stronger shock than you can stand.

Challenge 1197, page 806: The issue is: is the 'universe' a concept? More about this issue in the final part of the text.

Challenge 1199, page 810: When thinking, physical energy, momentum and angular momentum are conserved, and thermodynamic entropy is not destroyed. Any experiment showing anything different would point to unknown processes. However, there is no evidence for such processes.

Challenge 1200, page 811: The best method cannot be much shorter than what is needed to describe 1 in 6000 million, or 33 bits. The Dutch and UK post code systems (including the letters NL or UK) are not far from this value and thus can claim to be very efficient.

Challenge 1201, page 811: For complex systems, when the unknowns are numerous, the advance is thus simply given by the increase in answers. For the universe as a whole, the number of open issues is quite low, as shown on page 1340; here there has not been much advance in the last years. But the advance is clearly measurable in this case as well.

Challenge 1202, page 811: Is it possible to use the term 'complete' when describing nature?

Challenge 1205, page 812: There are many baths in series: thermal baths in each light-sensitive cell of the eyes, thermal baths inside the nerves towards the brain and thermal baths inside brain cells.

Challenge 1207, page 813: Yes.

Challenge 1210, page 820: Physicists claim that the properties of objects, of space-time and of interactions form the smallest list possible. However, this list is longer than the one found by linguists! The reason is that physicists have found primitives that do not appear in everyday life. In a sense, the aim of physicists is limited by list of unexplained questions of nature, given on page 1340.

Challenge 1211, page 821: Neither has a defined content, clearly stated limits or a domain of application.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1212, page 821: Impossible! That would not be a concept, as it has no content. The solution to the issue must be and will be different.

Challenge 1213, page 823: To neither. This paradox shows that such a 'set of all sets' does not exist.

Challenge 1214, page 824: The most famous is the class of all sets that do not contain themselves. This is not a set, but a class.

Challenge 1215, page 824: Dividing cakes is difficult. A simple method that solves many – but not all – problems among N persons P1...PN is the following:

— P1 cuts the cake into N pieces.
— P2 to PN choose a piece.
— P1 keeps the last part.
— P2...PN assemble their parts back into one.
— Then P2...PN repeat the algorithm for one person less.

The problem is much more complex if the reassembly is not allowed. A *just* method (in finite many steps) for 3 people, using nine steps, was published in 1944 by Steinhaus, and a *fully satisfactory* method in the 1960s by John Conway. A fully satisfactory method for four persons was found only in 1995; it has 20 steps.

Challenge 1216, page 824: $(x, y) := \{x, \{x, y\}\}$.

Challenge 1217, page 825: Hint: show that any countable list of reals misses at least one number. This was proven for the first time by Cantor. His way was to write the list in decimal expansion and then find a number that is surely not in the list. Second hint: his world-famous trick is called the diagonal argument.

Challenge 1218, page 826: Hint: all reals are limits of series of rationals.

Challenge 1220, page 827: Yes, but only provided division by zero is not allowed, and numbers are restricted to the rationals and reals.

Challenge 1221, page 827: There are infinitely many of them. But the smallest is already quite large: 10169491525423728813559322033898305084745762711864406779 66. If the number six is changed in the puzzle, one gets that the smallest solution for 1 is 1, for 4 is 102564, for 5 is 142857, for 8 is 1012658227848, for 2 is 105263157894736842, for 7 is 1014492753623188405797, for 3 is 1034482758620689655172413793, and for 9 is 1011235955056179775280898876404494382022471 9. The smallest solution for 6 is the largest of this list.

Challenge 1222, page 828: $0 := \varnothing$, $1 := \{\varnothing\}$, $2 := \{\{\varnothing\}\}$ etc.

Challenge 1223, page 831: Subtraction is easy. Addition is not commutative only for cases when infinite numbers are involved: $\omega + 2 \neq 2 + \omega$.

Challenge 1224, page 831: Examples are $1 - \varepsilon$ or $1 - 4\varepsilon^2 - 3\varepsilon^3$.

Challenge 1225, page 832: The answer is 57; the cited reference gives the details.

Challenge 1226, page 834: $2^{2^{22}}$ and $4^{4^{4^4}}$.

Challenge 1228, page 834: The child is minus 0.75 years old, or minus 9 months old; the father is thus very near the mother.

Challenge 1229, page 834: This is not an easy question. The first nontrivial numbers are 7, 23, 47, 59, 167 and 179. See ROBERT MATTHEWS, Maximally periodic reciprocals, *Bulletin of the Institute of Mathematics and its Applications* **28**, pp. 147–148, 1992. Matthews shows that a number n for which $1/n$ generates the maximum of $n - 1$ decimal digits in the decimal expansion is a special sort of prime number that can be deduced from the so-called *Sophie Germain primes S*;

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

one must have $n = 2S + 1$, where both S and $2S + 1$ must be prime and where S mod 20 must be 3, 9, or 11.

Thus the first numbers n are 7, 23, 47, 59, 167 and 179, corresponding to values for S of 3, 11, 23, 29, 83 and 89. In 1992, the largest known S that meets the criteria was

$$S = (39051 \cdot 2^{6002}) - 1 \,, \tag{579}$$

a 1812-digit long Sophie Germain prime number that is 3 mod 20. It was discovered by Wilfred Keller. This Sophie Germain prime leads to a prime n with a decimal expansion that is around 10^{1812} digits long before it starts repeating itself. Read your favourite book on number theory to find out more. Interestingly, the solution to this challenge is also connected to that of challenge 1221. Can you find out more?

Challenge 1230, page 834: Klein did not belong to either group. As a result, some of his nastier students concluded that he was not a mathematician at all.

Challenge 1231, page 834: A barber cannot belong to either group; the definition of the barber is thus contradictory and has to be rejected.

Challenge 1232, page 834: See the members.shaw.ca/hdhcubes/cube_basics.htm web page for more information on magic cubes.

Challenge 1233, page 835: Such an expression is derived with the intermediate result $(1-2^2)^{-1}$. The handling of divergent series seems absurd, but mathematicians know how to give the expression a defined content. (See GODFREY H. HARDY, *Divergent Series*, Oxford University Press, 1949.) Physicists often use similar expressions without thinking about them, in quantum field theory.

Challenge 1234, page 845: 'All Cretans lie' is *false*, since the opposite, namely 'some Cretans say the truth' is true in the case given. The trap is that the opposite of the original sentence is usually, but *falsely*, assumed to be 'all Cretans say the truth'.

Challenge 1235, page 845: The statement cannot be false, due to the first half and the 'or' construction. Since it is true, the second half must be true and you are an angel.

Challenge 1241, page 846: This can be debated; in any case it is definitely known that both statements are lies, as shown on page 1173.

Challenge 1244, page 847: There is no way to settle this.

Challenge 1247, page 847: The light bulb story seems to be correct. The bulb is very weak, so that the wire is not evaporating.

Challenge 1248, page 847: The origin might be the number of people present in the last supper in the New Testament; or the forgotten 13th sign of the Zodiac. There is no truth in this superstition. In fact, every superstition is a lie. However, beware of people who are jealous of those who do not care about superstitions, and who get violent as a reaction.

Challenge 1249, page 847: Without exception so far, all those who pretend to have been stigmatized have wounds in the *palms* of their hands. However, in crucifixion, the nails are driven through the *wrist*, because nails driven through the palms cannot carry the weight of a human body: the palms would tear open.

Challenge 1250, page 848: The term 'multiverse' is both a belief and a lie.

Challenge 1252, page 848: In which frame of reference? How? Beware of anybody making that statement: he is a crook.

Challenge 1256, page 853: Only induction allows to make use of similarities and thus to define concepts.

Challenge 1257, page 855: This depends on the definition (of the concept) of deity used.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Page 1440

Challenge 1258, page 856: Yes, as we shall find out.

Challenge 1259, page 856: Yes, as observation implies interaction.

Challenge 1260, page 856: Lack of internal contradictions means that a concept is valid as a thinking tool; as we use our thoughts to describe nature, mathematical existence is a specialized version of physical existence, as thinking is itself a natural process. Indeed, mathematical concepts are also useful for the description of the working of computers and the like.

Another way to make the point is to stress that all mathematical concepts are built from sets and relations, or some suitable generalizations of them. These basic building blocks are taken from our physical environment. Sometimes the idea is expressed differently; many mathematicians have acknowledged that certain mathematical concepts, such as natural numbers, are taken directly from experience.

Challenge 1261, page 857: Examples are Achilles, Odysseus, Mickey Mouse, the gods of polytheism and spirits.

Challenge 1263, page 858: Torricelli made vacuum in a U-shaped glass tube, using mercury, the same liquid metal used in thermometers. Can you imagine how? A more difficult question: where did he get mercury from?

Challenge 1264, page 859: Stating that something is infinite can be allowed, if the statement is falsifiable. An example is the statement 'There are infinitely many mosquitoes.'

Other statements are not falsifiable, such as 'The universe continue without limit behind the horizon.' Such a statement is a belief, not a fact.

Challenge 1265, page 861: They are not sets either and thus not collections of points.

Challenge 1266, page 862: There is still no possibility to interact with all matter and energy, as this includes oneself.

Challenge 1267, page 867: No. There is only a generalization encompassing the two.

Challenge 1268, page 868: An explanation of the universe is not possible, as the term explanation require the possibility to talk about systems outside the one under consideration. The universe is not part of a larger set.

Challenge 1269, page 868: Both can in fact be seen as two sides of the same argument: there is no other choice;there is only one possibility. The rest of nature shows that it has to be that way, as everything depends on everything.

Challenge 1272, page 878: $|z|^2$ is the *determinant* of the matrix $z = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ -b & a \end{pmatrix}$.

Challenge 1276, page 878: Use Cantor's diagonal argument, as in challenge 1217.

Challenge 1281, page 881: Any rotation by an angle 2π is described by -1. Only a rotation by 4π is described by $+1$; quaternions indeed describe spinors.

Challenge 1283, page 883: Just check the result component by component. See also the mentioned reference.

Challenge 1285, page 885: For a Gaussian integer $n + im$ to be prime, the integer $n^2 + m^2$ must be prime, and in addition, a condition on n mod 3 must be satisfied; which one and why?

Challenge 1289, page 887: The metric is regular, positive definite and obeys the triangle inequality.

Challenge 1293, page 889: The solution is the set of all two by two matrices, as each two by two matrix specifies a linear transformation, if one defines a transformed point as the product of the point and this matrix. (Only multiplication with a fixed matrix can give a linear transformation.) Can you recognize from a matrix whether it is a rotation, a reflection, a dilation, a shear, or a stretch along two axes? What are the remaining possibilities?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1296, page 890: The (simplest) product of two functions is taken by point-by-point multiplication.

Challenge 1297, page 890: The norm $\|f\|$ of a real function f is defined as the supremum of its absolute value:

$$\|f\| = \sup_{x \in \mathrm{R}} |f(x)| \,. \tag{580}$$

In simple terms: the maximum value taken by the absolute of the function is its norm. It is also called 'sup'-norm. Since it contains a supremum, this norm is only defined on the subspace of *bounded* continuous functions on a space X, or, if X is compact, on the space of all continuous functions (because a continuous function on a compact space must be bounded).

Challenge 1301, page 895: Take out your head, then pull one side of your pullover over the corresponding arm, continue pulling it over the over arm; then pull the other side, under the first, to the other arm as well. Put your head back in. Your pullover (or your trousers) will be inside out.

Challenge 1302, page 895: Both can be untied.

Challenge 1306, page 899: The transformation from one manifold to another with different topology can be done with a tiny change, at a so-called *singular point*. Since nature shows a minimum action, such a tiny change cannot be avoided.

Challenge 1307, page 901: The product $M^\dagger M$ is Hermitean, and has positive eigenvalues. Thus H is uniquely defined and Hermitean. U is unitary because $U^\dagger U$ is the unit matrix.

Challenge 1312, page 913: Planck limits can be exceeded for extensive observables for which many particle systems can exceed single particle limits, such as mass, momentum, energy or electrical resistance.

Challenge 1316, page 918: Do not forget the relativistic time dilation.

Challenge 1317, page 918: About 10 μg.

Challenge 1318, page 918: Since the temperature of the triple point of water is fixed, the temperature of the boiling point is fixed as well. Historically, the value of the triple point has not been well chosen.

Challenge 1319, page 919: Probably the quantity with the biggest variation is mass, where a prefix for $1\,\mathrm{eV/c^2}$ would be useful, as would be one for the total mass in the universe, which is about 10^{90} times larger.

Challenge 1320, page 920: The formula with $n - 1$ is a better fit. Why?

Challenge 1323, page 923: No, only properties of parts of the universe. The universe itself has no properties, as shown on page 1444.

Challenge 1324, page 924: The slowdown goes *quadratically* with time, because every new slowdown adds to the old one!

Challenge 1325, page 926: The double of that number, the number made of the sequence of all even numbers, etc.

Challenge 1328, page 954: This could be solved with a trick similar to those used in the irrationality of each of the two terms of the sum, but nobody has found one.

Challenge 1329, page 954: There are still many discoveries to be made in modern mathematics, especially in topology, number theory and algebraic geometry. Mathematics has a good future.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



CREDITS

Since May 2007, the production and distribution of this text is generously supported by the Klaus Tschira Foundation.

Film credits

The animations of a plane electromagnetic wave on page 724 are copyright and courtesy by Thomas Weiland and taken from on his website www.temf.de at the Technische Universität Darmstadt. The animation of the electromagnetic field emitted by an oscillating charge on page 736 is copyright and courtesy by Daniel Schroeder. He will post it on his website physics.weber.edu/schroeder/mrr/MRRtalk.html one day.

Image credits

The photograph of a circular rainbow on page 665 is copyright and courtesy of Oat Vaiyaboon, and taken from his flickr collection; his website is hangingpixels.com. The photograph of a rubbed comb's effect on water on page 670 is copyright and courtesy of Robert Fritzius and found on his website www.datasync.com/~rsf1/fun/bend-w.htm. The photograph of lightning on page 673 is copyright Steven Horsburgh (see www.horsburgh.com) and used with his permission. The photograph of the Kelvin generator on page 673 is courtesy and copyright of Harald Chmela and taken from his website www.hcrs.at. The photograph of a white shark on page 676 is copyright and courtesy of Klaus Jost and found on his beautiful website at www.jostimages.com. The pictures of the charge conservation experiment on page 676 and of a red hot oven on page 770 are copyright and courtesy of Wolfgang Rueckner. The photograph of *M. bavaricum* on page 685 is copyright by Marianne Hanzlik and is courtesy of Nicolai Petersen. The pictures of the Tesla coil on page 695 are courtesy and copyright of Robert Billon, and found on his website f3wm.free.fr. The photograph of the electrified hair on the playground, on page 696, is courtesy and copyright of Evan Keller and found on his website www.flickr.com/photos/evanrkeller. The photograph of a lifter on page 698 is courtesy and copyright of Jean-Louis Naudin; more information can be found on his website www.jlnlabs.org. The ocean figure on page 699 is courtesy of Stefan Maus, and taken from his www.gfz-potsdam.de/pb2/pb23/SatMag/ocean_tides.html website. The simple motor photograph on page 700 is courtesy and copyright of Stefan Kluge. The comic on page 704 is copyright and courtesy of Randall Munroe, and found on his website xkcd.com. The Gauss rifle on page page 697 is courtesy and copyright Simon Quellen Field and found on his website www.sci-toys.com. The prism photograph on pages 722 and on 749 is by Susan Schwartzenberg and courtesy and copyright of the Exploratorium, found at www.exploratorium.edu. The picture of the rainbow on page 717 is from the NOAA website. The photographs of the beautifully simple remote control shown on page 725 are copyright and courtesy of Guido Pegna, and found on his website www.pegna.com. The secondary rainbow picture on

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

page 726 is courtesy and copyright of Antonio Martos. The supernumerary rainbow picture on page 726 is courtesy and copyright of Wolfgang Hinz and from his website www.meteoros.de. The interference figure on page 727 is copyright and courtesy of Rüdiger Paschotta and found on his free laser encyclopedia at www.rp-photonics.com. The combined infrared and visible rainbow picture on page 728 is courtesy and copyright of Stefan Zeiger collection at www.photo.net/photodb/member-photos?include=all&user_id=439012. The photographs of birefringence on page 729 are copyright and courtesy of Roger Weller, from his website skywalker.cochise.edu/wellerr/mineral/calcite/calcite1.htm, Brad Amos, from his website homepage.ntlworld.com/w.amos2/BradAmos'sWebsite, and Martin Pietralla, from his lecture material. The images formed by lenses on page 739 are copyright and courtesy of Eric Kirchner and found in his paper cited in the text. The photo of Poisson's spot on page 742 is courtesy and copyright of Christopher Jones, and taken from his website www.union.edu/PUBLIC/PHYDEPT/jonesc/scientific_photos.htm. The photograph of a superior mirage on page 743 is courtesy and copyright by Thomas Hogan and found on his website home.centurytel.net/Arkcite/looming.htm. The photograph of an inferior mirage on page 743 is courtesy and copyright by Andy Barson and found on his website www.andybarson.co.uk. The solar furnace photograph on page 744 is courtesy and copyright of Gerhard Weinrebe. The photo of comet McNaught on page 746 is courtesy and copyright of Flagstaffotos. The photograph of the solar green flash on page 750 is copyright and courtesy of Andrew Young and part of his extensive and fascinating website at mintaka.sdsu.edu/GF; the lunar green flash photograph is copyright and courtesy of Laurent Laveder and taken from his beautiful site at www.PixHeaven.net. The picture of milky water on page 750 was made for this text and is copyright by Antonio Martos. The fogbow photograph on page 752 is courtesy and copyright of Michel Tournay, and can be found on his website www.spacew.com/gallery/Micheltournay. The photograph of a split rainbow on page 752 is courtesy and copyright of Eva Seidenfaden, and can be found on her website www.paraselene.de. The photograph of the sixfold rainbow on page 752 is courtesy and copyright of Terje Nordvik, and can be found on antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/ap070912.html. The photograph of the red rainbow on page 752 is courtesy and copyright of Zhu XiaoJin, and can be found on his collection at www.cs.cmu.edu/~zhuxj/astro/. The photograph of parhelia on page 752 is courtesy and copyright of Phil Appleton and found on the website www.astronet.ru/db/xware/msg/1174325/solsticehalo_appleton.jpg.html. The infrared photograph on page 762 is copyright and courtesy of Serge Augustin. The photograph of the sunflower on page 763 is copyright and courtesy of Andrew Davidhazy and found on his website www.rit.edu/~andpph. The pictures of retinas on page 764 are courtesy and copyright of Austin Roorda. The microscope picture on page 767 is copyright and courtesy of Stefan Hell. The pictures showing colour blindness on page 771 are courtesy and copyright of Michael Douma, from his splendid website at webexhibits.org/causesofcolor/2.html. The cloud photographs on page 777 are courtesy of NASA. The pictures of laboratory plasma clouds that resemble ball lightning on page 779 are courtesy and copyright by Sergei Emelin and Alexei Pirozerski and taken from their website balllightning.narod.ru. The drawings of the interior of the Earth on page 781 are copyright and courtesy of MPI-Chemie, Mainz/GEO and can be found in the brochure at www.mpch-mainz.mpg.de/mpg/deutsch/Panels_B.pdf. They were kindly provided by Mirjana Kotowski. The photographs of diamagnetic levitation on page page 784 are copyright and courtesy of Joachim Schlichting and can be found on his website www.uni-muenster.de/Physik/DP. The photographs of the levitation of a rotating sphere on page page 785 are copyright and courtesy of Kay Kublenz and can be found on his website www.schwebemagnet.de. The historical portraits of physicists in the text do not have copyright, except where mentioned. All drawings not explicitly mentioned are copyright © 1997 – 2009 by Christoph Schiller. If you suspect that a copyright is not correctly given or obtained, this has not done on purpose, and you are kindly asked to contact the author.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Fourth Part



Quantum Theory:

The Smallest Change

In our quest to understand how things move,
we discover that there is a minimal change in nature,
implying that motion is fuzzy,
that matter is not permanent,
that boxes are never tight,
that matter is composed of elementary units,
and that light and interactions are streams of particles.
The minimal change explains why antimatter exists,
why particles are unlike gloves,
why copying machines do not exist,
and that probabilities are reasonable.

Contents

976 33 Minimum action – quantum theory for poets

The effects of the quantum of action on rest 979 • The consequences of the quantum of action for objects 979 • Why 'quantum'? 981 • The effect of the quantum of action on motion 983 • Quantum limits and surprises 985 • Transformation, growth and Democritus 986 • Randomness 989 • Waves 990 • Quantum flows 990 • Quantum information 991 • Curiosities and fun challenges about the quantum of action 992

994 34 Light – the strange consequences of the quantum of action

What is the faintest lamp? 994 • What is light? – Again 999 • The size of photons 1000 • Are photons countable? – Squeezed light 1000 • The positions of photons 1003 • Are photons necessary? 1004 • How can a wave be made up of particles? 1006 • Can light move faster than light? – Virtual photons 1012 • Indeterminacy of electric fields 1013 • Curiosities and fun challenges about photons 1013

1016 35 Motion of matter – beyond classical physics

Wine glasses and pencils – no rest 1016 • Cool gas 1017 • No infinite precision 1017 • Flows and the quantization of matter 1017 • Knocking tables and quantized conductivity 1018 • Quantized liquid flow 1019 • Matter quantons and their motion – matter waves 1019 • Mass and acceleration of quantons 1021 • Velocities of quantons 1022 • Why are atoms not flat? Why do shapes exist? 1022 • Rotation of quantons – the lack of north poles 1023 • Silver, Stern and Gerlach – polarization of quantons 1025 • The quantum description of physical systems 1027 • The quantum description of motion 1028 • The state evolution – dispersion of quantons 1030 • Tunnelling and limits on memory – damping of quantons 1032 • Phase and the Aharonov–Bohm effect 1034 • The motion of quantons with spin 1035 • Relativistic wave equations 1036 • Virtual particles 1037 • Compositeness 1037 • Curiosities and fun challenges about quantum matter 1039

1041 36 Colours and other interactions between light and matter

What are stars made of? 1041 • What determines the colours of atoms? 1042 • Relativistic hydrogen 1046 • Relativistic wave equations – again 1047 • Antimatter 1049 • Curiosities and fun challenges about colour 1050 • The strength of electromagnetism 1050

1052 37 Permutation of particles – are particles like gloves?

Why does indistinguishability appear in nature? 1054 • Can particles be counted? 1055 • What is permutation symmetry? 1055 • Indistinguishability and symmetry 1056 • The behaviour of photons 1057 • Bunching and antibunching 1058 • The energy dependence of permutation symmetry 1058 • Indistinguishability in quantum field theory 1059 • How accurately is permutation symmetry verified? 1060 • Copies, clones and gloves 1061

1063 38 Rotations and statistics – visualizing spin

The belt trick 1066 • Angels, Pauli's exclusion principle and the hardness of matter 1068 • Spin, statistics and composition 1069 • Is spin a rotation about an axis? 1070 • Why is fencing with laser beams impossible? 1071 • Rotation requires antiparticles 1071 • A summary on spin and indistinguishability 1072 • Limits and open questions of quantum statistics 1073

1074 39 Superpositions and probabilities – quantum theory without ideology

1074 **Why are people either dead or alive?**
Summary on decoherence, life and death 1080

1081 **What is a system? What is an object?**
Is quantum theory non-local? – A bit about the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox 1082 • Curiosities and fun challenges about superpositions 1084

1086 **What is all the fuss about measurements in quantum theory?**
Hidden variables 1091 • Summary on probabilities and determinism 1093 • What is the difference between space and time? 1095 • Are we good observers? 1096 • What connects information theory, cryptology and quantum theory? 1096 • Is the universe a computer? 1097 • Does the universe have a wave function? And initial conditions? 1097

1099 Bibliography

1110 Challenge hints and solutions

1114 Credits
Film credits 1114 • Image credits 1114

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 33

MINIMUM ACTION – QUANTUM THEORY FOR POETS

> Natura [in operationibus suis] non facit saltus.*
> 15th century

Climbing Motion Mountain up to this point, we completed three legs. We came across Galileo's mechanics (the description of motion for kids), then continued with Einstein's relativity (the description of motion for science-fiction enthusiasts), and finally explored Maxwell's electrodynamics (the description of motion for business people). These three classical descriptions of motion are impressive, beautiful and useful. However, they have a small problem: they are wrong. The reason is simple: none of them describes *life*.

Whenever we observe a flower, such as the one of Figure 425, we enjoy its bright colours, its wild smell, its soft and delicate shape or the fine details of its symmetry. None of the three classical descriptions of nature can explain any of these properties; neither do they explain the impression that the flower makes on our senses. Classical physics can describe certain aspects of the impression, but it cannot explain their origins. For such an explanation, we need *quantum theory*. In fact, we will discover that in life, *every type of pleasure* is an example of quantum motion.** Take any example of a pleasant situation: for example, a beautiful evening sky, a waterfall, a caress, or a happy child. Classical physics is not able to explain it: the colours, shapes and sizes involved remain mysterious.

Challenge 1330 s

In the early days of physics, this limitation was not seen as a shortcoming, because neither senses nor material properties were thought to be related to motion – and pleasure was not considered a serious subject of investigation for a respectable researcher. However, we have since learned that our senses of touch, smell and sight are primarily *detectors of motion*. Without motion, there would be no senses. Furthermore, all detectors are made of matter. During the exploration on electromagnetism we began to understand that all properties of matter are due to motions of charged constituents. Density, stiffness, colour, and all other material properties result from the electromagnetic behaviour of the Lego bricks of matter: namely, the molecules, the atoms and the electrons. Thus, the properties of matter are also consequences of motion. Moreover, we saw that these tiny constituents are *not* correctly described by classical electrodynamics. We even found that light itself behaves unclassically. Therefore the inability of classical physics to describe matter and the senses is indeed due to its intrinsic limitations.

Page 299

Page 768

Ref. 805

* 'Nature [in its workings] makes no jumps.'

** The photograph on page 973 shows a female glow worm, *Lampyris noctiluca*, as found in the United Kingdom (© John Tyler, www.johntyler.co.uk/gwfacts.htm).

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 425 An example of a quantum machine (© Ata Masafumi)



FIGURE 426 Max Planck (1858–1947)

In fact, every failure of classical physics can be traced back to a single, fundamental discovery made in 1899 by Max Planck:* Ref. 806

▷ *In nature, actions smaller than* $\hbar/2 = 0.53 \cdot 10^{-34}$ Js *are not observed.*

All attempts to observe actions smaller than this fail.** In other words, in nature – as in a good film – there is always some action. The existence of a minimal action – the so-called *quantum principle* – is in complete contrast with classical physics. (Why?) However, it has Challenge 1331 s

* For more about Max Planck and his accomplishments, see the footnote on page 768.

** In fact, the quantum principle cited here is a slight simplification: the constant originally introduced by Planck was the (unreduced) $h = 2\pi\hbar$. The factors 2π and $1/2$ leading to the final quantum principle were found somewhat later, by other researchers.

This somewhat unconventional, but didactically useful, approach to quantum theory is due to Niels Bohr. Nowadays, it is hardly ever encountered in the literature; this may be the first time in many decades that it has been used in a teaching text. Ref. 807

Niels Bohr (b. 1885 Copenhagen, d. 1962 Copenhagen) made Copenhagen University into one of the centres of development of quantum theory, overshadowing Göttingen. He developed the description of the atom in terms of quantum theory, for which he received the 1922 Nobel Prize in Physics. He had to flee Denmark in 1943 after the German invasion, because of his Jewish background, but returned there after the war.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 427 Niels Bohr (1885–1962)

TABLE 90 How to convince yourself and others that there is a minimum action, or minimum change $\hbar$ in nature

Issue	Method
Local change or action values $< \hbar$ are not observed	check all observations
Change values $< \hbar$ are non-local	check all observations
Local change or action values $< \hbar$ cannot be produced	check all attempts
Local change or action values $< \hbar$ cannot be imagined	solve all paradoxes
A smallest local change or action value $\hbar$ is consistent	1 – show that all consequences, however weird, are confirmed by observation
	2 – deduce quantum theory from it and check it

passed an enormous number of experimental tests, many of which we will encounter in this part of our mountain ascent. Planck discovered the principle when studying the properties of incandescent light, i.e., light emanating from hot bodies. But the quantum principle also applies to motion of matter, and even, as we will see later, to motion of space-time. Incidentally, the factor 1/2 results from historical accidents in the definition of the constant $\hbar$ (which is pronounced 'aitch-bar'). Despite this missing factor, $\hbar$ is called the *quantum of action*, or alternatively *Planck's (reduced) constant*.

Page 768

The quantum principle states that no experiment can measure an action smaller than $\hbar/2$. For a long time, Einstein tried to devise experiments to overcome this limit. But he failed in all his attempts: nature does not allow it, as Bohr showed again and again.

In physics – as in the theatre – action is a measure of the *change* occurring in a system. Therefore, a minimum action implies that *there is a minimum change in nature*. Thus the quantum of action would perhaps be better named the *quantum of change*. If we compare two observations, there will always be change between them. (What is called 'change' in everyday life is often called 'change of state' by physicists; the meaning is the same.)

Can a minimum change exist in nature? Table 90 shows that we need to explore three

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

points to accept the idea. We need to show that no higher speed is *observed* in nature, that no higher speed *can* ever be observed, and show that *all* consequences of invariance, however weird they may be, apply to nature. In fact, this is all of quantum theory. Therefore, these checks are all we do in the remaining of this part of our adventure. But before we explore some of the experiments that confirm the existence of a smallest change, we present some of its more surprising consequences.

The effects of the quantum of action on rest

Since action is a measure of change, a minimum observable action means that two successive observations of the same system always differ by at least $\hbar/2$. In every system, there is always *something* happening. As a consequence, in nature *there is no rest*. Everything moves, all the time, at least a little bit. *Natura facit saltus.** True, these jumps are tiny, as $\hbar/2$ is so small. But for example, the quantum of action implies that in a mountain – an archetypal 'system at rest' – all the atoms and electrons are continually buzzing around. Rest can be observed only macroscopically, and only as a long-time or many-particle average.

Page 976

Since there is a minimum action for all observers, and since there is no rest, in nature *there is no perfectly straight or perfectly uniform motion*. Forget all you have learnt so far. Inertial motion is an approximation! An object can move in straight, uniform motion only approximately, and only when observed over long distances or long times. We will see later that the more massive the object is, the better the approximation is. (Can you confirm this?) So *macroscopic* observers can still talk about space-time symmetries; and *special* relativity can thus be reconciled with quantum theory.

Challenge 1332 s

Also free fall, or motion along a geodesic, exists only as a long-time average. So *general* relativity, which is based on the existence of freely-falling observers, cannot be correct when actions of the order of $\hbar$ are involved. Indeed, the reconciliation of the quantum principle with general relativity – and thus with curved space – is a big challenge. (The solution is simple only for weak, everyday fields.) The issues involved are so mind-shattering that they form a separate, final, part of this mountain ascent. We thus explore situations without gravity first.

The consequences of the quantum of action for objects

Have you ever wondered why leaves are green? You probably know that they are green because they absorb blue (short-wavelength) and red (long-wavelength) light, while allowing green (medium-wavelength) light to be reflected. How can a system filter out the small and the large, and let the middle pass through? To do so, leaves must somehow *measure* the frequency. But we have seen that classical physics does not allow measurement of time (or length) intervals, as any measurement requires a measurement unit, and classical physics does not allow such units to be defined. On the other hand, it takes only a few lines to confirm that with the help of the quantum of action $\hbar$ (and the Boltzmann constant k, which Planck's discovered at the same time), fundamental units for *all* measurable quantities can be defined, including time and therefore frequency. (Can you find a combination of c, G and $\hbar$ that gives a time? It will only take a few minutes.) When

Page 317

Challenge 1333 s

* 'Nature makes jumps.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 428 An artist's impression of a water molecule

Planck had found all such combinations, he was as happy as a child; he knew straight away that he had made a fundamental discovery, even though (in 1899) quantum theory did not yet exist. He even told his seven-year-old son Erwin about it, while walking with him through the woods around Berlin. Planck explained to his son that he had made a discovery as important as universal gravity. Indeed, Planck knew that he had found the key to understanding many of the effects that were then unexplained. In particular, without the quantum of action, colours could not exist: every colour is a quantum effect.*

Planck also realized that the quantum of action allows us to understand the *size* of all things. (Can you find the combination of c, G and $\hbar$ that yields a length?) With the quantum of action, it was finally possible to determine the maximum size of mountains, of trees and of humans. Planck knew that the quantum of action confirmed what Galileo had already deduced long before him: that sizes are due to fundamental, minimal scales in nature.

Challenge 1335 e

Page 254

The size of objects is related to the size of atoms. In turn, the size of atoms is a direct consequence of the quantum of action. Can you derive an approximation for the size of atoms, knowing that it is given by the motion of electrons of mass m_e and charge e, constrained by the quantum of action? This connection, a simple formula, was discovered in 1910 by Arthur Erich Haas, 15 years before quantum theory was formulated. At the time, he was widely ridiculed. Nowadays, the formula is found in all textbooks.**

Challenge 1336 s

In determining the size of atoms, the quantum of action has another important consequence: Gulliver's travels are impossible. There are no tiny people and no giant ones. Classically, nothing speaks against the idea; but the quantum of action prevents it. Can you supply the detailed argument?

Challenge 1337 s

But if rest does not exist, how can *shapes* exist? Any shape of everyday life, including that of a flower, is the result of body parts remaining *at rest* with respect to each other. Now, all shapes result from interactions between the constituents of matter, as shown most clearly in the shapes of molecules. But how can a molecule, such as the water molecule H_2O, shown in Figure 428, have a shape? In fact, a molecule does not have

* In fact, it is also possible to define all measurement units in terms of c, G and e, the electron charge. Why is this not satisfactory?

Challenge 1334 s

** Before the discovery of $\hbar$, the only simple length scale for the electron was the combination $e^2/(4\pi\varepsilon_0 m_e c^2) \approx 3\,\mathrm{fm}$; this is ten thousand times smaller than an atom.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 429 Max Born (1882–1970)

a *fixed* shape, but its shape fluctuates, as would be expected from the quantum of action. Despite the fluctuations, every molecule does have an *average* shape, because different angles and distances correspond to different energies. Again, these average length and angle values only exist because the quantum of action yields fundamental length scales in nature. Without the quantum of action, there would be *no* shapes in nature.

The *mass* of an object is also a consequence of the quantum of action, as we will see later on. Since all material properties – such as density, colour, stiffness or polarizability – are defined as combinations of length, time and mass units, we find that all material properties arise from the quantum of action.

In short, the quantum of action determines the size, shape, colour, mass, and all other properties of objects, from stones to whipped cream. Measurements are only possible at all because of the existence of the quantum of action.

Why 'quantum'?

Quantum effects surround us on all sides. However, since the minimum action is so small, its effects on *motion* appear mostly, but not exclusively, in *microscopic* systems. The study of such systems was called *quantum mechanics* by Max Born, one of the major contributors to the field.* Later, the term *quantum theory* became more popular.

Quantum theory arises from the existence of *minimum* measurable values in nature, precisely as Galileo had speculated in the seventeenth century. As discussed in detail earlier on, it was Galileo's insistence on these *piccolissimi quanti* that got him into trouble. We will soon discover that the idea of a smallest change is necessary for a precise and

Page 252

* Max Born (b. 1882 Breslau, d. 1970 Göttingen) first studied mathematics, then turned to physics. A professor at Göttingen University, he made the city one of the world centres of physics. He developed quantum mechanics with his assistants Werner Heisenberg and Pascual Jordan, and then applied it to scattering, solid-state physics, optics and liquids. He was the first to understood that the state function describes a probability amplitude. He and Wolf together wrote what is still the main textbook on optics.

Ref. 809

Born attracted to Göttingen the most brilliant talents of the time, receiving as visitors Hund, Pauli, Nordheim, Oppenheimer, Goeppert-Mayer, Condon, Pauling, Fock, Frenkel, Tamm, Dirac, Mott, Klein, Heitler, London, von Neumann, Teller, Wigner, and dozens of others. Being Jewish, Born lost his job in 1933; he emigrated, and became professor in Edinburgh, where he stayed for 20 years. Physics at Göttingen never recovered from this loss. For his elucidation of the meaning of the wave function he received the 1954 Nobel Prize in Physics.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 91 Some small systems in motion and the observed action values for their changes

System & change	Action	Motion
Light		
Smallest amount of light absorbed by a coloured surface	$1\hbar$	quantum
Smallest impact when light reflects from mirror	$2\hbar$	quantum
Smallest visible amount of light	*c.* $5\hbar$	quantum
Smallest amount of light absorbed in flower petal	*c.* $1\hbar$	quantum
Blackening of photographic film	*c.* $3\hbar$	quantum
Photographic flash	*c.* $10^{17}\hbar$	classical
Electricity		
Electron ejected from atom	*c.* $1–2\hbar$	quantum
Electron added to molecule	*c.* $1–2\hbar$	quantum
Electron extracted from metal	*c.* $1–2\hbar$	quantum
Electron motion inside microprocessor	*c.* $2–6\hbar$	quantum
Signal transport in nerves, from one molecule to the next	*c.* $5\hbar$	quantum
Current flow in lightning bolt	*c.* $10^{38}\hbar$	classical
Materials		
Tearing apart two neighbouring iron atoms	*c.* $1–2\hbar$	quantum
Breaking a steel bar	*c.* $10^{35}\hbar$	classical
Basic process in superconductivity	$1\hbar$	quantum
Basic process in transistors	$1\hbar$	quantum
Basic magnetic process	$1\hbar$	quantum
Chemistry		
Atom collision in liquid at room temperature	*c.* $1\hbar$	quantum
Shape oscillation of water molecule	*c.* $1 – 5\hbar$	quantum
Shape change of molecule, e.g. in chemical reaction	*c.* $1 – 5\hbar$	quantum
Single chemical reaction curling a hair	*c.* $2 – 6\hbar$	quantum
Tearing apart two mozzarella molecules	*c.* $300\hbar$	quantum
Smelling one molecule	*c.* $10\hbar$	quantum
Burning fuel in a cylinder in an average car engine explosion	*c.* $10^{37}\hbar$	classical
Life		
Air molecule hitting eardrum	*c.* $2\hbar$	quantum
Smallest sound signal detectable by the ear	Challenge 1338 ny	
Single DNA duplication step during cell division	*c.* $100\hbar$	quantum
Ovule fertilization	*c.* $10^{14}\hbar$	classical
Smallest step in molecular motor	*c.* $5\hbar$	quantum
Sperm motion by one cell length	*c.* $10^{15}\hbar$	classical
Cell division	*c.* $10^{19}\hbar$	classical
Fruit fly's wing beat	*c.* $10^{24}\hbar$	classical
Person walking one body length	*c.* $2 \cdot 10^{36}\hbar$	classical
Nuclei and stars		
Nuclear fusion reaction in star	*c.* $1 – 5\hbar$	quantum
Particle collision in accelerator	*c.* $1\hbar$	quantum
Explosion of gamma-ray burster	*c.* $10^{80}\hbar$	classical

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 430 Werner Heisenberg (1901–1976)

accurate description of nature. Born adopted Galileo's term for the new branch of physics. The English language adopted the Latin singular 'quantum' instead of the Italian plural 'quanti'.

Note that the term 'quantum' does *not* imply that all measurement values are *multiples* of a smallest one: this is so only in a few rare cases.

Quantum theory is the description of microscopic motion. But when is quantum theory necessary? Table 91 shows that all processes on atomic and molecular scales, including biological and chemical processes, involve actions with values that are near the quantum of action. So do processes of light emission and absorption. These phenomena can *only* be described with quantum theory.

Table 91 also shows that the term 'microscopic' has a different meaning for a physicist and for a biologist. For a biologist, a system is microscopic if it requires a microscope for its observation. For a physicist, a system is microscopic if its characteristic action is of the order of the quantum of action. In other words, for a physicist a system is microscopic if it is *not* visible in a (light) microscope. To increase the confusion, some quantum physicists nowadays call their own class of microscopic systems 'mesoscopic', while others call their systems 'nanoscopic'. Both terms were introduced only to attract attention and funding: they are useless.

The effect of the quantum of action on motion

There is another way to characterize the difference between a microscopic, or quantum, system and a macroscopic, or classical, one. A minimum action implies that the difference between the action values S of two successive observations of the same system, a time Δt apart, is limited. One has

$$S(t+\Delta t) - S(t) = (E+\Delta E)(t+\Delta t) - Et = E\Delta t + t\Delta E + \Delta E\Delta t \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{2} \,. \qquad (581)$$

Now the values of the energy E and time t – but not of ΔE or Δt – can be set to zero if we choose a suitable observer. Thus, the existence of a quantum of action implies that in

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

any system the evolution is constrained by

$$\Delta E \Delta t \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{2} \,, \tag{582}$$

where E is the energy of the system and t is its age, so that ΔE is the change of energy and Δt is the time between two successive observations.

Challenge 1339 e By a similar reasoning , we find that for any system the position and momentum are constrained by

$$\Delta x \Delta p \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{2} \,, \tag{583}$$

where Δx is the indeterminacy in position and Δp is the indeterminacy in momentum. These two famous relations were called *indeterminacy relations* by their discoverer, Werner Heisenberg.* In English they are often called 'uncertainty relations'; however, this term is incorrect: the quantities are not uncertain, but *undetermined*. Because of the quantum of action, system observables have *no* definite value. There is no way to ascribe a precise value to momentum, position, or any other observable of a quantum system.

Any system whose indeterminacy is of the order of $\hbar$ is a quantum system; if the indeterminacy product is much larger, the system is classical, and classical physics is sufficient for its description. So even though classical physics assumes that there are *no* measurement indeterminacies in nature, a system is classical only if its indeterminacies are *large* compared to the minimum possible ones. Therefore quantum theory is necessary whenever one tries to measure some quantity as precisely as possible. In fact, every measurement is itself a quantum process.

The indeterminacy relations again show that *motion cannot be observed to infinite precision*. In other words, the microscopic world is *fuzzy*. This fact has many important consequences and many strange ones. For example, if motion cannot be observed with infinite precision, the very concept of motion needs to be handled with great care, as it cannot be applied in certain situations. In a sense, the rest of our quest is just an exploration of the implications of this result.

In fact, as long as space-time is *flat*, it turns out that we *can* retain the concept of motion to describe observations, provided we remain aware of the limitations implied

* It is often said that the indeterminacy relation for energy and time has a different weight from that for momentum and position. This is a wrong idea, propagated by the older generation of physicists, which has survived through many textbooks for over 70 years. Just forget it. It is essential to remember that all four quantities appearing in the inequalities describe the *internal* properties of the system. In particular, t is a time variable deduced from changes observed *inside* the system, and not the time coordinate measured by an outside clock; similarly, the position x is not the external space coordinate, but the position characterizing the system.

Ref. 810 Werner Heisenberg (1901–1976) was an important German theoretical physicist and an excellent table-tennis and tennis player. In 1925, as a young man, he developed, with some help from Max Born and Pascual Jordan, the first version of quantum theory; from it he deduced the indeterminacy relations. For these achievements he received the Nobel Prize for physics in 1932. He also worked on nuclear physics and on turbulence. During the Second World War, he worked on the German nuclear-fission programme. After the war, he published several successful books on philosophical questions in physics, and tried unsuccessfully – with some half-hearted help from Wolfgang Pauli – to find a unified description of nature based on quantum theory, the 'world formula'.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

by the quantum principle.

Quantum limits and surprises

The quantum of action implies the existence of short-time deviations from energy, momentum and angular-momentum conservation in microscopic systems. In the first part of our mountain ascent, we realized that any type of non-conservation implies the existence of *surprises* in nature. Well, here are some of them.

Page 186

Since precisely uniform motion does not exist, a system moving in one dimension only – such as the hand of a clock – always has the possibility of moving a bit in the opposite direction, thus leading to incorrect readings. Indeed, quantum theory predicts that clocks have essential limitations, and that perfect clocks do not exist. It is also impossible to avoid that an object makes small displacement sideways. In fact, quantum theory implies that, strictly speaking, neither uniform nor one-dimensional motion exists.

Quantum limitations apply also to metre rules. It is impossible to ensure that the rule is completely at rest with respect to the object being measured. Thus the quantum of action implies, on one hand, that measurements are possible, and on the other, that their accuracy is limited.

It also follows from the quantum of action that any inertial or freely-falling observer must be *large*, as only large systems approximate inertial motion. *An observer cannot be microscopic.* If humans were not macroscopic, they could neither observe nor study motion.

Because of the finite accuracy with which microscopic motion can be observed, faster-than-light motion is possible in the microscopic domain. Quantum theory thus predicts *tachyons*, at least over short time intervals. For the same reason, *motion backwards in time* is possible over microscopic times and distances. In short, a quantum of action implies the existence of microscopic time travel. Of course, this remains impossible in the macroscopic domain, such as everyday life.

But there is more: the quantum of action implies that *there is no permanence in nature*. Imagine a moving car suddenly disappearing for good. In such a situation, neither momentum nor energy would be conserved. The action change for such a disappearance is large compared to $\hbar$, so that its observation would contradict even classical physics – as you may wish to check. However, the quantum of action allows a *microscopic* particle, such as an electron, to disappear for a *short* time, provided it reappears afterwards.

Challenge 1340 s

The quantum of action also implies that *the vacuum is not empty*. If one looks at empty space twice, the two observations being separated by a tiny time interval, some energy will be observed the second time. If the time interval is short enough, then because of the quantum of action, matter particles will be observed. Indeed, particles can appear anywhere from nowhere, and disappear just afterwards: the action limit requires it. In summary, nature exhibits short-term appearance and disappearance of matter. In other words, the classical idea of an *empty* vacuum is correct only when the vacuum is observed over a *long* time.

The quantum of action implies that compass needles cannot work. If we look twice in quick succession at a compass needle, or even at a house, we usually observe that it stays oriented in the same direction. But since physical action has the same dimensions as angular momentum, a minimum value for action implies a minimum value for angular

Challenge 1341 e

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 431 Hills are never high enough

momentum. Even a macroscopic object has a minimum value for its rotation. In other words, quantum theory predicts that *everything rotates*. Something can be non-rotating only approximately, when observations are separated by long time intervals.

For microscopic systems, the limits on rotation have different effects. If the rotation angle can be observed – as for molecules – the system behaves like macroscopic object: its position and orientation are fuzzy. But for a system whose rotation angle cannot be observed, the quantum of action limits the angular momentum to multiples of $\hbar/2$. As a result, all microscopic bound systems – such as molecules, atoms, or nuclei – contain rotational motion and rotating components.

Transformation, growth and Democritus

Page 28

At the beginning of our adventure, we mentioned that the Greeks distinguished three types of changes: transport, growth, and transformation. We also mentioned that Democritus had deduced that all these types of changes – including life and death – were in fact the same, and due to the motion of atoms. The quantum of action makes exactly this point.

First of all, a minimum action implies that cages in zoos are dangerous and banks are not safe. A cage is a feature that it needs a lot of energy to overcome. Mathematically, the wall of a cage is an energy hill, like the one shown in Figure 431. Imagine that a particle with momentum p approaches one side of the hill, which is assumed to have width Δx.

In everyday life – and thus in classical physics – the particle will never be observed on the other side of the hill if its kinetic energy $p^2/2m$ is *less* than the height E of the hill. But imagine that the missing momentum to overcome the hill, $\Delta p = \sqrt{2mE} - p$, satisfies $\Delta x \Delta p \leqslant \hbar/2$. The particle will have the possibility to overcome the hill, despite its insufficient energy. The quantum of action thus implies that a hill of width

$$\Delta x \leqslant \frac{\hbar/2}{\sqrt{2mE} - p} \tag{584}$$

is *not* an obstacle to a particle of mass m. But this is not all. Since the value of the particle momentum p is itself uncertain, a particle can overcome the hill even if the hill is *wider* than the value (584) – although the broader it is, the lower the probability will be. So any particle can overcome *any* obstacle. This is called the *tunnelling effect*, for obvious reasons.

In short, the minimum-action principle implies that there are no tight boxes in nature. Thanks to the tunnelling effect, *matter is not impenetrable*, in contrast to everyday, classi-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 432 Leaving enclosures



FIGURE 433 Identical objects with crossing paths

cal observation. Can you explain why lion cages work *despite* the quantum of action? Challenge 1342 s

By the way, the quantum of action also implies that a particle with a kinetic energy greater than the energy height of a hill can be reflected by the hill. Classically, this is impossible. Can you explain it? Challenge 1343 ny

The minimum-action principle also implies that bookshelves are dangerous. Shelves are obstacles to motion. A book on a shelf is in the same situation as the mass in Figure 432: the mass is surrounded by energy hills hindering its escape to the outer, lower-energy world. But thanks to the tunnelling effect, escape is always possible. The same picture applies to a branch of a tree, a nail in a wall, or anything attached to anything else. Things can never be permanently fixed together. In particular, we will discover that every example of light emission – even radioactivity – results from this effect. The quantum of action thus implies that *decay is part of nature*. Note that decay often appears in everyday life, under a different name: *breaking*. In fact, all breakages require the quantum of action for their description. Obviously, the cause of breaking is often classical, but the *mechanism* of breaking is always quantum. Only objects that obey quantum theory can break. In short, there are no stable excited systems in nature. For the same reason, by the way, no memory can be perfect. (Can you confirm this?) Ref. 811 Challenge 1344 ny

Taking a more general view, *ageing* and *death* also result from the quantum of action. Death, like ageing, is a composition of breaking processes. Breaking is a form of decay, and is due to tunnelling. Death is thus a quantum process. Classically, death does not exist. Might this be the reason why so many people believe in immortality or eternal youth? Challenge 1345 s

We will also discover that the quantum of action is the reason for the importance of the action observable in classical physics. In fact, the existence of a *minimal* action is the reason for the *least*-action principle of classical physics.

A minimum action also implies that matter cannot be continuous, but must be composed of smallest entities. Indeed, any flow of a truly continuous material would contradict the quantum principle. Can you give the precise argument? Of course, at this point Challenge 1346 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 434 Transformation through reaction

in our adventure, the non-continuity of matter is no longer a surprise. But the quantum of action implies that even *radiation* cannot be continuous. As Albert Einstein was the first to state clearly, light is made of quantum particles.

More generally, the quantum of action implies that in nature *all flows and all waves are made of microscopic particles*. The term 'microscopic' (or 'quantum') is essential, as such particles do *not* behave like little stones. We have already encountered several differences, and we will encounter others shortly. For these reasons, there should be a special name for microscopic particles; but so far all proposals, of which *quanton* is the most popular, have failed to catch on.

The quantum of action has several strange consequences for microscopic particles. Take two such particles with the same mass and composition. Imagine that their paths cross, and that at the crossing they approach each other very closely, as shown in Figure 433. A minimum action implies that in such a situation, if the distance becomes small enough, the two particles can switch roles, without anybody being able to avoid, or notice, it. Thus, in a volume of gas it is *impossible* – thanks to the quantum of action – to follow particles moving around and to say which particle is which. Can you confirm this deduction, and specify the conditions, using the indeterminacy relations? In summary, in nature *it is impossible to distinguish between identical particles*. Can you guess what happens in the case of light?

Challenge 1347 s

Challenge 1348 s

But matter deserves still more attention. Imagine again two particles – even two different ones – approaching each other very closely, as shown in Figure 434. We know that if the approach distance gets small, things get fuzzy. Now, the minimum-action principle makes it possible for something to happen in that small domain as long as resulting outgoing products have the same total linear momentum, angular momentum and energy as the incoming ones. Indeed, ruling out such processes would imply that arbitrarily small actions could be observed, thus eliminating nature's fuzziness, as you may wish to check for yourself. In short, *a minimum action allows transformation of matter*. One also says that the quantum of action allows particle *reactions*. In fact, we will discover that *all* kinds of reactions in nature, including breathing, digestion, and all other chemical and nuclear reactions, are due just to the existence of the quantum of action.

Challenge 1349 e

One type of process that is especially dear to us is growth. The quantum of action implies that all growth happens in small steps. Indeed, all growth processes in nature are

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 435 A famous quantum effect: how do train windows manage to show two superimposed images?



FIGURE 436 A particle and a screen with two nearby slits

quantum processes.

So Democritus was both right and wrong. He was right in deducing fundamental constituents for matter and radiation. He was right in unifying all change in nature – from transport to transformation and growth – as motion of particles. But he was wrong in assuming that the small particles behave like stones.

Randomness

The quantum of action has other interesting consequences. Because of the indeterminacy relations, it is impossible to obtain definite values for both the momentum and the position of a particle. Obviously, this is also impossible for the individual components of an experimental set-up or an observer. Therefore, initial conditions – both for a system and for an experimental set-up – cannot be exactly duplicated. A minimum action thus implies that whenever an experiment on a microscopic system is performed twice, the outcomes will be different. They could only be the same if both the system and the observer were in exactly the same configuration each time. This turns out to be impossible, because of the second principle of thermodynamics and also because of the quantum principle. Therefore, *microscopic systems behave randomly*. Obviously, there will be some *average* outcome; nevertheless, microscopic observations are probabilistic. Albert Einstein found this conclusion of quantum theory the most difficult to swallow. The quantum of action implies that the behaviour of quantum systems is strikingly different from that of classical systems. But the conclusion is unavoidable: nature behaves randomly.

Every *window* proves that nature behaves randomly. Everybody knows that one can use a train window either to look at the *outside* landscape or, by concentrating on the reflected image, to observe some interesting person *inside* the carriage. In other words, glass reflects some of the light particles and lets some others pass through. More precisely, glass reflects a random selection of light particles; yet the average proportion is constant. Partial reflection is thus similar to the tunnelling effect. Indeed, the partial reflection of photons in glass is a result of the quantum of action. Again, the situation can be *described* by classical physics, but the precise amount of reflection cannot be *explained* without quantum theory. Without the quantum of action, train journeys would be much more

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

boring.

Waves

The quantum of action implies an important result about the *paths* of particles. If a particle travels from one point to another, there is no way to say which path it has taken in between. Indeed, in order to distinguish between two possible, but slightly different, paths, actions smaller than $\hbar/2$ would have to be measured. In particular, if a particle is sent through a screen with two sufficiently close slits, it is impossible to say which slit the particle passed through. This impossibility is fundamental. Matter is predicted to exhibit interference.

We already know phenomena of motion for which it is not possible to say with precision which path is taken when two slits are crossed: *waves* behave in this way. All waves
Page 238 are subject to the indeterminacy relations

$$\Delta\omega\Delta t \geqslant \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta k\Delta x \geqslant \frac{1}{2} \,. \tag{585}$$

We saw above that quantum systems are subject to

$$\Delta E\Delta t \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta p\Delta x \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{2} \,. \tag{586}$$

We are thus led to ascribe a frequency and a wavelength to a quantum system:

$$E = \hbar\omega \quad \text{and} \quad p = \hbar k = \hbar\frac{2\pi}{\lambda} \,. \tag{587}$$

The energy–frequency relation was deduced by Albert Einstein in 1905; it is found to be valid in particular for all examples of light emission and light absorption. In 1923 and 1924, Louis de Broglie* predicted that the relation should hold also for all quantum *matter*
Page 1019 particles. The experimental confirmation came a few years later. (This is thus another example of a discovery that was made about 20 years too late.) In short, the quantum of action implies that matter particles behave like waves.

Quantum flows

The quantum of action, the smallest change, implies that flows cannot be arbitrary weak.
Page 276 This applies to *all* flows: in particular, it applies to rivers, solid matter flows, gas flows, light beams, energy flows, entropy flows, momentum flows, angular momentum flows,

* Louis de Broglie (b. 1892 Dieppe, d. 1987 Paris), French physicist and professor at the Sorbonne. The energy–frequency relation for light had earned Albert Einstein his Nobel Prize already in 1921. De Broglie expanded it to predict the wave nature of the electron (and of all other quantum matter particles): this was the essence of his doctoral thesis. The prediction was confirmed experimentally a few years later, in 1927. For the prediction of the wave nature of matter, de Broglie received the Nobel Prize for physics in 1929. Being an aristocrat, he did no more research after that. For example, it was Schrödinger who then wrote down the wave equation, even though de Broglie could equally have done so.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

probability flows, signals of all kind, electrical charge flows, colour charge flows and weak charge flows.

Water flows in rivers, like any other matter flow, cannot be arbitrary small: the quantum of action implies that there is a smallest matter flow in nature. Depending on the situation, the smallest matter flow is a molecule, an atom or a smaller particle. Indeed, the quantum of action is also at the origin of the observation of a smallest charge in electric current. Since all matter can flow, the quantum of action implies that *all matter has particle aspects*.

In the same way, the quantum of action, the smallest change, implies that light cannot be arbitrarily faint. There is a smallest illumination in nature; it is called a *photon* or a *light quantum*. Now, light is a wave, and the argument can be made for any other wave as well. In short, the quantum of action thus implies that *all waves have particle aspects*. This has been proved for light waves, water waves, X rays, sound waves, plasma waves, fluid whirls and any other wave type that has ever been observed. (Gravitational waves have not yet been observed; it is expected that their particle-like aspects, the *gravitons*, exist also in this case.)

In summary, the quantum of action states: *if it moves, it is made of quantum particles, or quantons*. Later on we will explore and specify the exact differences between a quantum particle and a particle in everyday life.

Quantum information

In computer science, the smallest unit of change is called a 'bit'. The existence of a smallest change in nature implies that computer (or information) science can be used to describe nature, and in particular quantum theory. However, it can describe only the 'software' side. The 'hardware' side of nature is also required. The hardware of nature enters the description whenever the actual value $\hbar$ of the quantum of action must be introduced.

As we explore the similarities and differences between nature and information science, we will discover that the quantum of action implies that macroscopic physical systems cannot be copied – or 'cloned', as quantum theorists like to say. Nature does not allow copies of macroscopic objects. In other words, perfect copying machines do not exist. The quantum of action makes it impossible to gather and use all information in a way that allows production of a perfect copy. As a consequence, we will deduce that the precise order in which measurements are performed in an experiment matters. When the order of measurements can be reversed without affecting the net result, physicists speak of 'commutation'. The quantum of action implies that physical observables do not commute.

We will also find that the quantum of action implies that systems are not always independent, but can be 'entangled'. This term, introduced by Erwin Schrödinger, describes one of the most absurd consequences of quantum theory. Entanglement makes everything in nature connected to everything else. Entanglement produces effects that seem (but are not) faster than light. Entanglement produces a (fake) form of non-locality. Entanglement also implies that trustworthy communication cannot exist.

Page 1081

Ref. 812

Don't all these deductions look wrong, or at least crazy? In fact, if you or your lawyer made any of these statements in court, maybe even under oath, you would probably end up in prison! However, all the above statements are correct: they are all confirmed by experiment. And there are many more surprises to come. You may have noticed that, in

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

the preceding examples, we have made no explicit reference to electricity, to the nuclear interactions, or to gravity. In these domains the surprises are even more astonishing. Observation of antimatter, electric current without resistance, the motion inside muscles, vacuum energy, nuclear reactions in stars, and maybe soon the boiling of empty space, will fascinate you as much as they have fascinated, and still fascinate, thousands of researchers.

In particular, the consequences of the quantum of action for the early universe are mind-boggling. Just try to explore for yourself its consequences for the big bang. Together, all these topics will lead us a long way towards the top of Motion Mountain. They are so strange, so incredible, and so numerous, that quantum physics can rightly be called the description of motion for *crazy* scientists. In a sense, this generalizes our previous definition of quantum physics as the description of motion related to pleasure.

Challenge 1350 d

It is sometimes said that 'nobody understands quantum theory'. This is wrong. In fact, it is worse than wrong: it is disinformation. Dictatorships use disinformation to prevent people from making up their own mind and from enjoying life. But the consequences of the quantum of action can be understood and enjoyed by everybody. In order to do so, our first task on our way towards the top of Motion Mountain will be the study of our classical standard of motion: the motion of light.

> Nie und nirgends hat es Materie ohne
> Bewegung gegeben, oder kann es sie geben.
> Friedrich Engels, *Anti-Dühring*.*

Curiosities and fun challenges about the quantum of action

Even if we accept that no experiment performed so far contradicts the minimum action, we still have to check that the minimum action does not contradict reason. In particular, the minimum action must also be consistent with all *imagined* experiments. This is not self-evident.

* *

Angular momentum has the same dimensions as action. A smallest action implies that there is a smallest angular momentum in nature. How can this be, given that some particles have spin zero, i.e., have no angular momentum?

Challenge 1351 s

* *

Could we have started the whole discussion of quantum theory by stating that there is a minimum angular momentum instead of a minimum action?

Challenge 1352 s

* *

Niels Bohr, besides propagating the idea of a minimum action, was also an enthusiast of the complementarity principle. This is the idea that certain pairs of observables of a system – such as position and momentum – have linked *precision*: if one of the pair is known to high precision, the other is necessarily known with low precision. Can you deduce this principle from the minimum action?

Challenge 1353 s

Ref. 813 * 'Never and nowhere has matter existed, nor can it exist, without motion.' Friedrich Engels (1820–1895) was one of the theoreticians of Marxism, often also called Communism.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

When electromagnetic fields come into play, the value of the action (usually) depends on the choice of the vector potential, and thus on the choice of gauge. We saw in the section on electrodynamics that a suitable choice of gauge can change the value of the action by adding or subtracting any desired amount. Nevertheless, there is a smallest action in nature. This is possible, because in quantum theory, physical gauge changes cannot add or subtract any amount, but only multiples of *twice* the minimum value. Thus they do not allow us to go below the minimum action.

* *

Challenge 1354 s Adult plants stop growing in the dark. Without light, the reactions necessary for growth cease. Can you show that this is a quantum effect, not explainable by classical physics?

* *

Challenge 1355 s Most quantum processes in everyday life are electromagnetic. Can you show that the quantum of action must also hold for nuclear processes?

* *

Challenge 1356 s Is the quantum of action independent of the observer, even near the speed of light? This question was the reason why Planck contacted the young Einstein, inviting him to Berlin, thus introducing him to the international physics community.

* *

Challenge 1357 ny The quantum of action implies that *Tom Thumb* cannot exist, that fractals cannot exist in nature, and that '*Moore's law*' of semiconductor electronics, which states that the number of transistors on a chip doubles every two years, cannot be correct. Why not?



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 34

LIGHT – THE STRANGE CONSEQUENCES OF THE QUANTUM OF ACTION

> Alle Wesen leben vom Lichte,
> jedes glückliche Geschöpfe.
> Friedrich Schiller, *Wilhelm Tell*.*

What is the faintest lamp?

If all the colours of materials are quantum effects, as just argued, it becomes especially interesting to study the properties of light itself. If in nature there is a minimum change, then there should also be a minimum illumination. This was already predicted in ancient Greece, for example by Epicurus (341–271 BCE). He stated that light is a stream of little particles, so that the smallest possible illumination would be that of a single light particle.

Ref. 814

Ref. 815

In the 1930s, Brumberg and Vavilov found a beautiful way to check this prediction using the naked eye, despite our inability to consciously detect single photons. In fact, the experiment is so simple that it could have been performed at least a century earlier; but nobody had had a sufficiently daring imagination to try it. The two researchers constructed a small shutter that could be opened for time intervals of 0.1 s. From the other side, in a completely dark room, they illuminated the opening with extremely weak green light: about 200 aW at 505 nm. At that intensity, whenever the shutter opens, on average about 50 photons can pass. This is just the sensitivity threshold of the eye. To perform the experiment, they repeatedly looked into the open shutter. The result was simple but surprising. Sometimes they observed light, and sometimes they did not. Whether they did or did not was completely random. Brumberg and Vavilov gave the simple explanation that at low lamp powers, because of fluctuations, the number of photons is above the eye threshold half the time, and below it the other half. The fluctuations are random, and so the detection is as well. This would *not* happen if light were a continuous stream: in that case, the eye would detect light at every opening of the shutter. (At higher light intensities, the percentage of non-observations quickly decreases, in accordance with the explanation given.) Nobody knows how the theory of light would have developed if this simple experiment had been performed 100 years earlier.

The experiment can become clearer if we use certain devices to help us. A simple way is to start with a screen behind a prism illuminated with white light. The light is split into colours. As the screen is placed further and further away, the illumination intensity cannot become arbitrarily small, as that would contradict the quantum of action. To check

* 'From light all beings live.' Friedrich Schiller (b. 1759 Marbach, d. 1805 Weimar), German poet, playwright and historian.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Figure to be included

FIGURE 437 How to experience single photon effects (see text)



FIGURE 438 How does a white-light spectrum appear at extremely long screen distances? (The short-screen-distance spectrum shown, © Andrew Young, is optimized for CRT display, not for colour printing, as explained on mintaka.sdsu.edu/GF/explain/optics/rendering.html.)

this prediction, we only need some black-and-white photographic film. Film is blackened by daylight of any colour; it becomes dark grey at medium intensities and light grey at lower intensities. Looking at an extremely light grey film under the microscope, we discover that, even under uniform illumination, the grey shade is actually composed of black spots, arranged more or less densely. Nowadays, this can also be performed with photomultipliers. Photomultipliers can also detect single photons. As shown in Figure 439, low-intensity light does *not* produce a homogeneous colour: on the contrary, low-intensity produces a random pattern of equal spots.

This is a general observation: whenever sensitive light detectors are constructed with the aim of 'seeing' as accurately as possible (and thus in environments as dark as possible), one finds that light manifests as a stream of *light quanta*. Nowadays they are usually called *photons*, a term that appeared in 1926. Light of low or high intensity corresponds simply to a stream with a small or large number of photons.

A particularly interesting example of a low-intensity source of light is a single atom. Atoms are tiny spheres. When they radiate light or X-rays, the radiation should be emitted as spherical waves. But in all experiments, it is found that each atom emits only a 'blob' of light. The light emitted by an atom is *never* found to form a spherical wave, as

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 439 Light waves are made of particles: observation of photons – black spots in these negatives – in a low intensity double slit experiment, with exposure times of 1, 2 and 5 s, using an image intensifier (© Delft University of Technology)

Figure to be included

FIGURE 440 An atom radiating one photon triggers only one detector and recoils in only one direction

one might expect from everyday physics. Whenever a radiating atom is surrounded by many detectors, only a *single* detector is triggered.

All experiments in dim light show that the continuum description of light is incorrect. All these experiments prove directly that light is a stream of particles, as Epicurus had proposed in ancient Greece. More precise measurements confirm the role of the quantum of action: every photon leads to the *same* amount of change. Photons of the same frequency blackens a film or trigger a scintillation screen in the same way. The amount of change induced by a single photon is the *minimal* amount of change that light can produce.

If there were no minimum action, light could be packaged into arbitrarily small amounts. In other words, the classical description of light by a *continuous* vector potential $A(t, x)$, or electromagnetic field $F(t, x)$, whose evolution is described by a principle of least action, is *wrong*. Continuous functions do not describe the observed particle effects. A modified description is required. The modification has to be significant only at

Page 714

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 441 Detectors that allow photon counting

low light intensities, since at high intensities the classical Lagrangian accurately describes all experimental observations.*

At which intensities does light cease to behave as a continuous wave? Human eyesight does not allow us to consciously distinguish single photons, although experiments show
Ref. 816 that the hardware of the eye is in principle able to do so. The faintest stars that can be seen at night produce a light intensity of about $0.6\,\mathrm{nW/m^2}$. Since the pupil of the eye is small, and we are not able to see individual photons, photons must have energies smaller than 100 aJ. Brumberg and Vavilov's experiment yields an upper limit of around 20 aJ.

An exact value for the quantum of action found in light must be deduced from laboratory experiment. Today, recording and counting individual photons is a standard procedure. Photon counters are part of many spectroscopy set-ups, such as those used to measure tiny concentrations of materials. For example, they are used to detect drugs in human hair.

In general, all experiments show that a beam of light of frequency f or angular frequency ω, which determines its colour, is accurately described as a stream of photons, each with the same energy E, given by

$$E = \hbar\, 2\pi f = \hbar\,\omega\ . \tag{588}$$

This relation shows that for light, the smallest measurable action is given by the quantum of action $\hbar$. This is *twice* the smallest action observable in nature; the reasons for and implications of the factor 2 will unfold during the rest of our walk. In summary, *colour* is a property of photons. A coloured light beam is a hailstorm of corresponding photons.

The value of *Planck's constant* can be determined from measurements of black bodies
Page 768 or other light sources. The result,

$$\hbar = 1.1 \cdot 10^{-34}\,\mathrm{Js}\ , \tag{589}$$

is so small that we can understand why photons go unnoticed by humans. For example,
Challenge 1358 e a green photon with a wavelength of 555 nm has an energy of 0.37 aJ. Indeed, in normal

* The transition from the classical case to the quantum case used to be called *quantization*. This concept, and the ideas behind it, are only of historical interest today.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 442 Compton's experiment: photons have momentum

light conditions the photons are so numerous that the continuum approximation for the electromagnetic field is highly accurate. In the dark, the insensitivity of the signal processing of the human eye – in particular the slowness of the light receptors – makes photon counting impossible. However, the eye is not far from the maximum possible sensitivity. From the numbers given above about dim stars, we can estimate that humans are able to see *consciously*, under ideal conditions, flashes of about half a dozen photons.

Ref. 816

Challenge 1359 ny

Let us explore the remaining properties of photons. First, photons have no measurable (rest) mass or electric charge. Can you confirm this? In fact, experiments can only give an upper limit for both quantities. The present experimental upper limit for the (rest) mass of a photon is 10^{-52} kg, and for the charge is $5 \cdot 10^{-30}$ times the electron charge.

Challenge 1360 ny

Ref. 817

We know that light can *hit* objects. Since the energy and the speed of photons is known, we guess that the photon momentum is given by

Challenge 1361 ny

$$p = \frac{E}{c} = \hbar \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} \quad \text{or} \quad \boldsymbol{p} = \hbar \boldsymbol{k} \,. \tag{590}$$

In other words, if light is made of particles, we should be able to play billiard with them. This is indeed possible, as Arthur Compton showed in a famous experiment in 1923. He directed X-rays, which are high-energy photons, onto graphite, a material in which electrons move almost freely. He found that whenever the electrons in the material are hit by the X-ray photons, the deflected X-rays change colour. As expected, the strength of the hit is related to the deflection angle of the photon. From the colour change and the reflection angle, Compton confirmed that the photon momentum indeed satisfies the expression $\boldsymbol{p} = \hbar \boldsymbol{k}$.

Ref. 818

All other experiments agree that photons have momentum. For example, when an atom *emits* light, the atom feels a *recoil*. The momentum again turns out to be given by the expression $\boldsymbol{p} = \hbar \boldsymbol{k}$. In short, the quantum of action determines the momentum of the photon.

The value of a photon's momentum respects the indeterminacy principle. Just as it is impossible to measure exactly both the wavelength of a wave and the position of its crest, so it is impossible to measure both the momentum and the position of a photon. Can you confirm this? In other words, the value of the photon momentum is a direct consequence of the quantum of action.

Challenge 1362 ny

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

From our study of classical physics, we know that light has a property beyond its colour: light can be *polarized*. That is only a complicated way to say that light can *turn* the objects that it shines on. In other words, light has an angular momentum oriented along the axis of propagation. What about photons? Measurements consistently find that each light quantum carries an *angular momentum* given by $L = \hbar$. It is called its *helicity*. The quantity is similar to one found for massive particles: one therefore also speaks of the *spin* of a photon. In short, photons somehow 'turn' – in a direction either parallel or antiparallel to the direction of motion. Again, the magnitude of the photon helicity, or spin, is no surprise; it confirms the classical relation $L = E/\omega$ between energy and angular momentum that we found in the section on classical electrodynamics. Note that, counterintuitively, the angular momentum of a single photon is fixed, and thus independent of its energy. Even the most energetic photons have $L = \hbar$. Of course, the value of the helicity also respects the limit given by the quantum of action. The helicity value $\hbar$ – twice the minimum $\hbar/2$ – has important consequences, which will become clear shortly.

Page 747

Challenge 1363 ny

What is light? – Again

> La lumière est un mouvement luminaire de corps lumineux.
>
> Blaise Pascal*

In the seventeenth century, Blaise Pascal used the above statement about light to make fun of certain physicists, ridiculing the blatant use of a circular definition. Of course, he was right: in his time, the definition was indeed circular, as no meaning could be given to any of the terms. But whenever physicists study an observation with care, philosophers lose out. All those originally undefined terms now have a definite meaning and the circular definition is resolved. Light is indeed a type of motion; this motion can rightly be called 'luminary' because, in contrast to the motion of material bodies, it has the unique property $v = c$; the luminous bodies, today called photons, are characterized, and differentiated from all other particles, by their dispersion relation $E = cp$, their energy $E = \hbar\omega$, their spin $L = \hbar$, the vanishing of all other quantum numbers, and the property of being the quanta of the electromagnetic field.

In short, *light is a stream of photons*. It is indeed a 'luminary movement of luminous bodies'. Photons provide our first example of a general property of the world on small scales: *all waves and all flows in nature are made of quantum particles*. Large numbers of (coherent) quantum particles – or *quantons* – behave and form as waves. We will see shortly that this is the case even for matter. Quantons are the fundamental constituents of *all* waves, without exception. Thus, the everyday continuum description of light is similar in many respects to the description of water as a continuous fluid: photons are the atoms of light, and continuity is an approximation valid for large numbers of particles. Small numbers of quantons often behave like classical particles.

Physics books used to discuss at length a so-called *wave–particle duality*. Let us be clear from the start: quantons, or quantum particles, are *neither* classical waves *nor* classical particles. In the microscopic world, quantons are the fundamental objects.

* 'Light is the luminary movement of luminous bodies.' Blaise Pascal (b. 1623 Clermont, d. 1662 Paris), important French mathematician and physicist up to the age of 26, after which he became a theologian and philosopher.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

However, there is much that is still unclear. Where, inside matter, do these monochromatic photons come from? Even more interestingly, if light is made of quantons, all electromagnetic fields, even static ones, must be made of photons as well. However, in static fields nothing is flowing. How is this apparent contradiction resolved? And what implications does the particle aspect have for these static fields? What is the difference between quantons and classical particles? The properties of photons require more careful study. Let us go on.

The size of photons

First of all, we might ask: what are these photons made of? All experiments so far, performed down to the present limit of about 10^{-20} m, give the same answer: 'we can't find anything'. This is consistent with both a vanishing mass and a vanishing size of photons. Indeed, one would intuitively expect a body with a finite size to have a finite mass. Thus, although experiments can give only an upper limit, it is consistent to claim that a photon has *zero size*.

A particle with zero size cannot have any constituents. Thus a photon cannot be divided into smaller entities: photons are not composite. For this reason, they are called *elementary* particles. We will soon give some further strong arguments for this result.

Challenge 1364 ny

(Can you find one?) It is a strange result. How can a photon have vanishing size, have no constituents, and still be *something*? This is a hard question; the answer will appear only later on. At the moment we simply have to accept the situation as it is. We therefore turn to an easier question.

Are photons countable? – Squeezed light

> Also gibt es sie doch.
>
> Max Planck*

We saw above that the simplest way to count photons is to distribute them across a large screen and then to absorb them. But this method is not entirely satisfactory, as it destroys the photons. How can one count photons without destroying them?

One way is to reflect photons in a mirror and measure the recoil of the mirror. It seems almost unbelievable, but nowadays this effect is becoming measurable even for small numbers of photons. For example, it has to be taken into account in relation to the laser mirrors used in gravitational wave detectors, whose position has to be measured

Page 532

with high precision.

Another way of counting photons without destroying them involves the use of special high-quality laser cavities. It is possible to count photons by the effect they have on atoms cleverly placed inside such a cavity.

In other words, light intensity can indeed be measured without absorption. However, the next difficulty appears straight away. Measurements show that even the best light beams, from the most sophisticated lasers, *fluctuate* in intensity. There are no steady

* 'Thus they do exist after all.' Max Planck, in his later years, said this after standing silently, for a long time, in front of an apparatus that counted single photons by producing a click for each photon it detected. For a large part of his life, Planck was sceptical of the photon concept, even though his own experiments and conclusions were the starting point for its introduction.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

beams. This comes as no surprise: if a light beam did *not* fluctuate, observing it twice would yield a vanishing value for the action. However, there is a minimum action in nature, namely $\hbar/2$. Thus any beam and any flow in nature must fluctuate. But there is more.

A light beam is described by its intensity and its phase. The change – or action – that occurs while a beam moves is given by the variation in the product of intensity and phase. Experiments confirm the obvious deduction: the intensity and phase of a beam behave like the momentum and position of a particle, in that they obey an indeterminacy relation. You can deduce it yourself, in the same way as we deduced Heisenberg's relations. Using as characteristic intensity $I = E/\omega$, the energy divided by the angular frequency, and calling the phase φ, we get*

$$\Delta I \, \Delta\varphi \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{2} \,. \tag{592}$$

For light emitted from an ordinary lamp, the product on the left-hand side of the above inequality is much larger than the quantum of action. On the other hand, laser beams can (almost) reach the limit. Laser light in which the two indeterminacies differ greatly from each other is called *non-classical light* or *squeezed light*; it is used in many modern research applications. Such light beams have to be treated carefully, as the smallest disturbances transform them back into ordinary laser beams, in which the two indeterminacies have the same value. Extreme examples of non-classical light are beams with a given, fixed, photon number, and thus with an extremely high phase indeterminacy.

The observation of non-classical light highlights a strange fact, valid even for classical light: the number of photons in a light beam is not a well-defined quantity. In general, it is undetermined, and it *fluctuates*. The number of photons at the beginning of a beam is not necessarily the same as the number at the end of the beam. Photons, unlike stones, cannot be counted precisely – as long as they are moving and not absorbed. In flight, it is only possible to determine an approximate number, within the limits set by indeterminacy.

An extreme example is a light beam with an (almost) fixed phase. In such a beam, the photon number fluctuates from zero to infinity. In order to produce a *coherent* laser beam that approximates a pure sine wave as perfectly as possible, one must build a source in which the photon number is as undetermined as possible.

At the other extreme is a beam with a fixed number of photons: in such a beam, the phase fluctuates erratically. The light that we encounter in most everyday situations – such as the light from an incandescent lamps – lies somewhere in between, the phase and intensity indeterminacies being of similar magnitude.

As an aside, it turns out that even in deep, dark intergalactic space, far from any star, there are about 400 photons per cubic centimetre. This number, like the number of photons in a light beam, also has a measurement indeterminacy. Can you estimate it?

Challenge 1365 ny

* A large photon number is assumed in the expression. This is obvious, as $\Delta\varphi$ cannot grow beyond all bounds. The exact relations are

$$\Delta I \, \Delta \cos\varphi \geqslant \frac{1}{2}|\langle \sin\varphi \rangle|$$
$$\Delta I \, \Delta \sin\varphi \geqslant \frac{1}{2}|\langle \cos\varphi \rangle| \tag{591}$$

where $\langle x \rangle$ denotes the expectation value of the observable x.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 443 Various types of light



FIGURE 444 An interferometer

In summary, unlike pebbles, *photons are not countable*. And this it not the only difference between photons and pebbles.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 445 How to measure photon statistics with an electronic coincidence counter, the variation being measured by varying the position of a detector

The positions of photons

Where is a photon when it moves in a beam of light? Quantum theory gives a simple answer: nowhere in particular. This is proved most spectacularly by experiments with interferometers; they show that even a beam made of a *single* photon can be split, led along two different paths, and then recombined. The resulting interference shows that the single photon cannot be said to have taken either of the two paths. If one of the two paths is blocked, the pattern on the screen changes. In other words, somehow the photon must have taken both paths at the same time. Photons cannot be localized: they have no position.*

This impossibility of localizing photons can be quantified. It is impossible to localize photons in the direction *transverse* to the motion. It is less difficult to localize photons *along* the direction of motion. In the latter case, the quantum of action implies that the indeterminacy in the longitudinal position is given by the wavelength of the light. Can you confirm this?

Challenge 1366 ny

In particular, this means that photons *cannot* be simply visualized as short wave trains. Photons are truly *unlocalizable* entities, specific to the quantum world.

Now, if photons can *almost* be localized along their direction of motion, we can ask how photons are lined up in a light beam. Of course, we have just seen that it does not make sense to speak of their *precise* position. But do photons in a perfect beam arrive at almost-regular intervals?

To the shame of physicists, the study of this question was initiated by two astronomers, Robert Hanbury Brown and Richard Twiss, in 1956. They used a simple method to measure the probability that the second photon in a light beam arrives at a given time after the first one. They simply split the beam, put one detector in the first branch, and varied the position of a second detector in the other branch.

Ref. 819

Hanbury Brown and Twiss found that, for coherent light, the clicks in the two counters – and thus the photons themselves – are *correlated*. This result is completely contrary to classical electrodynamics. Photons are indeed necessary to describe light. To be more precise, their experiment showed that whenever the first photon hits, the second one is most likely to hit just afterwards. Thus, photons in beams are *bunched*. (As we will see below, this also implies that photons are bosons.)

Page 1011

Every light beam has an upper time limit for bunching, called the *coherence time*. For times longer than the coherence time, the probability for bunching is low, and indepen-

* One cannot avoid this conclusion by saying that photons are *split* at the beam splitter: if a detector is placed in each arm, one finds that they never detect a photon at the same time. Photons cannot be divided.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 446 The kinetic energy of electrons emitted in the photoelectric effect

dent of the time interval, as shown in Figure 445. The coherence time characterizes every light beam, or rather every light source. In fact, it is often easier to think in terms of the *coherence length* of a light beam. For thermal lamps, the coherence length is only a few micrometres: a small multiple of the wavelength. The largest coherence lengths, of over 100 000 km, are obtained with research lasers. Interestingly, coherent light is even found in nature: several special stars have been found to emit it. Ref. 820

Although the intensity of a good laser beam is almost constant, the photons do not arrive at regular intervals. Even the best laser light shows bunching, though with different statistics and to a lesser degree than lamp light. Light whose photons arrive regularly, thus exhibiting so-called *(photon) anti-bunching*, is obviously non-classical in the sense defined above; such light can be produced only by special experimental arrangements. Extreme examples of this phenomenon are being investigated at present by several research groups aiming to construct light sources that emit one photon at a time, at regular time intervals, as reliably as possible.

In summary, experiments force us to conclude that light is made of photons, but that photons cannot be localized in light beams. It makes no sense to talk about the position of a photon in general; the idea makes sense only in some special situations, and then only approximately and as a statistical average.

Are photons necessary?

In light of the results uncovered so far, the answer to the above question is obvious. But the issue is tricky. In textbooks, the *photoelectric effect* is usually cited as the first and most obvious experimental proof of the existence of photons. In 1887, Heinrich Hertz observed that for certain metals, such as lithium or caesium, incident ultraviolet light leads to charging of the metal. Later studies of the effect showed that the light causes emission of electrons, and that that the energy of the ejected electrons does not depend on the intensity of the light, but only on the difference between $\hbar$ times its frequency and a material-dependent threshold energy. Figure 446 summarizes the experiment and the measurements. In classical physics, these measurement are difficult to explain. But in 1905, Albert Einstein deduced the measurements from the assumption that light is made of photons of energy $E = \hbar\omega$. He imagined that this energy is used partly to take the electron over the threshold, and partly to give it kinetic energy. More photons only lead Ref. 822

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

to more electrons, not to faster ones.

In 1921, Einstein received the Nobel Prize for the explanation of the photoelectric effect. But Einstein was a *genius*: he deduced the correct result by a somewhat incorrect reasoning. The (small) mistake was the assumption that a classical, continuous light beam would produce a different effect. In fact it easy to see that a classical, continuous electromagnetic field interacting with discrete matter, made of discrete atoms containing discrete electrons, could lead to exactly the same result, if the motion of electrons is described by quantum theory. Several researchers confirmed this early in the twentieth century. The photoelectric effect by itself does *not* imply the existence of photons.

Ref. 823

Indeed, many researchers were unconvinced that the photoelectric effect shows the existence of photons. Historically, the most important argument for the *necessity* of light quanta was given by Henri Poincaré. In 1911 and 1912, aged 57 and only a few months before his death, he published two influential papers proving that the radiation law of black bodies – in which the quantum of action had been discovered by Max Planck – *requires* the existence of photons. He also showed that the amount of radiation emitted by a hot body is *finite* only because of the *quantum* nature of the processes leading to light emission. A description of these processes in terms of classical electrodynamics would lead to *infinite* amounts of radiated energy. Poincaré's two influential papers convinced most physicists that it was worthwhile to study quantum phenomena in more detail. Poincaré did not know about the action limit $S \geqslant \hbar/2$; yet his argument is based on the observation that light of a given frequency has a minimum intensity, namely a single photon. Such a one-photon beam may be split into two beams, for example by using a half-silvered mirror. However, one will never find more than one photon in those two beams together.

Ref. 824

Another interesting experiment that requires photons is the observation of 'molecules of photons'. In 1995, Jacobson et al. predicted that the de Broglie wavelength of a *packet* of photons could be observed. According to quantum theory, it is given by the wavelength of a single photon divided by the number of photons in the packet. The team argued that the packet wavelength could be observable if such a packet could be split and recombined without destroying the cohesion within it. In 1999, this effect was indeed observed by de Pádua and his research group in Brazil. They used a careful set-up with a nonlinear crystal to create what they call a *biphoton*, and observed its interference properties, finding a reduction in the effective wavelength by the predicted factor of two. Since then, packages with three and even four entangled photons have been created and observed.

Ref. 825

Ref. 826

Yet another argument for the necessity of photons is the above-mentioned recoil felt by atoms emitting light. The recoil measured in these cases is best explained by the emission of a photon in a particular direction. In contrast, classical electrodynamics predicts the emission of a spherical wave, with no preferred direction.

Page 996

Obviously, the observation of *non-classical light*, also called *squeezed light*, also argues for the existence of photons, as squeezed light proves that photons are indeed an *intrinsic* aspect of light, necessary even when interactions with matter play no role. The same is true for the Hanbury Brown–Twiss effect.

Page 1002

Ref. 827

Finally, the spontaneous decay of excited atomic states also requires the existence of photons. This cannot be explained by a continuum description of light.

In summary, the concept of a photon is indeed necessary for a precise description of light; but the details are often subtle, as the properties of photons are unusual and require a change in our habits of thought. To avoid these issues, most textbooks stop

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 447 Light crossing light

discussing photons after coming to the photoelectric effect. This is a pity, as it is only then that things get interesting. Ponder the following. Obviously, all electromagnetic fields are made of photons. At present, photons can be counted for gamma rays, X-rays, ultraviolet light, visible light and infrared light. However, for lower frequencies, such as radio waves, photons have not yet been detected. Can you imagine what would be necessary to count the photons emitted from a radio station?

Challenge 1367 ny

This issue leads directly to the most important question of all:

How can a wave be made up of particles?

> Fünfzig Jahre intensiven Nachdenkens haben mich der Antwort auf die Frage 'Was sind Lichtquanten?' nicht näher gebracht. Natürlich bildet sich heute jeder Wicht ein, er wisse die Antwort. Doch da täuscht er sich.
>
> Albert Einstein, 1951 *

If a light wave is made of particles, one must be able to explain each and every wave property in terms of photons. The experiments mentioned above already hint that this is possible only because photons are *quantum* particles. Let us take a more detailed look at this.

Light can *cross* other light undisturbed. This observation is not hard to explain with photons; since photons do not interact with each other, and are point-like, they 'never' hit each other. In fact, there *is* an extremely small positive probability for their interaction, as will be found below, but this effect is not observable in everyday life.

But some problems remain. If two light beams of identical frequency and fixed phase relation cross, we observe alternating bright and dark regions: so-called *interference fringes*.** How do these interference fringes appear? How can it be that photons are not

Page 727

* 'Fifty years of intense reflection have not brought me nearer to the answer to the question 'What are light quanta?' Of course nowadays every little mind thinks he knows the answer. But he is wrong.' Einstein said this a few years before his death.

** This experiment is only possible if both beams are derived from a single beam by splitting, or if two expensive high-precision lasers are used. (Why?)

Challenge 1368 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 448 Interference and the description of light with arrows (at three instants of time)

detected in the dark regions? There is only one possible answer: the brightness at a given place corresponds to the *probability* that a photon will arrive there. The fringes imply that photons behave like little *arrows*. Some further thought leads to the following description:

— The probability of a photon arriving somewhere is given by the *square of an arrow*.
— The final arrow is the *sum* of all the arrows arriving there by all possible paths.
— The arrow's direction stays fixed in space when the photons move.
— The length of an arrow shrinks with the square of the distance travelled.
— Photons emitted by single-coloured sources are emitted with arrows of constant length pointing in the direction ωt; in other words, such sources spit out photons with a *rotating* mouth.
— Photons emitted by thermal sources, such as pocket lamps, are emitted with arrows of constant length pointing in *random* directions.

With this model* we can explain the stripes seen in laser experiments, such as those of Figure 447 and Figure 448. You can check that in some regions the two arrows travelling through the two slits add up to zero *for all times*. No photons are detected there. In other regions, the arrows always add up to the maximal value. These regions are always bright. Regions in between have intermediate shades. Obviously, in the case of pocket lamps, the brightness also behaves as expected: the averages simply add up, as in the common region shown in the left-hand diagram of Figure 447.

You may wish to calculate the distance between the lines, given the source distance, the colour and the distance to the screen. Challenge 1369 ny

* The model gives a correct description of light except that it neglects polarization.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 449 Light reflected by a mirror, and the corresponding arrows (at an instant of time)

Obviously, the photon model implies that an interference pattern like this is built up as the sum of a large number of single-photon hits. Using low-intensity beams, we should therefore be able to see how these little spots slowly build up an interference pattern by accumulating in the bright regions and never hitting the dark regions. This is indeed the case. All experiments have confirmed this description.

Page 996

It is important to note that interference between two light beams is *not* the result of two different photons cancelling each other out or being added together. Such cancellation would contradict conservation of energy and momentum. Interference is an effect applicable to each photon separately, because each photon is spread out over the whole set-up: each photon takes all possible paths. As Paul Dirac said, *each photon interferes only with itself*. Interference only works because photons are quantons, and not classical particles.

Ref. 828

Dirac's oft-quoted statement leads to a famous paradox: if a photon can interfere only with itself, how can two laser beams from two different lasers interfere with each other? The answer given by quantum physics is simple but strange: in the region where the beams interfere, it is impossible to say from which source a photon has come. The photons in the crossing region *cannot* be said to come from a specific source. Photons in the interference region are quantons, which indeed interfere only with themselves. In that region, one cannot truly say that light is a flow of photons. Despite regular claims to the contrary, Dirac's statement is correct. It is a strange consequence of the quantum of action.

Waves also show *diffraction*. To understand this phenomenon with photons, let us start with a simple mirror, and study *reflection* first. Photons (like all quantum particles) move from source to detector by *all* possible paths. As Richard Feynman,* who discov-

* Richard ('Dick') Phillips Feynman (b. 1918 New York City, d. 1988), US-American physicist. One of the founders of quantum electrodynamics, he also discovered the 'sum-over-histories' reformulation of quantum theory, made important contributions to the theory of the weak interaction and to quantum gravity,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 450 The light reflected by a badly-placed mirror and by a grating

ered this explanation, liked to stress, the term 'all' has to be taken literally. This is not a big deal in the explanation of interference. But in order to understand a mirror, we have to include all possibilities, however crazy they seem, as shown in Figure 449.

As stated above, a light source emits rotating arrows. To determine the probability that light arrives at a certain location within the image, we have to add up all the arrows arriving at the same time at that location. For each path, the arrow orientation at the image is shown – for convenience only – below the corresponding segment of the mirror. The angle and length of the arriving arrow depends on the path. Note that the sum of all the arrows does not vanish: light does indeed arrive at the image. Moreover, the largest contribution comes from the paths near to the middle. If we were to perform the same calculation for another image location, (almost) no light would get there. So the rule that reflection occurs with the incoming angle equal to the outgoing angle is an approximation, following from the arrow model of light.

In fact, a detailed calculation, with more arrows, shows that the approximation is quite precise: the errors are much smaller than the wavelength of the light.

and co-authored a famous textbook, the *Feynman Lectures on Physics*. He is one of those theoretical physicists who made his career mainly by performing complex calculations – but he backtracked with age, most successfully in his teachings and books. He helped building the nuclear bomb, wrote papers in topless bars, avoided to take any professional responsibility, and was famously arrogant and disrespectful of authority. Though he tried to surpass the genius of Wolfgang Pauli throughout his life, he failed in this endeavour. He was deeply dedicated to physics and to enlarging knowledge. A collector of surprising physical explanations, he wrote several popular books on his work and life. He shared the 1965 Nobel Prize in Physics for his work on quantum electrodynamics.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 451 If light were made of little stones, they would move faster in water

The proof that light does indeed take all these strange paths is given by a more specialized mirror. As show in Figure 450, one can repeat the experiment with a mirror that reflects only along certain stripes. In this case, the stripes have been carefully chosen so that the corresponding path lengths lead to arrows with a bias in one direction, namely to the left. The arrow addition now shows that such a specialized mirror – usually called a *grating* – allows light to be reflected in unusual directions. Indeed, this behaviour is standard for waves: it is called *diffraction*. In short, the arrow model for photons allows us to describe this wave property of light, provided that photons follow the 'crazy' probability scheme. Do not get upset! As was said above, quantum theory is the theory for crazy people.

You may wish to check that the arrow model, with the approximations it generates by summing over all possible paths, automatically ensures that the quantum of action is indeed the smallest action that can be observed.

Challenge 1370 ny

All waves have a *signal velocity*. The signal velocity also depends on the medium in which they propagate. As a consequence, waves show *refraction* when they move from one medium into another with different signal velocity. Interestingly, the naive particle picture of photons as little stones would imply that light is faster in materials with high refractive indices: the so-called *dense* materials. Can you confirm this? However, experiments show that light in dense materials moves *slowly*. The wave picture has no difficulty explaining this observation. (Can you confirm this?) Historically, this was one of the arguments *against* the particle theory of light. Nevertheless, the arrow model of light presented above is able to explain refraction properly. It is not difficult: try it.

Challenge 1371 ny

Challenge 1372 ny

Challenge 1373 ny

Waves also *reflect partially* from materials such as glass. This is one of the most difficult wave properties to explain with photons. This is one of the few effects that is *not* explained by a classical wave theory of light. However, it *is* explained by the arrow model, as we will find shortly. Partial reflection confirms rules 1367 and 1367 of the arrow model. It shows that photons indeed behave *randomly*: some are reflected and other are not, without any selection criterion. The distinction is purely statistical. More about this issue shortly.

In waves, the fields *oscillate in time and space*. One way to show how waves can be made of particles is to show how to build up a sine wave using a large number of photons. A sine wave is a coherent state of light. The way to build them up was explained by Roy Glauber. In fact, to build a pure sine wave, one needs a superposition of a beam with one photon, a beam with two photons, a beam with three photons, and so on. Together, they give a perfect sine wave. As expected, its photon number fluctuates to the highest possible degree.

Ref. 829



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

If we repeat the calculation for non-ideal beams, we find that the indeterminacy relation for energy and time is respected: every emitted beam will possess a certain spectral width. Purely monochromatic light does not exist. Similarly, no system that emits a wave *at random* can produce a monochromatic wave. All experiments confirm these results.

Waves can be *polarized*. So far, we have disregarded this property. In the photon picture, polarization is the result of carefully superposing beams of photons spinning clockwise and anticlockwise. Indeed, we know that linear polarization can be seen as a result of superposing circularly-polarized light of both signs, using the proper phase. What seemed a curiosity in classical optics turns out to be a fundamental justification for quantum theory.

Photons are *indistinguishable*. When two photons of the same colour cross, there is no way to say afterwards which of the two is which. The quantum of action makes this impossible. The indistinguishability of photons has an interesting consequence. It is impossible to say which emitted photon corresponds to which arriving photon. In other words, there is no way to follow the path of a photon, as we are used to following the path of a billiard ball. In addition, the experiment by Hanbury Brown and Twiss, implies that photons are bosons. Particles with this property are called bosons. We will discover more details about the indistinguishability of bosons later in.

Page 1003
Ref. 830
Page 1052

In summary, we find that light waves *can* indeed be built of particles. However, this is only possible with the proviso that photons are not precisely countable, that they are not localizable, that they have no size, no charge and no mass, that they carry an (approximate) phase, that they carry spin, that they are indistinguishable bosons, that they can take any path whatsoever, that one cannot pinpoint their origin, and that their probability of arriving somewhere is determined by the square of the sum of amplitudes for all possible paths. In other words, light can be made of particles only if these particles have very special *quantum* properties. These quantum properties allow them to behave like waves when they are present in large numbers.

Quantons are thus quite different from ordinary particles. In fact, one can argue that the only (classical) particle aspects of photons are their quantized energy, momentum and spin. In all other respects, photons are *not* like little stones. It is more accurate to say that *photons are calculating devices to precisely describe observations about light*. These calculating devices are often called *quantons*. In summary, *all waves are streams of quantons*. In fact, all waves are *correlated* streams of quantons. This is true for light, for any other form of radiation, and for all forms of matter.

Ref. 831

The strange properties of quantons are the reason why earlier attempts to describe light as a stream of (classical) particles, such as the attempt of Newton, failed miserably, and were rightly ridiculed by other scientists. Indeed, Newton upheld his theory against all experimental evidence – especially with regard to light's wave properties – which is something that a physicist should never do. Only after people had accepted that light is a wave, and then discovered and understood that quantum particles are different from classical particles, was the approach successful.

The indeterminacy relations show that even a single quanton can be regarded as a wave; however, whenever it interacts with the rest of the world, it behaves as a particle. In fact, it is *essential* that all waves be made of quantons; but if they are not, then interactions are non-local, and objects, contrary to experience, cannot be localized at all. To decide between the wave and particle descriptions, we can use the following criterion. Whenever

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

matter and light interact, it is more appropriate to describe electromagnetic radiation as a wave if the wavelength λ satisfies

$$\lambda \gg \frac{\hbar c}{kT} , \tag{593}$$

where $k = 1.4 \cdot 10^{-23}$ J/K is Boltzmann's constant. If the wavelength is much *smaller* than the quantity on the right-hand side, the particle description is most appropriate. If the two sides are of the same order of magnitude, both descriptions play a role.

Can light move faster than light? – Virtual photons

In a vacuum, light can move faster than c, as well as slower than c. The quantum principle provides the details. As long as this principle is obeyed, the speed of a short light flash can differ – though only by a tiny amount – from the 'official' value. Can you estimate the allowable difference in arrival time for a light flash coming from the dawn of time?

Challenge 1374 ny

The arrow explanation gives the same result. If one takes into account the crazy possibility that photons can move with any speed, one finds that all speeds very different from c cancel out. The only variation that remains, translated into distances, is the indeterminacy of about one wavelength in the longitudinal direction, which we mentioned above.

Challenge 1375 ny

More bizarre consequences of the quantum of action appear when one studies *static* electric fields, such as the field around a charged metal sphere. Obviously, such a field must also be made of photons. How do they move? It turns out that static electric fields are made of *virtual* photons. Virtual photons are photons that do not appear as free particles: they only appear for an extremely short time before they disappear again. In the case of a static electric field, they are *longitudinally* polarized, and do not carry energy away.

Virtual photons, like other virtual particles, are 'shadows' of particles that obey

$$\Delta x \Delta p \leqslant \hbar/2 . \tag{594}$$

Rather than obeying this indeterminacy relation, they obey the opposite relation, which expresses their very brief appearance. Despite their intrinsically short life, and the impossibility of detecting them directly, they have important effects. We will explore virtual particles in detail shortly.

Page 1037

In fact, the vector potential A allows *four* polarizations, corresponding to the four coordinates (t, x, y, z). It turns out that for the photons one usually talks about – the free or *real* photons – the polarizations in the t and z directions cancel out, so that one observes only the x and y polarizations in actual experiments.

For bound or *virtual* photons, the situation is different. All four polarizations are possible. Indeed, the z and t polarizations are the ones that can be said to be the building blocks of *static* electric and magnetic fields.

In other words, static electric and magnetic fields are continuous flows of virtual photons. Virtual photons can have mass, can have spin directions not pointing along the path of motion, and can have momentum opposite to their direction of motion. All these prop-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

erties are in contrast to real photons. Exchange of virtual photons leads to the *attraction* of bodies of different charge. In fact, virtual photons *necessarily* appear in any description of electromagnetic interactions. Later on we will discuss their effects further – including the famous attraction of neutral bodies.

In summary, light can indeed move faster than light, though only by an amount allowed by the quantum of action. For everyday situations, i.e., for high values of the action, all quantum effects average out, including light velocities different from c.

There is another point that we should mention here. Not only the position, but also
Ref. 832 the energy of a single photon can be undefined. For example, certain materials split one photon of energy $\hbar\omega$ into two photons, whose two energies add up to the original one. Quantum mechanics implies that the energy partitioning is known only when the energy of one of the two photons is measured. Only at that very instant is the energy of the second photon known. Before it, both photons have undefined energies. The process of energy fixing takes place *instantaneously*, even if the second photon is far away. We
Page 1082 will explain below the background to this and similar strange effects, which *seem* to be faster than light. In fact, they do not involve faster-than-light transmission of energy or
Challenge 1376 ny information.

Indeterminacy of electric fields

We have seen that the quantum of action implies an indeterminacy for light intensity. This implies a similar limit for electric and magnetic fields. This conclusion was first
Ref. 833 drawn in 1933 by Bohr and Rosenfeld. They started from the effects of the fields on a test particle of mass m and charge q, which are described by:

$$m\boldsymbol{a} = q(\boldsymbol{E} + \boldsymbol{v} \times \boldsymbol{b}) \,. \tag{595}$$

Since it is impossible to measure both the momentum and the position of a particle, they
Challenge 1377 ny deduced an indeterminacy for the electrical field, given by

$$\Delta E = \frac{\hbar}{q\,\Delta x\,T} \,, \tag{596}$$

where T is the measurement time and Δx is the position indeterminacy. Thus every value of an electric field, and similarly of a magnetic field, possesses an indeterminacy. The physical state of the electromagnetic field behaves like the state of matter in this respect. This is the topic we explore now.

Curiosities and fun challenges about photons

Can one explain refraction with photons? Newton was not able to do so, but today we can. In refraction by a horizontal surface, as shown in Figure 452, the situation is translationally invariant along the horizontal direction. Therefore, the momentum component along this direction is also conserved: $p_1 \sin\alpha_1 = p_2 \sin\alpha_2$. The photon energy $E = E_1 = E_2$ is obviously conserved.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 452 Refraction and photons



FIGURE 453 A falling pencil

The index of refraction n is defined in terms of momentum and energy as

$$n = \frac{cp}{E} \,. \tag{597}$$

The 'law' of refraction follows.

There is an important issue here. The velocity of a photon $v = \delta E/\delta p$ in a light ray is *not* the same as the phase velocity $u = E/p$ that enters into the calculation.

* *

If en electromagnetic wave has amplitude A, the photon density d is

$$d = \frac{A^2}{\hbar\omega} \,. \tag{598}$$

Challenge 1378 ny Can you show this?

* *

A typical effect of the quantum 'laws' is the yellow colour of the lamps used for street illumination in most cities. They emit pure yellow light of a single frequency; that is why no other colours can be distinguished in their light. According to classical electrodynamics, harmonics of that light frequency should also be emitted. Experiments show, however, that this is not the case; so classical electrodynamics is thus wrong. Is this argument correct? Challenge 1379 ny

* *

What happens to photons that hit an object but are not absorbed or transmitted? Generally speaking, they are *scattered*. The details of the scattering depend on the object, as Table 92 shows.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 454 The blue shades of the sky and the colours of clouds are due to various degrees of Raleigh, Mie and Tyndall scattering (© Giorgio di Iorio)

TABLE 92 Types of light scattering

SCATTERING TYPE	SCATTERER	DETAILS	EXAMPLES
Rayleigh scattering	atoms, molecules	$1/\lambda^4$, scatterers smaller than $\lambda/10$	blue sky
Mie scattering	transparent objects, droplets	$1/\lambda^{0.5}$ to $1/\lambda^2$	blue sky, red evenings
Tyndall scattering	non-transparent objects	weakly or not wavelength-dependent	smog, white clouds, fog
Raman scattering	excited atoms, molecules	light gains energy	...
Anti-Raman scattering	atoms, molecules	light loses energy	...
Compton scattering	electrons	X-ray lose energy	



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009





Chapter 35

MOTION OF MATTER – BEYOND CLASSICAL PHYSICS

> All great things begin as blasphemies.
> George Bernard Shaw

The existence of a smallest action has numerous consequences for the motion of matter. We start with a few experimental results that show that the quantum of action is indeed the smallest measurable action.

Wine glasses and pencils – no rest

> Otium cum dignitate.*
> Cicero, *De oratore*.

A simple consequence of the quantum of action is the impossibility of completely filling a glass of wine. If we call a glass at maximum capacity (including surface tension effects, to make the argument precise) 'full', we immediately see that the situation requires the liquid's surface to be completely at rest. But a completely quiet surface would admit two successive observations that differ by less than $\hbar/2$. We could try to reduce all motions by reducing the temperature of the system. But absolute rest would imply reaching absolute zero temperature. Experiments show that this is impossible. (Indeed, this impossibility, the so-called *third 'law' of thermodynamics*, is equivalent to the existence of a minimum action.) *There is no rest in nature.* In other words, the quantum of action proves the old truth that a glass of wine is always partially empty *and* partially full.

The absence of microscopic rest, predicted by the quantum of action, is confirmed in many experiments. For example, a pencil standing on its tip *cannot* remain vertical, even if it is isolated from all disturbances, such as vibrations, air molecules and thermal motion. This follows from the indeterminacy relation. In fact, it is even possible to calculate the time after which a pencil must have fallen over.**

* 'Rest with dignity.'

Ref. 834 ** This is not easy, but not too difficult either. For an initial orientation *close* to the vertical, the fall time T turns out to be

$$T = \frac{1}{2\pi} T_0 \ln \frac{8}{\alpha} \tag{599}$$

where α is the starting angle, and a fall through angle π is assumed. Here T_0 is the oscillation time of the pencil for small angles. (Can you determine it?) Challenge 1380 ny

The indeterminacy relation for the tip of the pencil yields a minimum starting angle, because the momentum indeterminacy cannot be made arbitrarily large. You should be able to provide an upper limit. Once this angle is known, you can calculate the maximum time. Challenge 1381 ny

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The absence of rest for the electrons inside atoms also prevents them from falling into the nuclei. The size of atoms, and thus of all matter, is therefore a direct consequence of the absence of microscopic rest.

Cool gas

Rest is impossible in nature. In fact, even at extremely low temperatures, the particles inside matter are in motion. This fundamental lack of rest is said to be due to the so-called *zero-point fluctuations*. A good example is provided by the recent measurements of Bose–Einstein condensates, systems with a small number of atoms (between ten and a few million) at extremely low temperatures (around 1 nK). These cool gases can be observed with high precision. Using elaborate experimental techniques, Bose–Einstein condensates can be put into states for which $\Delta p \Delta x$ is almost exactly equal to $\hbar/2$ – though never lower than this value.

This leads to an interesting puzzle. In a normal object, the distance between the atoms is much larger than their de Broglie wavelength. (Can you confirm this?) But today it is possible to cool objects to extremely low temperatures. At sufficiently low temperatures, less than 1 nK, the wavelength of the atoms may be larger than their separation. Can you imagine what happens in such cases?

Challenge 1382 s
Ref. 835
Challenge 1383 s

No infinite precision

The quantum of action prevents the observation of rest in many ways. In order to determine the position of a system with high precision, we need a high-energy probe: only a high-energy probe has a wavelength small enough to allow very precise position measurements. As a result of this high energy, however, the system is disturbed. Worse, the disturbance itself is not precisely measurable; so there is no way to determine the original position even by taking the disturbance into account. In short, perfect rest cannot be observed even in principle. Indeed, all experiments in which systems have been observed with high precision confirm that perfect rest does not exist. For example, this result has been confirmed for electrons, neutrons, protons, ions, atoms, molecules, atomic condensates, crystals, and objects with a mass of up to a tonne, as used in certain gravitational wave detectors.

Flows and the quantization of matter

> “Die Bewegung ist die Daseinsform der Materie.”
> Friedrich Engels, *Anti-Dühring*.*

Not only does the quantum of action make rest impossible, but it makes any situation that does not change in time impossible. The most important examples of (apparently) stationary situations are *flows*. The quantum of action implies that *no* flow can be stationary. More precisely, a smallest action implies that no flow can be continuous. All flows are made of smallest entities. Flows are made of quantum particles. Apart from light, there are two types of flow from our everyday experience for which we should confirm this directly: flows of electricity and flows of liquids.

Ref. 813

* ‘Motion is matter’s way of being.’

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 455 Steps in the flow of electricity in metal wire crossings: the set-up, the nanowires at the basis of the effect, and three measurement results (© José Costa-Krämer, AAPT from Ref. 837)

Knocking tables and quantized conductivity

If electrical current were a continuous flow, it would be possible to observe action values as small as desired. The simplest counter-example was discovered in 1996, by José Costa-Krämer and his colleagues. They put two metal wires on top of each other on a kitchen table and attached a battery, a current-voltage converter (or simply a resistor) and a storage oscilloscope to them. Then they measured the electrical current while *knocking* on the table. In the last millisecond before the wires detach, the conductivity and thus the electrical current diminished in regular steps of a 7 μA, as can easily be seen on the oscilloscope (see Figure 455). This simple experiment could have beaten, if it had been performed a few years earlier, a number of earlier, enormously expensive experiments which discovered this quantization at costs of several million euro each, using complex set-ups at extremely low temperatures.

Ref. 836, Ref. 837

In fact, the quantization of conductivity appears in any electrical contact with a small cross-section. In such situations the quantum of action implies that the conductivity can only be a multiple of $2e^2/\hbar \approx 1/12\,906\,1/\Omega$. Can you confirm this result? Note that electrical conductivity can be as small as required; only the *quantized* electrical conductivity has the minimum value of $2e^2/\hbar$.

Challenge 1384 ny

Many more elaborate experiments confirm the observation of conductance steps. They force us to conclude that there is a *smallest charge* in nature. This smallest charge has the same value as the charge of an electron. Indeed, electrons turn out to be part of every atom, in a construction to be explained shortly. In metals, a large number of electrons can move freely: that is why metals conduct electricity so well.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 456 Electrons beams diffract and interfere at multiple slits (© Claus Jönsson)

Quantized liquid flow

The flow of matter also exhibits smallest units. We mentioned in the first part that a consequence of the particulate structure of liquids is that oil or any other smooth liquid produces *noise* when it flows through even the smoothest of pipes. We mentioned that the noise we hear in our ears in situations of absolute silence – for example, in a snowy landscape in the mountains – is due to the granularity of blood flow in the veins. Experiments show that all flows of matter produce vibrations. This is a consequence of the quantum of action, and of the resulting granularity of matter.

In short, matter and electricity flow in smallest units. Depending on the material, the smallest flowing units of matter may be 'molecules', 'atoms', 'ions', or 'electrons'.

Matter quantons and their motion – matter waves

Electrons, ions, atoms and molecules are *quantum* particles, or *quantons*. Like photons, matter quantons share some properties with ordinary stones, but also differ from them in many ways. A stone has position and momentum, mass and acceleration, orientation and angular momentum, size, shape, structure and colour. Let us explore each of these properties for quantons.

Ref. 838 In 1923 and 1924, the French physicist Louis de Broglie pondered the concept of the photon and the possible consequences of the quantum of action for matter particles. In the case of light, the quantum of action connects wave behaviour to particle behaviour. He reasoned that the same should apply to matter. It dawned to him that streams of matter particles with the same momentum should behave as waves, just as light quanta do. He thus predicted that coherent matter flows should have a wavelength and angular frequency given by

$$\lambda = \frac{2\pi\hbar}{p} \quad \text{and} \quad \omega = \frac{E}{\hbar}\,, \tag{600}$$

where p and E are the momentum and the energy, respectively, of the single particles. Soon after this prediction, experiments began to confirm the idea. It is indeed observed that matter streams can diffract, refract and interfere, with the values predicted by de Broglie. Because of the smallness of the wavelength, careful experiments are needed to detect these effects. But one by one, all experimental confirmations of the wave properties of light were repeated for matter beams. For example, just as light is diffracted when

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 457 Formation of an interference pattern in a low-intensity double-slit experiment: (a) 8 electrons, (b) 270 electrons, (c) 2000 electrons, (d) 6000 electrons, after 20 minutes of exposure (© Tonomura Akira/Hitachi)

it passes around an edge or through a slit, matter is also diffracted in these situations. Ref. 839 This is true even for electrons, the simplest particles of matter, as shown in Figure 456. (The experiment with electrons, performed by Claus Jönsson in Tübingen in 1961, was voted the most beautiful experiment in all of physics in 2002.)

Inspired by light interferometers, researchers began to build *matter* interferometers. Ref. 840 Today these work with beams of electrons, nucleons, nuclei, atoms, or even large Page 726 molecules. Just as observations of light interference prove the wave character of light, so the interference patterns observed with these instruments prove the wave character of matter.

Like light, matter is also made of particles; like light, matter behaves as a wave when large numbers of particles with the same momentum are involved. But although beams of large molecules behave as waves, everyday objects – such as cars on a motorway – do not seem to. There are two main reasons for this. First, for cars on a motorway the relevant wavelength is extremely small. Secondly, the speeds of the cars vary too much: streams of cars with the same speed could be coherent, but these are extremely rare in everyday life.

If matter behaves like a wave, we can draw a strange conclusion. For any wave, the position and the wavelength cannot both be sharply defined simultaneously: the indeter-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

minacies of the wave number $k = 2\pi/\lambda$ and of the position X obey the relation

$$\Delta k \Delta X \geq \frac{1}{2} \,. \tag{601}$$

Similarly, for every wave the angular frequency $\omega = 2\pi f$ and the instant T of its peak amplitude cannot both be sharply defined. Their indeterminacies are related by

$$\Delta \omega \Delta T \geq \frac{1}{2} \,. \tag{602}$$

Using the wave properties of matter, we get

$$\Delta p \Delta X \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{2} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Delta E \Delta T \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{2} \,. \tag{603}$$

These famous relations are called *Heisenberg's indeterminacy relations*. They were discovered by the German physicist Werner Heisenberg in 1925. They state that there is no way to simultaneously ascribe a precise momentum and position to a material system, nor to simultaneously ascribe a precise energy and age. The more accurately one quantity is known, the less accurately the other is.* Matter quantons – rather like stones, but unlike photons – *can* be localized, but only approximately.

Both these indeterminacy relations have been checked experimentally in great detail. In fact, every experiment proving that matter behaves like a wave is a confirmation of the indeterminacy relation – and vice versa.

Incidentally, Niels Bohr called the relation between two variables linked in this way *complementarity*. He then systematically explored all possible such pairs. You can search for such pairs yourself. Bohr was deeply fascinated by the existence of a complementarity principle, and he later extended it in philosophical directions. In a famous story, somebody asked him what was the quantity complementary to precision. He answered: 'clarity'.

Challenge 1385 ny

In short, the quantum of action means that values of position and momentum cannot both be exactly defined for quantons. The values are fuzzy – position and momentum are undetermined. In addition, the more precisely one of the two is known, the less precisely the other is known.

Mass and acceleration of quantons

Matter quantons, like stones, have mass. Hits by single electrons, atoms or molecules can be detected. Quantons can also be slowed down or accelerated. We have already explored some of these experiments in the section on electrodynamics. However, quantons differ from pebbles. Using the time–energy indeterminacy relation, you can deduce that

Page 680

Challenge 1386 s

$$a \leqslant \frac{2mc^3}{\hbar} \,. \tag{604}$$

* A policeman stops the car being driven by Werner Heisenberg. 'Do you know how fast you were driving?' 'No, but I know exactly where I was!'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 458 Probability clouds: a hydrogen atom in its spherical ground state (left) and in a non-spherical excited state (right) as seen by an observer travelling around it (QuickTime film produced with Dean Dauger's software package 'Atom in a Box', available at daugerresearch.com)

Thus there is a maximum acceleration for quantons.* Indeed, no particle has ever been observed with a higher acceleration than this value. In fact, no particle has ever been observed with an acceleration anywhere near this value.

Ref. 841

Velocities of quantons

The usual, *real*, matter quantons always move more slowly than light. However, the quantum of action allows the existence of particles that move faster than light – so-called *virtual* particles – which we will meet later on.

Page 1037

Why are atoms not flat? Why do shapes exist?

Experiments show that composed quantons have structures with finite sizes and often complex shapes. Obviously, the size and shape of quantons is due to the motion of their constituents.

In 1901, Jean Perrin, and independently in 1904 Nagaoka Hantaro, proposed that atoms are small 'solar systems'. In 1913, Niels Bohr used this idea, combining it with the quantum of action, and found that he could predict a number of properties of the hydrogen atom that had not until then been understood. These calculations, though often found in textbooks, are only of historical interest today. Even Bohr knew that they were not correct, because they assumed that hydrogen atoms were flat. This is observed not to be the case; moreover, it contradicts the quantum of action. Since the motion of quantum

Ref. 842

Ref. 843

Challenge 1388 e

* We note that this acceleration limit is different from the acceleration limit due to general relativity:

$$a \leqslant \frac{c^4}{4Gm} \,. \tag{605}$$

In particular, the quantum limit (604) applies to microscopic particles, whereas the general-relativistic limit applies to macroscopic systems. Can you confirm that in each domain the relevant limit is the smaller of the two?

Challenge 1387 e



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 459 The quantization of angular momentum

constituents is fuzzy, all composed quantons must be made of *clouds* of constituents.

While atoms are spherical, molecules have more complex shapes. Experiment and theory show that the shape of any atom or molecule is due to the cloud, or probability distribution, of its electrons. Quantum theory states that atoms or molecules are not hard balls, as Democritus or Dalton believed, but that they are clouds. Atomic electron clouds are not infinitely hard, but can to a certain degree mix and interpenetrate. This mixing leads to molecules, liquids, solids, flowers and people.

Of course, the quantum of action also implies that shapes fluctuate. For example, if a long molecule is held fixed at its two ends, it cannot remain at rest in between. Such experiments are easy to perform, for example with DNA; they again confirm that perfect rest does not exist.

Rotation of quantons – the lack of north poles

> Tristo è quel discepolo che non avanza il suo maestro.
>
> Leonardo da Vinci*

Stones can rotate. The quantum of action also has important consequences for rotational motion. Action and angular momentum have the same physical dimensions. It only takes a little thought to show that if matter or radiation has a momentum and wavelength related by the quantum of action, then angular momentum is fixed in multiples of the quantum of action. This famous argument is due to Dicke and Wittke. Ref. 844

Imagine a circular fence, made of N steel bars spaced apart at a distance $a = 2\pi R/N$, as shown in Figure 459. At the centre of the fence, imagine a source of matter or radiation that can emit particles towards the fence in any chosen direction. The linear momentum

* 'Sad is that disciple who does not surpass his master.' This statement is sculpted in large letters in the chemistry aula of the University of Rome *La Sapienza*.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

of such a particle is $p = \hbar k = 2\pi\hbar/\lambda$. At the fence slits, the wave will interfere. Outside the fence, the direction of the motion of the particle is determined by the condition of positive interference. In other words, the angle θ, describing the direction of motion outside the fence, is given by $a \sin\theta = M\lambda$, where M is an integer. Through the deflection due to the interference process, the fence receives a linear momentum $p \sin\theta$, or an angular momentum $L = pR \sin\theta$. Using all these expressions, one finds that the angular momentum transferred to the fence is

$$L = NM\hbar \,. \tag{606}$$

In other words, the angular momentum of the fence is an integer multiple of $\hbar$. Fences can only have integer intrinsic angular momenta (in units of $\hbar$). Of course, this is only a hint, not a proof. Nevertheless, the generalization of argument to all bodies is correct. The measured intrinsic angular momentum of bodies is always a multiple of $\hbar$. Quantum theory thus states that every object's angular momentum increases in steps. Angular momentum is quantized.

But rotation has more interesting aspects. Thanks to the quantum of action, just as linear momentum is usually fuzzy, so is angular momentum. There is an indeterminacy relation for angular momentum L. The complementary variable is the phase angle φ of the rotation. The indeterminacy relation can be expressed in several ways. The simplest – though not the most precise – is

Ref. 845 Ref. 846 Page 1001

$$\Delta L \, \Delta\varphi \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{2} \,. \tag{607}$$

(This is obviously an approximation: the relation is only valid for large angular momenta. It cannot be valid for small values, as $\Delta\varphi$ by definition cannot grow beyond 2π. In particular, angular-momentum eigenstates have $\Delta L = 0$.*) The indeterminacy of angular momentum appears for all macroscopic bodies, or alternatively, for all cases when the angular phase of the system can be measured.

The quantization and indeterminacy of angular momentum have important consequences. Classically speaking, the poles of the Earth are the places that do not move when observed by a non-rotating observer. Therefore, at those places matter would have a defined position and a defined momentum. However, the quantum of action forbids this. There cannot be a North Pole on Earth. More precisely, the idea of a rotational axis is an approximation, not valid in general.

Even more interesting are the effects of the quantum of action on microscopic particles, such as atoms, molecules or nuclei. To begin with, we note that action and angular momentum have the same units. The precision with which angular momentum can be

* An *exact* formulation of the indeterminacy relation for angular momentum is

$$\Delta L \, \Delta\varphi \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{2} |1 - 2\pi P(\pi)| \,, \tag{608}$$

where $P(\pi)$ is the normalized probability that the angular position has the value π. For an angular-momentum eigenstate, one has $\Delta\varphi = \pi/\sqrt{3}$ and $P(\pi) = 1/2\pi$. This expression has been tested and confirmed by experiments. Ref. 847

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

measured depends on the precision of the rotation angle. But if a *microscopic* particle rotates, this rotation might be unobservable: a situation in fundamental contrast with the case of *macroscopic* objects. Experiments indeed confirm that many microscopic particles have unobservable rotation angles. For example, in many (but not all) cases, an atomic nucleus rotated by half a turn cannot be distinguished from the unrotated nucleus.

If a microscopic particle has a *smallest* unobservable rotation angle, the quantum of action implies that the angular momentum of that particle *cannot* be zero. It must always be rotating. Therefore we need to check, for each particle, what its smallest unobservable angle of rotation is. Physicists have checked all particles in nature in experiments, and found smallest unobservable angles (depending on the particle type) of 0, 4π, 2π, $4\pi/3$, π, $4\pi/5$, $2\pi/3$, etc.

Let us take an example. Certain nuclei have a smallest unobservable rotation angle of *half* a turn. This is the case for a prolate nucleus (one that looks like a rugby ball) turning around its short axis. Both the largest observable rotation and the indeterminacy are thus a *quarter* turn. Since the change, or action, produced by a rotation is the number of turns multiplied by the angular momentum, we find that the angular momentum of this nucleus is $2 \cdot \hbar$.

As a general result, we deduce from the minimum angle values that the angular momentum of a microscopic particle can be 0, $\hbar/2$, $\hbar$, $3\hbar/2$, $2\hbar$, $5\hbar/2$, $3\hbar$, etc. In other words, the intrinsic angular momentum of a particle, usually called its *spin*, is an integer multiple of $\hbar/2$. Spin describes how a particle behaves under rotations. (It turns out that all spin-0 particles are composed of other particles, thus respecting the quantum of action as the limit for rotational motion in nature.)

How can a particle rotate? At this point, we do not yet know how to *picture* the rotation. But we can *feel* it – just as we showed that light is made of rotating entities: all matter, including electrons, can be *polarized*. This is shown clearly by the famous Stern–Gerlach experiment.

Silver, Stern and Gerlach – polarization of quantons

After a year of hard work, in 1922, Otto Stern and Walther Gerlach* completed an experiment to investigate the polarization of matter quantons. They knew that inhomogeneous magnetic fields act as polarizers for rotating charges. Rotating charges are present in every atom. Therefore they let a beam of silver atoms, extracted from an oven by evaporation, pass an inhomogeneous magnetic field. They found that the beam splits into two *separate* beams, as shown in Figure 460. No atoms leave the magnetic field region in intermediate directions. This is in full contrast to what would be expected from classical physics.

Ref. 848

The splitting into two beams is an intrinsic property of silver atoms; today we know that it is due to their spin. Silver atoms have spin $\hbar/2$, and depending on their orientation in space, they are deflected either in the direction of the field inhomogeneity or against it. The splitting of the beam is a pure quantum effect: there are no intermediate

* Otto Stern (1888–1969) and Walther Gerlach (1889–1979), both German physicists, worked together at the University of Frankfurt. For his subsequent measurement of the anomalous magnetic moment of the proton, Stern received the Nobel Prize for physics in 1943, after he had had to flee Germany.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 460 The Stern–Gerlach experiment

options. Indeed, the Stern–Gerlach experiment provides one of the clearest demonstrations that classical physics does not work well in the microscopic domain. In 1922, the result seemed so strange that it was studied in great detail all over the world.

When one of the two beams – say the 'up' beam – is passed through a second set-up, all the atoms end up in the 'up' beam. The other possible exit, the 'down' beam, remains unused in this case. In other words, the up and down beams, in contrast to the original beam, cannot be split. This is not surprising.

But if the second set-up is rotated by $\pi/2$ with respect to the first, again two beams – 'right' and 'left' – are formed, and it does not matter whether the incoming beam is directly from the oven or from the 'up' part of the beam. A partially-rotated set-up yields a partial, uneven split. The proportions depend on the angle.

Challenge 1389 e

We note directly that if we split the beam from the oven first vertically and then horizontally, we get a different result from splitting the beam in the opposite order. Splitting processes do not commute. (When the order of two operations makes a difference to the net result, physicists call them 'non-commutative'.) Since all measurements are also processes, we deduce that, in general, measurements in quantum systems are non-commutative.

Beam splitting is direction-dependent. Matter beams behave almost in the same way as polarized light beams. Indeed, the inhomogeneous magnetic field acts on matter somewhat like a polarizer acts on light. The up and down beams, taken together, define a polarization direction. In fact, the polarization direction can be rotated (with the help of a *homogeneous* magnetic field). Indeed, a rotated beam in a unrotated magnet behaves like an unrotated beam in a rotated magnet.

The 'digital' split forces us to rethink our description of motion. In special relativity,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

the existence of a maximum speed forced us to introduce the concept of space-time, and then to refine our description of motion. In general relativity, the maximum force obliged us to introduce the concepts of horizon and curvature, and then again to refine our description of motion. At this point, the existence of the quantum of action forces us to take two similar steps. We will first introduce the concept of a Hilbert space, and then we will refine our description of motion yet again.

The quantum description of physical systems

In everyday life and in classical physics, a system is said to *have* momentum, to *have* position, and to *have* an axis of rotation. The quantum of action makes it impossible for us to continue using this language. In classical physics, the state (the quantities a system 'has') and the result of a measurement coincide: this is because measurements can be imagined to have a negligible effect on the system. But because of the existence of a smallest action, the interaction necessary to perform the measurement *cannot* be made arbitrarily small.

Indeed, the Stern–Gerlach experiment shows that the measured values of spin orientation are *not* intrinsic, but result from the measurement process itself (in this case, the interaction with the inhomogeneous field). This is in contrast to the spin *magnitude*, which is intrinsic and state-independent.

Therefore, the quantum of action forces us to distinguish three entities:

— the state of the system;
— the operation of measurement;
— the result of the measurement.

Thus, in contrast to the classical case, the general state of a quantum system is *not* described by the outcomes of measurements. The simplest illustration of this difference is the system made of a single particle in the Stern–Gerlach experiment. The experiment shows that a spin measurement on a general (oven) particle state sometimes gives 'up' (say +1), and sometimes gives 'down' (say –1). So a general atom, in an oven state, has no intrinsic orientation. It is also found that feeding 'up' states into the measurement apparatus gives 'up' states: thus certain special states ('eigenstates') do remain unaffected by measurement. Finally, the experiment shows that states can be rotated by applied fields: they have an abstract direction.

These details can be formulated in a straightforward way. Since measurements are operations that take a state as input and produce as output a measurement result and an output state, we can say:

— States are described by small rotating arrows; in other words, they are complex *vectors* in an abstract space. The space of all possible states is a *Hilbert space*.
— Measurements of observables are operations on the state vectors. Measurements are said to be described by self-adjoint, or *Hermitean*, operators (or matrices).
— Measurement results are *real numbers*.
— Changes of viewpoint are described by *unitary* operators (or matrices) that act on states and measurement operators.

Thus we have distinguished three quantities that are not distinguished in classical physics:

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

states, measurement of observables and measurement results. Given this distinction, quantum theory follows quite simply, as we shall see.

Quantum theory describes observables as operators, and thus as *transformations* in Hilbert space, because any measurement is an interaction with a system and thus a transformation of its state. The Stern–Gerlach experiment shows this clearly: the interaction with the field transforms some atoms in one way, and other atoms in another way.

Quantum-mechanical experiments also show that a measurement of an observable can only give a result that is an eigenvalue of this transformation. The resulting states, the 'special' states just mentioned, are the eigenvectors. Therefore every expert on motion must know what an eigenvalue and an eigenvector is.

For any linear transformation T, those special vectors $|\psi\rangle$ that are transformed into multiples of themselves,

$$T|\psi\rangle = \lambda|\psi\rangle \tag{609}$$

are called *eigenvectors* (or *eigenstates*), and the multiplication factor λ is called the associated *eigenvalue*. Experiments show that the state of the system *after* a measurement is given by the eigenvector corresponding to the measured eigenvalue. In the Stern–Gerlach experiment, the eigenstates are the 'up' and the 'down' states. Eigenvalues of Hermitean operators are always real, so that consistency is ensured.

In summary, the quantum of action obliges us to distinguish between three concepts that are mixed together in classical physics: the state of a system, a measurement on the system, and the measurement result. The quantum of action forces us to change the vocabulary with which we describe nature, and obliges to use more differentiated concepts. Now follows the main step: the description of *motion* with these concepts. This is what is usually called 'quantum theory'.

The quantum description of motion

In nature, motion happens in a way that minimizes change. Indeed, in classical physics, Page 198 the principle of least action states that in nature, all motion happens along that particular path – out of all possible paths with the same endpoints – for which the action is minimal. This principle of cosmic laziness was stated mathematically by saying that in nature, the *variation* δS of the action is zero. We now transfer this idea to the quantum domain.

For quantum systems, we need to redefine both the concept of action and the concept of variation: first of all, we to find a description of action that is based on operators; secondly, we need to define the action variation without paths, as the concept of 'path' does not exist for quantum systems; thirdly, since there is a smallest action in nature, a vanishing variation is not a clearly defined concept, and we must overcume this hurdle.

In classical physics, we defined the action (or change) as the integral of the Lagrangian between the initial and final points in time, and the Lagrangian itself as the difference Page 194 between kinetic and potential energy. In quantum theory, the action (or change) is best defined using the *quantum action*, as defined by Julian Schwinger. We call the initial and final states of the system ψ_i and ψ_f. The action S between these two states is defined as

$$S = \langle \psi_i \,|\, \int L \,\mathrm{d}t \,|\, \psi_f \rangle \,, \tag{610}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

where L is the *Lagrangian (operator)*. The angle brackets represent the 'multiplication' of states and operators as defined in quantum theory. More about this, including the difference between left and right angle brackets, will be clarified below. In simple words, also in quantum theory, action is the integral of the Lagrangian.

The Lagrangian operator L is defined in the same way as in classical physics: the Lagrangian $L = T - V$ is the difference between the kinetic energy T and the potential energy V operators. The only difference is that, in quantum theory, the momentum and position *variables* of classical physics are replaced by the corresponding *operators* of quantum physics.*

To transfer the concept of action variation δS to the quantum domain, we use Julian Schwinger's approach and use the straightforward expression

$$\delta S = \langle \psi_i \,|\, \delta \int L \mathrm{d}t \,|\, \psi_f \rangle \ . \tag{611}$$

The concept of path is not needed in this expression, as it is based on varying wave functions instead of varying particle paths.

The last classical requirement to be transferred to the quantum domain is that the variation of the action must vanish. In the quantum domain, the variation of the action cannot be zero, as the smallest observable action is the quantum of action. As Julian Schwinger discovered, there is only one possible way to express the required minimality of action:

$$\delta S = \langle \psi_i \,|\, \delta \int L \mathrm{d}t \,|\, \psi_f \rangle = -i\hbar \, \delta \langle \psi_i | \psi_f \rangle \ . \tag{612}$$

This so-called *quantum action principle* describes all motion in the quantum domain. Classically, the right-hand side is zero – since $\hbar$ is taken to be zero – and we then recover the minimum-action principle $\delta S = 0$ of classical physics. But in quantum theory, the variation of the action is proportional to the variation at the end points.

In simple words, all quantum motion, i.e., the quantum evolution of a state $|\psi\rangle$, happens in such a way that the action variation is the same as $-i$ times the quantum of action $\hbar$ times the variation of the scalar product between initial and final states. In other words, in the actual motion, the intermediate states do *not* play a role at all. The variation of the action is indeed zero under variations of the intermediate 'path'.

In the quantum action principle, the factor $-i$ plays an important role. We recall that states are vectors. The factor $-i$ encodes the idea that state vectors rotate during motion. Indeed, the factor $-i$ implies that the *complex* variation on the right-hand side is rotated (in the complex plane) by a right angle. As a result, even if the variation at the endpoints is small, no action change below $\hbar/2$ can be observed.

To convince ourselves of the correctness of the quantum action principle, we proceed in the following way. We first deduce the evolution equation; then we deduce all the experimental phenomena presented so far; and finally we deduce some new predictions and compare these to experiments.

* More precisely, there is also a condition governing the ordering of operators in a mixed product, so that the non-commutativity of operators is taken into account. We do not explore this issue here.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The state evolution – dispersion of quantons

The quantum action principle determines how all quantum systems move. Usually, we describe motion as the change of state with time. If we use the usual method – the calculus of variations – to deduce how a *state* $|\psi\rangle$ changes with time, we find:

Ref. 808

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t}|\psi\rangle = H|\psi\rangle \,, \tag{613}$$

where $H = T + V$ is the Hamiltonian of the system, the sum of kinetic and potential energy. This famous equation is *Schrödinger's equation of motion*.* This evolution equation applies to all quantum systems and is one of the high points of modern physics.

Ref. 849

In fact, Erwin Schrödinger had found his equation in two different ways. In his first paper, he deduced it from a variational principle, though one slightly different from the one just given. In the second paper, he deduced the evolution equation directly, by asking a simple question: how does the state evolve? He knew that the state of a quanton behaves both like a wave and like a particle. A wave is described by a field, which he denoted $\psi(t, x)$. If the state ψ behaves like a wave, then it must be described by a function (a 'wave function') with amplitude W multiplied by a phase factor $e^{i\boldsymbol{kx}-\omega t}$. The state can thus be written as

Ref. 850

$$|\psi\rangle = \psi(t, x) = W(t, x)e^{i\boldsymbol{kx}-\omega t} \,. \tag{614}$$

At the same time, the state must also behave like a particle. In particular, the non-relativistic particle relation between energy and momentum $E = \boldsymbol{p}^2/2m + V(\boldsymbol{x}) - V\boldsymbol{x}$ being the potential at position $\boldsymbol{x}$ – must remain valid for these waves. Thus, from the two relations for matter wavelength and frequency, we must have

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = H\psi = \frac{\Delta \psi}{2m} + V(\boldsymbol{x})\psi \,. \tag{615}$$

In 1926, this *wave equation* for the complex field ψ became instantly famous when Schrödinger used it, by inserting the potential felt by an electron near a proton, to calculate the energy levels of the hydrogen atom. Light is emitted by electrons; therefore a precise description of the motion of electrons in atoms allows us to describe the light frequencies they emit. (We will perform the calculation and the comparison with experiment below.) The Schrödinger equation explained the discrete colours of all radiation emitted by hydrogen: the frequencies of the light emitted by hydrogen gas were found to be in agreement with the prediction of the equation to five decimal places. This was an important result, especially if we keep in mind that classical physics cannot event explain

Page 1042

* Erwin Schrödinger (b. 1887 Vienna, d. 1961 Vienna) was famous for being a *physicien bohémien*, always living in a household with two women. In 1925 he discovered the equation that brought him international fame, and the Nobel Prize for physics in 1933. He was also the first to show that the radiation discovered by Victor Hess in Vienna was indeed coming from the cosmos. He left Germany, and then again Austria, out of dislike for National Socialism, and was a professor in Dublin for many years. There he published his famous and influential book *What is life?*. In it, he came close to predicting the then-unknown nucleic acid DNA from theoretical insight alone.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 461 Erwin Schrödinger (1887–1961)

the existence of atoms! The description of the motion of matter had arrived at a new high point.

The most precise description of matter is found when the *relativistic* energy–momentum relation is taken into account. We explore this approach below. No deviations between relativistic calculations and experiments have ever been found. Even today, predictions and measurements of atomic spectra remain the most precise and accurate in the whole study of nature: in some cases, the calculated values agree with experiments to 13 decimal places.

Page 1046

Let us delve a little into the details of the description given by the Schrödinger equation (615). The equation expresses a simple connection: the classical speed of matter is the group velocity of the field ψ. We know from classical physics that the group velocity is not always well defined: in cases where the group dissolves in several peaks, the concept of group velocity is not of much use. These are the cases in which quantum motion is very different from classical motion, as we will soon discover. But for the other, more well-behaved cases, we find that the wave function moves in the same way as a classical particle does.

As an example, the left corner pictures in these pages show the evolution of a wave function (actually its purely real, squared modulus $|\psi|^2$) for the case of an exploding two-particle system.

The squared modulus $|\psi|^2$ represents a probability distribution. In an atom, the probability distribution of the electrons determines the shape of the electron clouds. That is why it is said that the Schrödinger equation contains not only most of physics, but all of chemistry and biology. We will return to these sciences later on.

Page 1146

The Schrödinger equation makes another point: velocity and position of matter are not independent variables, and cannot be chosen at will. Indeed, the initial condition of a system is given by the initial value of the wave function alone. No derivatives have to be (or can be) specified. In other words, quantum systems are described by a *first-order* evolution equation, in stark contrast to classical systems.

We write the wave function ψ or $|\psi\rangle$, with no difference in meaning. The wave function is a *complex-valued* function: it assigns a complex number to every point in space. This reflects the fact that quantum states behave like arrows. Indeed, we know that complex numbers can be described by arrows. The orientation of the arrow in this abstract plane is called the *phase* of the wave function.

Page 877

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 462 Climbing a hill

Even though the wave function can be seen as defining an arrow at every point in space, the wave function as a whole can also described as one, single vector, this time in a Hilbert space. The scalar product of two wave functions is the spatial integral of the product of the complex conjugate of the first function and the (unconjugated) second function. With this definition, all vector concepts (unit vectors, null vectors, basis vectors, etc.) can be meaningfully applied to wave functions.

For free quantum particles, the evolution equation has a simple consequence. Imagine a wavefunction that is localized around a given starting position. This wave function describes a quantum system at rest. When time passes, this wave function will *spread out* in space. Indeed, the evolution equation is similar, mathematically, to a diffusion equation. In the same way that a drop of ink in water spreads out, also a localized quantum particle will spread out in space. The most probable position stays unchanged, but the probability to find the particle at large distances from the strating position increases over time. For quantum particles, this spreading effect is indeed observed. For macroscopic objects, the spreading effect is not observed, however: cars rarely move away from parking spaces. Indeed, quantum theory predicts that for macroscopic systems, the effect of spreading is negligibly small. Can you show why?

Challenge 1390 ny

Many quantum particles are not free but move in an external potential. In these cases the quantum action principle, or equivalently, the Schrödinger equation, have a number of intriguing consequences.

Tunnelling and limits on memory – damping of quantons

'Common sense' says that a slow ball cannot roll over a high hill. More precisely, classical physics says that if the kinetic energy T is smaller than the potential energy V that the ball would have at the top of the hill, then the ball cannot reach the top of the hill. In contrast, according to quantum theory, there is a positive probability of passing the hill for *any* energy of the ball.

In quantum theory, hills and obstacles are described by potential barriers, and objects by wave functions. Any initial wave function will spread *beyond* any potential barrier of finite height and width. The wave function will also be non-vanishing at the location of the barrier. In short, any object can overcome any hill or barrier. This effect is called the *tunnelling effect*. It is in complete contrast to everyday experience – and to classical mechanics.

The tunnelling effect results from a new aspect contained in the quantum description of hills: the statement that all obstacles in nature can be overcome with a *finite* effort. No obstacle is infinitely difficult to surmount. Indeed, only for a potential of infinite height would the wave function vanish and fail to spread to the other side. But such potentials

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

exist only as approximations; in nature potentials are always of finite value.

Challenge 1391 ny How large is the tunnelling effect? Calculation shows that the transmission probability P is given approximately by

$$P \approx \frac{16T(V-T)}{V^2}\, \mathrm{e}^{\frac{-2w}{\hbar}\sqrt{2m(V-T)}} \tag{616}$$

where w is the width of the hill, v its height, and m and T the mass and the kinetic energy of the particle. For a system of large number of particles, the probability is the product of the probabilities for the different particles.

Let us take the case of a car in a garage, and assume that it is made of 10^{28} atoms at room temperature. A typical garage wall has a thickness of 0.1 m and a potential height of $V = 1\,\mathrm{keV} = 160\,\mathrm{aJ}$ for the passage of an atom. We get that the probability of finding the car outside the garage is

$$P \approx \left(10^{-(10^{12})}\right)^{(10^{28})} \approx 10^{-(10^{40})} \,. \tag{617}$$

Challenge 1392 e The smallness of this value (just try to write it down, to be convinced) is the reason why it is never taken into account by the police when a car is reported missing. (Actually, the probability is considerably smaller. Can you name at least one effect that has been Challenge 1393 ny forgotten in this simple calculation?)

Obviously, tunnelling can be important only for small systems, made of a few particles, and for thin barriers, with a thickness of the order of $\hbar/\sqrt{2m(V-T)}$. For example, tunnelling of single atoms is observed in solids at high temperature, but is not important in daily life. For electrons, the effect is larger: the barrier width w for an appreciable tunnelling effect is

$$w \approx \frac{0.5\,\mathrm{nm}\,\sqrt{\mathrm{aJ}}}{\sqrt{V-T}} \,. \tag{618}$$

At room temperature, the kinetic energy T is of the order of 6 zJ; increasing the temperature obviously increases the tunnelling. As a result, electrons tunnel quite easily through barriers that are a few atoms in width. Indeed, every TV tube uses tunnelling at high temperature to generate the electron beam producing the picture. The necessary heating is the reason why television tubes take some time to switch on.

The tunnelling of electrons also limits the physical size of computer memories. Memory chips cannot be made arbitrary small. Silicon integrated circuits with one terabyte Challenge 1394 s (TB) of random-access memory (RAM) will probably never exist. Can you imagine why? In fact, tunnelling limits the working of any type of memory, including that of our brain. Indeed, if we were much hotter than 37 °C, we could not remember anything!

Since light is made of particles, it can also tunnel through potential barriers. The best – or highest – potential barriers for light are mirrors; mirrors have barrier heights of the order of one attojoule. Tunnelling implies that light *can* be detected behind any mirror. These so-called evanescent waves have indeed been detected; they are used in various high-precision experiments.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 463 The Aharonov–Bohm effect: the influence of the magnetic vector potential on interference (left) and a measurement confirmation (right), using a microscopic sample that transports electrons in thin metal wires (© Doru Cuturela)

Phase and the Aharonov–Bohm effect

The motion of the cloud for a single microscopic particle is described by two quantities: the *density* and the *phase*. whereas the density is easy to picture – just think of a real cloud – the phase takes more effort. States or wave functions are clouds with a phase: they are clouds that can be rotated. In case of an everyday, spherical water cloud, rotation has no effect. In contrast, in quantum theory, the rotation of the cloud, its phase, has a measurable effect.

The phase is that aspect of the wave function that leads to the wave effects of matter. Most importantly, the phase of the wave function plays a role in interference effects. When two partial wave functions are separated and recombined after a relative phase change, the phase change will determine the interference. This is the origin of the electron beam interference results shown in Figure 456.

Page 1006

The phase of matter waves behaves like the phase of photons: it evolves with time, and thus increases along the path of a moving particle. The angular velocity with which it rotates is given by the famous relation $\omega = E/\hbar$. In summary, we can picture the wave function of a free particle as a moving clouds that rotates and disperses.

Ref. 851

A famous experiment shows the importance of the phase in a surprising way: the *Aharonov-Bohm* effect. The effect is famous because it is somewhat counterintuitive and because it was predicted before it was observed. Look at the set-up shown in Figure 463. A matter wave of charged particles is split into two by a cylinder – positioned at a right angle to the matter's path – and the matter wave recombines behind it. Inside the cylinder there is a magnetic field; outside, there is none. (A simple way to realize such a cylinder is a long solenoid.) The prediction is that an interference pattern will be observed, and that

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

the position of the stripes will depend on the value of the magnetic field. This happens even though the wave never enters the region with the field!

The reason for the surprising effect is that for a charged particle, the phase of a wave function is determined by the vector potential $\boldsymbol{A}$, not by the magnetic field $\boldsymbol{B}$. The vector potential around a solenoid does not vanish, as we know from the section on Page 710 electrodynamics, but circulates around the solenoid. This circulation distinguishes the two sides of the solenoid and leads to a phase shift – one that indeed depends on the magnetic field value – and thus produces interference.

In summary, the phase of a wave function is an essential aspect of it: the phase is the reason for calling it 'wave' function. Like in any wave, the phase evolves over time. For charged particles, it can be influenced by the vector potential.

We note that all experiments confirm that, to be precise, the absolute phase of a wave function cannot be measured. But phase differences or phase changes – the relative phase Challenge 1395 e – *can* be measured. Can you confirm this?

The motion of quantons with spin

> Everything turns.
>
> Anonymous

Spin describes how a particle behaves under rotations. The full details of electron spin were deduced from experiments by two Dutch students, George Uhleneck and Samuel Ref. 852 Goudsmit. They had the guts to publish what Ralph Kronig had also suspected: that electrons rotate around an axis with a (z-component of the) angular momentum of $\hbar/2$. In fact, this value is correct for all elementary matter particles. (In contrast, radiation particles have spin values that are integer multiples of $\hbar$.) In particular, Uhlenbeck and Goudsmit proposed a g-value of 2 for the electron in order to explain the optical spectra. Ref. 853 This factor was explained by Llewellyn Thomas as a relativistic effect a few months later.

By 2004, experimental techniques had become so sensitive that the magnetic effect of a single electron spin attached to an impurity (in an otherwise non-magnetic material) could be detected. Researchers now hope to improve these so-called 'magnetic-resonance-force microscopes' until they reach atomic resolution.

In 1927, the Austrian physicist Wolfgang Pauli* discovered how to include spin in a quantum-mechanical description: instead of a state function with a single component, one needs a state function with *two* components. Nowadays, Pauli's equation is mainly of conceptual interest, because – like that of Schrödinger – it does not comply with special

* Wolfgang Ernst Pauli (b. 1900 Vienna, d. 1958 Zürich), at the age of 21, wrote one of the best texts on special and general relativity. He was the first to calculate the energy levels of hydrogen using quantum theory, discovered the exclusion principle, incorporated spin into quantum theory, elucidated the relation between spin and statistics, proved the CPT theorem, and predicted the neutrino. He was admired for his intelligence, and feared for his biting criticisms, which led to his nickname, 'conscience of physics'. Despite this, he helped many people in their research, such as Heisenberg with quantum theory, without claiming any Ref. 854 credit for himself. He was seen by many, including Einstein, as the greatest and sharpest mind of twentieth-century physics. He was also famous for the 'Pauli effect', i.e., his ability to trigger disasters in laboratories, machines and his surroundings by his mere presence. As we will see shortly, one can argue that Pauli actually received the Nobel Prize for physics in 1945 (officially 'for the discovery of the exclusion principle') for finally settling the question of how many angels can dance on the tip of a pin.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

relativity. However, the idea of doubling the necessary components was taken up by Dirac when he introduced the relativistic description of the electron, and the idea is used for all other particle equations.

Relativistic wave equations

A few years after Max Planck had discovered the quantum of action, Albert Einstein published the theory of special relativity. The first question Planck asked himself was whether the value of the quantum of action would be independent of the speed of the observer. It was his interest in this question that led him to invite Einstein to Berlin. By doing so, he made the patent-office clerk famous in the world of physics.

Experiments show that the quantum of action is indeed independent of the speed of the observer. All observers find the same minimum value. To include special relativity into quantum theory, we therefore only need to find the correct quantum Hamiltonian operator.

Given that the classical Hamiltonian of a free particle is given by

$$H = \beta\sqrt{c^4m^2 + c^2\boldsymbol{p}^2} \quad \text{with} \quad \boldsymbol{p} = \gamma m\boldsymbol{v}\,, \tag{619}$$

one might ask: what is the corresponding Hamilton operator? The simplest answer was
Ref. 855 given, only in 1950, by L.L. Foldy and S.A. Wouthuysen. The operator is almost the same one:

$$H = \beta\sqrt{c^4m^2 + c^2\boldsymbol{p}^2} \quad \text{with} \quad \beta = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{620}$$

The signs appearing in the operator β distinguish between particles and antiparticles. There are two +1s and two −1s, to take care of the two possible spin directions. With this Hamiltonian operator, a wave function for a particle has vanishing antiparticle components, and vice versa. The Hamilton operator yields the velocity operator $\boldsymbol{v}$ through the same relation that is valid in classical physics:

$$\boldsymbol{v} = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\boldsymbol{x} = \beta\frac{\boldsymbol{p}}{\sqrt{c^4m^2 + c^2\boldsymbol{p}^2}}\,. \tag{621}$$

This velocity operator shows a continuum of eigenvalues, from minus to plus the speed of light. The velocity $\boldsymbol{v}$ is a constant of motion, as are $\boldsymbol{p}$ and $\sqrt{c^4m^2 + c^2\boldsymbol{p}^2}$.

The orbital angular momentum $\boldsymbol{L}$ is also defined as in classical physics, through

$$\boldsymbol{L} = \boldsymbol{x} \times \boldsymbol{p}\,. \tag{622}$$

Ref. 856 The orbital angular momentum $\boldsymbol{L}$ and the spin $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ are separate constants of motion. A particle (or antiparticle) with positive (or negative) component has a wave function with only one non-vanishing component; the other three components vanish.

But alas, the representation of relativistic motion given by Foldy and Wouthuysen is

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

not the simplest when it comes to take electromagnetic interactions into account. The simple identity between the classical and quantum-mechanical descriptions is lost when electromagnetism is included. We will solve this problem below.

Page 1047

– CS – the rest of quantum theory will appear soon – CS –

Virtual particles

Despite what was said above, actions smaller than the minimal action do have a role to play. We have already encountered one example: in a collision between two electrons, there is an exchange of virtual photons. We know that the exchanged virtual photon cannot be observed. Indeed, the action S for this exchange obeys

Page 1012

$$S \leqslant \frac{\hbar}{2} \,. \tag{623}$$

In short, *virtual* particles appear only as mediators in interactions. They cannot be observed. Virtual particles, in contrast to ordinary, real particles, do not obey the relation $E^2 - p^2c^2 = m^2c^4$. Indeed, virtual particles are the opposite of 'free' or real particles. They may be observed in a vacuum if the measurement time is very short. They are intrinsically short-lived.

– CS – more to come – CS –

In summary, all particle–antiparticles pairs of virtual matter and radiation together form what we call the vacuum. In addition, virtual radiation particles form static fields. Virtual particles are needed for a full description of all interactions. In particular, they are responsible for every decay process.

We will shortly describe a few more successes of quantum theory. But before doing that, we settle an important question.

Page 1119, page 1189

Compositeness

When is an object composite, and not elementary? Quantum theory gives several pragmatic answers. The first one is somewhat strange: an object is composite when its gyromagnetic ratio is different from the one predicted by QED. The *gyromagnetic ratio* γ is defined as the ratio between the magnetic moment $\boldsymbol{M}$ and the angular momentum $\boldsymbol{L}$:

$$\boldsymbol{M} = \gamma \boldsymbol{L} \,. \tag{624}$$

The gyromagnetic ratio γ is measured in units of $\mathrm{s}^{-1}\mathrm{T}^{-1}$, i.e., C/kg, and determines the energy levels of magnetic spinning particles in magnetic fields; it will reappear later in the context of magnetic resonance imaging. All candidates for elementary particles have spin 1/2. The gyromagnetic ratio for spin-1/2 particles of magnetic moment M and mass

Page 1222

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

m can be written as

$$\gamma = \frac{M}{\hbar/2} = g\frac{e}{2m} \,. \tag{625}$$

The criterion for being elementary can thus be reduced to a condition on the value of the dimensionless number g, the so-called *g-factor*. (The expression $e\hbar/2m$ is often called the *magneton* of the particle. Confusingly, the dimensionless factor $g/2$ is often called the gyromagnetic ratio as well.) If the g-factor *differs* from the value predicted by QED for point particles – about 2.0 – the object is *composite*. For example, a $^4He^+$ helium ion has spin 1/2 and a g value of $14.7 \cdot 10^3$. Indeed, the radius of the helium ion is $3 \cdot 10^{-11}$ m, obviously a finite value, and the ion is a composite entity. For the proton, one measures a g-factor of about 5.6. Indeed, experiments yield a finite proton radius of about 0.9 fm and show that it contains several constituents.

Challenge 1396 ny

The neutron, which has a magnetic moment despite being electrically neutral, must therefore be composite. Indeed, its radius is approximately the same as that of the proton. Similarly, molecules, mountains, stars and people must be composite. According to this first criterion, the only elementary particles are *leptons* (i.e., electrons, muons, tauons and neutrinos), *quarks*, and *intermediate bosons* (i.e., photons, W-bosons, Z-bosons and gluons). More details on these particles will be revealed in the chapters on the nucleus.

Page 1222

Another simple criterion for compositeness has just been mentioned: *any object with a measurable size is composite*. This criterion yields the same list of elementary particles as the first. Indeed, the two criteria are related. The simplest model for composite structures predicts that the g-factor obeys

Ref. 869

$$g - 2 = \frac{R}{\lambda_C} \tag{626}$$

where R is the radius and $\lambda_C = h/mc$ is the Compton wavelength of the system. This expression is surprisingly precise for helium-4 ions, helium-3, tritium ions and protons, as you may wish to check. The tables in Appendix E make the same point.

Challenge 1397 e

A third criterion for compositeness is more general: *any object larger than its Compton length is composite*. The argument is simple. An object is composite if one can detect *internal* motion, i.e., motion of some components. Now the action of any part with mass m_{part} moving inside a composed system of size r obeys

$$S_{part} < 2\pi\, r\, m_{part}\, c < \pi\, r\, m\, c \tag{627}$$

where m is the mass of the *composite* object. On the other hand, following the principle of quantum theory, this action, to be observable, must be larger than $\hbar/2$. Inserting this condition, we find that for any composite object*

$$r > \frac{\hbar}{2\pi\, m\, c} \,. \tag{628}$$

Challenge 1398 ny

* Can you find the missing factor of 2? And is the assumption that the components must always be lighter than the composite a valid one?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The right-hand side differs only by a factor $4\pi^2$ from the so-called *Compton (wave)length*

$$\lambda = \frac{h}{m\,c} \tag{629}$$

of an object. Thus any object *larger* than its own Compton wavelength is composite; and any object *smaller* than the right-hand side of expression (628) is elementary. Again, only leptons, quarks and intermediate bosons pass the test. All other objects are composite. This third criterion produces the same list as the previous ones. Can you explain why? Challenge 1399 ny

Interestingly, we are not yet finished with this topic. Even stranger statements about compositeness will appear when gravity is taken into account. Just be patient: it is worth it.

Curiosities and fun challenges about quantum matter

> It is possible to walk while reading, but not to read while walking.
>
> Serge Pahaut

The quantum of action implies that there are no fractals in nature. Quantum theory requires that all shapes in nature be 'fuzzy' *clouds*.

* *

Can atoms rotate? Can an atom that falls on the floor roll under the table? Can atoms be put into high-speed rotation? The answer is 'no' to all these questions, because angular momentum is quantized; moreover, atoms are not solid objects, but clouds. The macroscopic case of an object turning more and more slowly until it stops does not exist in the microscopic world. The quantum of action does not allow it. Ref. 857

* *

Do hydrogen atoms exist? Most types of atom have been imaged with microscopes, photographed under illumination, levitated one by one, and even moved with needles, one by one, as the picture on page 259 shows. Researchers have even moved single atoms by using laser beams to push them. However, not a single one of these experiments has measured hydrogen atoms. Is that a reason to doubt the existence of hydrogen atoms? Taking this not-so-serious discussion seriously can be a lot of fun. Ref. 858 Challenge 1400 s

* *

Light is refracted when it enters dense matter. Do matter waves behave similarly? Yes, they do. In 1995, David Pritchard showed this for sodium waves entering a gas of helium and xenon. Ref. 859

* *

Two observables can commute for two different reasons: either they are very *similar* – such as the coordinates x and x^2 – or they are very *different* – such as the coordinate x and the momentum p_y. Can you give an explanation for this? Challenge 1401 ny

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

Space and time translations commute. Why then do the momentum operator and the Challenge 1402 ny Hamiltonian not in general commute?

* *

Ref. 860 Given two mirrors and a few photons, it is possible to capture an atom and keep it floating between the two mirrors. This feat, one of several ways to isolate single atoms, is now Challenge 1403 ny standard practice in laboratories. Can you imagine how it is done?

* *

For a bound system in a non-relativistic state with no angular momentum, one has the Ref. 861 relation

$$\langle r^2 \rangle \, \langle T \rangle \;\geqslant \frac{9\hbar^2}{8m} \,, \tag{630}$$

where m is the reduced mass and T the kinetic energy of the components, and r is the Challenge 1404 s size of the system. Can you deduce this result, and check it for hydrogen?

* *

Most examples of quantum motion given so far are due to electromagnetic effects. Can Challenge 1405 ny you argue that the quantum of action must also apply to nuclear motion?

* *

One often reads that the universe might have been born from a quantum fluctuation. Challenge 1406 ny Does this statement make sense?



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 36

COLOURS AND OTHER INTERACTIONS BETWEEN LIGHT AND MATTER

> Rem tene; verba sequentur.*
>
> Cato

Stones have colours. So do quantons. Having separately described the motion of matter and of radiation, the next step is to describe their interactions. In other words, how do charged quantons react to electromagnetic fields, and vice versa? Interactions lead to surprising effects, especially when special relativity is taken into account.

What are stars made of?

Near the beginning of the eighteenth century, the English physicist William Wollaston and the Bavarian instrument-maker Joseph Fraunhofer** noted that the rainbow *lacks* certain colours. These colours appear as black lines when the rainbow is spread out in sufficient breadth. Figure 464 shows the lines in detail; they are called *Fraunhofer lines* today. In 1860, Gustav Kirchhoff and Robert Bunsen showed that the *missing* colours were exactly those colours that certain elements *emit* when heated. In this way they managed to show that sodium, calcium, barium, nickel, magnesium, zinc, copper and iron are present in the Sun. However, of the 476 lines they observed, they were unable to attribute 13. In 1868, Jules Janssen and Joseph Lockyer independently predicted that these unknown lines were from a new element. It was eventually found on Earth, in an uranium mineral called cleveite, in 1895. This new element was called *helium*, from the Greek word ἥλιος 'helios' – Sun. Today we know that it is the second most widespread ingredient of the Sun and of the universe, after hydrogen. Despite being so common, helium

* 'Know the subject and the words will follow.' Marcus Porcius Cato, (234–149 BCE) or Cato the elder, Roman politician famous for his speeches and his integrity.

** Joseph Fraunhofer (b. 1787 Straubing, d. 1826 München). Bavarian. Having been orphaned at the age of 11, he learned lens-polishing. He taught himself optics from books. He entered an optical company at the age of 19, ensuring the success of the business by producing the best available lenses, telescopes, micrometers, optical gratings and optical systems of his time. He invented the spectroscope and the heliometer. He discovered and counted 476 lines in the spectrum of the Sun; these lines are now named after him. (Today, Fraunhofer lines are still used as measurement standards: the second and the metre are defined in terms of them.) Physicists from all over the world would buy their equipment from him, visit him, and ask for copies of his publications. Even after his death, his instruments remained unsurpassed for generations. With his telescopes, in 1837 Bessel was able to make the first measurement of parallax of a star, and in 1846 Johann Gottfried Galle discovered Neptune. Fraunhofer became a professor in 1819. He died young, from the consequences of the years spent working with lead and glass powder.

Page 656

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 464 The spectrum of daylight: a stacked section of an extended rainbow, showing its Fraunhofer lines (© Nigel Sharp, NOAO, FTS, NSO, KPNO, AURA, NSF)

Figure to be included

FIGURE 465 A hydrogen discharge

is rare on Earth because it is a light noble gas that does not form chemical compounds. Helium thus tends to rise in the atmosphere and escape into space.

Understanding the colour lines produced by each element had started to become interesting already before the discovery of helium; but afterwards the interest increased further, thanks to the increasing number of applications of colour knwoledge in chemistry, physics, technology, crystallography, biology and lasers. It is obvious that classical electrodynamics cannot explain the existence of sharp colour lines. Indeed, only quantum theory can explain them – or any other colour.

What determines the colours of atoms?

The simplest atom to study is that of hydrogen. Hydrogen gas emits light consisting of a handfull of sharp spectral lines, as shown in Figure 466. Already in 1885, the Swiss schoolteacher Johann Balmer (1828–1898) had discovered that the wavelengths of visible hydrogen lines obey the formula:

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_m} = R\left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{m^2}\right) . \tag{631}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 466 The visible spectrum of hydrogen (NASA) and its energy levels, in four approximations of increasing precision. Can you associate the visible lines to the correct level transitions?

Careful measurements, which included the hydrogen's spectral lines in the infrared and in the ultraviolet, allowed Johannes Rydberg (1854–1919) to generalize this formula to:

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_{mn}} = R\left(\frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{m^2}\right) , \tag{632}$$

where n and $m > n$ are positive integers, and the so-called *Rydberg constant* R has the value $10.97\,\mu m^{-1}$; easier to remember, the inverse value is $1/R = 91.16\,nm$. All the colour lines emitted by hydrogen satisfy this simple formula. Thus, quantum theory has a clearly defined challenge here: to explain the formula and the value of R.

Incidentally, the transition λ_{21} for hydrogen is called the *Lyman-alpha line*. Its wavelength, 121.6 nm, lies in the ultraviolet. It is easily observed with telescopes, since most of the visible stars consist of excited hydrogen. The Lyman-alpha line is routinely used to determine the speed of distant stars or galaxies, since the Doppler effect changes the wavelength when the speed is large. The record so far is a galaxy found in 2004, with a Lyman-alpha line shifted to 1337 nm. Can you calculate the speed with which it is moving

Ref. 862

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1407 ny away from the Earth?

There are many ways to deduce Balmer's formula from the minimum action. The first way was due to Bohr. Then, in 1926, Schrödinger solved his equation of motion for the electrostatic potential $V(r) = e^2/4\pi\varepsilon_0 r$ of a point-like proton and by doing so, deduced Balmer's formula; however, this famous calculation is long and complex. In order to understand hydrogen colours, it is not necessary to solve an equation of motion; it is sufficient to compare the energies of the initial and final states. This can be done most easily by noting that a specific form of the action must be a multiple of $\hbar/2$. This approach was developed by Einstein, Brillouin and Keller, and is now named after them. It relies on Ref. 863 the fact that the action S of any quantum system obeys

$$S = \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint \mathrm{d}q_i p_i = \left(n_i + \frac{\mu_i}{4}\right)\hbar \tag{633}$$

for every coordinate q_i and its conjugate momentum p_i. Here, n_i can be zero or any positive integer, and μ_i is the so-called *Maslov index*, an even integer, which in the case of atoms has the value 2 for the radial and azimuthal coordinates r and θ, and 0 for the rotation angle φ. The integral is to be taken along a full orbit. In simple words, the action S is a half-integer multiple of the quantum of action.

Any rotational motion in a spherical potential $V(r)$ is characterized by a constant energy E and constant angular momenta L and L_z. Therefore the conjugate momenta for Challenge 1408 ny the coordinates r, θ and φ are

$$\begin{aligned} p_r &= \sqrt{2m(E - V(r)) - \frac{L^2}{r^2}} \\ p_\theta &= \sqrt{L^2 - \frac{L_z^2}{\sin^2\theta}} \\ p_\varphi &= L_z \,. \end{aligned} \tag{634}$$

Using these expressions in equation (633) and setting $n = n_r + n_\theta + n_\varphi + 1$ yields* the result

$$E_n = -\frac{1}{n^2}\frac{me^4}{2(4\pi\varepsilon_0)^2\hbar^2} = -\frac{R}{n^2} \approx -\frac{2.19\,\mathrm{aJ}}{n^2} \approx -\frac{13.6\,\mathrm{eV}}{n^2} \,. \tag{637}$$

Using the idea that a hydrogen atom emits a single photon when its electron changes from state E_n to E_m, one gets exactly the formula deduced by Balmer and Rydberg from

* The calculation is straightforward. After insertion of $V(r) = e/4\pi\varepsilon_0 r$ into equation (634) one needs to Challenge 1409 ny perform the (tricky) integration. Using the general result

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\oint \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{z}\sqrt{Az^2 + 2Bz - C} = -\sqrt{C} + \frac{B}{\sqrt{-A}} \tag{635}$$

one gets

$$\left(n_r + \frac{1}{2}\right)\hbar + L = n\hbar = \frac{e^2}{4\pi\varepsilon_0}\sqrt{\frac{m}{-2E}} \,. \tag{636}$$

This leads to the energy formula (637).

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

observations. The quantum of action thus explains the colours of hydrogen. (This whole discussion assumes that the electrons in hydrogen atoms are in eigenstates. Can you argue why this is the case?)

Challenge 1410 e

Challenge 1411 ny

The lowest energy level, for $n = 1$, is called the ground state. The energy value 2.19 aJ is the *ionization energy* of hydrogen; if that energy is added to the ground state, the electron is no longer bound to the nucleus. The ionization energy thus plays the same role for electrons around atoms as does the escape velocity for satellites around planets.

The calculation also yields the effective radius of the electron orbit in hydrogen. It is given by

$$r_n = n^2 \frac{\hbar^2 4\pi\varepsilon_0}{m_e e^2} = \frac{\hbar}{m_e c\alpha} = n^2 a_0 \approx n^2\, 52.918\,937\,\text{pm} \,. \tag{638}$$

In contrast to classical physics, quantum theory allows only certain specific orbits around the nucleus. (For more details about the fine structure constant α, see below.) The smallest value, 53 pm for $n = 1$, is called the *Bohr radius*, and is denoted by a_0. To be more precise, these radii are the average sizes of the electron clouds surrounding the nucleus. Quantum theory thus implies that a hydrogen atom excited to the level $n = 500$ is about 12 μm in size: larger than many bacteria! Such blown-up atoms, usually called *Rydberg atoms*, have indeed been observed in the laboratory, although they are extremely sensitive to perturbations.

Page 1046, page 1050

Ref. 864

The orbital frequency of electrons in hydrogen is

$$f_n = \frac{1}{n^3} \frac{e^4 m_e}{4\varepsilon_0^2 h^3} = \frac{1}{n^3} \frac{m_e c^2 \alpha^2}{h} \approx \frac{6.7\,\text{PHz}}{n^3} \tag{639}$$

and the electron speed is

$$v_n = \frac{1}{n} \frac{e^2}{4\pi\varepsilon_0 \hbar} = \frac{\alpha c}{n} \approx \frac{2.2\,\text{Mm/s}}{n} \approx \frac{0.007\ c}{n} \,. \tag{640}$$

As expected, the further the electron's orbit is from the nucleus, the more slowly it moves. This result can also be checked by experiment: exchanging the electron for a muon allows us to measure the time dilation of its lifetime. Measurements are in agreement with the calculations.

Ref. 865

In 1915, Arnold Sommerfeld understood that the analogy of electron motion with orbits could be continued in two ways. First of all, electrons can move in ellipses. The quantization of angular momentum implies that only selected eccentricities are possible. The higher the angular momentum, the larger the number of possibilities: the first are shown in Figure 467. The highest eccentricity corresponds to the minimum value $l = 0$ of the so-called azimuthal quantum number, whereas the case $l = n - 1$ correspond to circular orbits. In addition, the ellipses can have different orientations in space.

Ref. 866

The second point Sommerfeld noted was that the speeds of the electron in hydrogen are slightly relativistic. The above calculation did not take into account relativistic effects. However, high-precision measurements show slight differences between the non-relativistically calculated energy levels and the measured ones.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 467 The orbits of the Bohr–Sommerfeld model of the hydrogen atom and the corresponding orbital wave functions

Relativistic hydrogen

In the relativistic case, too, the EBK action has to be a multiple of $\hbar/2$. From the relativistic
Ref. 863 expression for energy of the electron

$$E + mc^2 = \sqrt{p^2c^2 + m^2c^4} - \frac{e^2}{4\pi\varepsilon_0 r} \tag{641}$$

Challenge 1412 ny we get the expression

$$p_r^2 = 2mE\left(1 + \frac{E}{2mc^2}\right) + \frac{2me^2}{4\pi\varepsilon_0 r}\left(1 + \frac{E}{mc^2}\right) . \tag{642}$$

We now introduce, for convenience, the so-called *fine structure constant*, as $\alpha = e^2/(4\pi\varepsilon_0\hbar c) = \sqrt{4\pi\hbar R/mc^3} \approx 1/137.036$. ($\alpha$ is a dimensionless constant; $R =$
Challenge 1413 ny $10.97\,\mu m^{-1}$ is the Rydberg constant.) The radial EBK action then implies that

$$E_{nl} + mc^2 = \frac{mc^2}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{\alpha^2}{(n-l-\frac{1}{2}+\sqrt{(l+\frac{1}{2})^2-\alpha^2})^2}}} . \tag{643}$$

This result, first found by Arnold Sommerfeld in 1915, is correct for point-like electrons. In reality, the electron has spin 1/2; the correct relativistic energy levels thus appear when

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 468 Paul Dirac (1902–1984)

we set $l = j \pm 1/2$ in the above formula. The result can be approximated by

$$E_{nj} = -\frac{R}{n^2}\left(1 + \frac{\alpha^2}{n^2}\left(\frac{n}{j+\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{3}{4}\right) + \ldots\right) . \tag{644}$$

It reproduces the hydrogen spectrum to an extremely high accuracy. If one compares the result with the non-relativistic one, one notes that each non-relativistic level n is split in n different levels. This is shown in Figure 466. In practice, in precision experiments the lines of the hydrogen spectrum have a so-called *fine structure*. The magnitude of the fine structure depends on α, a fundamental constant of nature. Since the importance of this fundamental constant was discovered in this context, the name chosen by Arnold Sommerfeld, the *fine structure constant*, has been taken over across the world. The fine structure constant describes the *strength* of the electromagnetic interaction.

Of course, it is possible to do even better. The introduction of virtual-particle effects and the coupling of the proton spin gives additional corrections, as shown in Figure 466. But that is still not all, isotope effects, Doppler shifts and level shifts to environmental electric or magnetic fields also influence the hydrogen spectrum.

Relativistic wave equations – again

> The equation was more intelligent than I was.
> Paul Dirac, about his equation, repeating a statement made by Heinrich Hertz.

Unfortunately, it is not a simple matter to generalize the representation of relativistic motion given by Foldy and Wouthuysen to the case of particles with electromagnetic interactions. The simple identity between the classical and quantum-mechanical descriptions is lost if electromagnetism is included.

Charged particles are best described by another, equivalent representation of the Hamiltonian, which was discovered much earlier, in 1926, by the British physicist Paul Dirac.* Dirac found a neat trick to take the square root appearing in the relativistic en-

* Paul Adrien Maurice Dirac (b. 1902 Bristol, d. 1984 Tallahassee), British physicist, son of a Francophone Swiss immigrant. He studied electrotechnics in Bristol, then went to Cambridge, where he later became a professor, holding the chair that Newton had once held. In the years from 1925 to 1933 he published a stream of papers, of which several were worth a Nobel Prize; he received this in 1933. He unified special relativity

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

ergy operator. In this representation, the Hamilton operator is given by

$$H_{\text{Dirac}} = \beta m + \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot p \,. \tag{645}$$

Its position operator x is not the position of a particle, but has additional terms; its velocity operator has only the eigenvalues plus or minus the velocity of light; the velocity operator is not simply related to the momentum operator; the equation of motion contains the famous 'Zitterbewegung' term; orbital angular momentum and spin are not separate constants of motion.

So why use this horrible Hamiltonian? It is the only one that can easily be used for charged particles. Indeed, it is transformed to the one coupled to the electromagnetic Page 712 field by the so-called minimal coupling, i.e., by the substitution

$$\boldsymbol{p} \to \boldsymbol{p} - q\boldsymbol{A} \,, \tag{646}$$

that treats electromagnetic momentum like particle momentum. With this prescription, Dirac's Hamiltonian describes the motion of charged particles interacting with an electromagnetic field $\boldsymbol{A}$. This substitution is not possible in the Foldy–Wouthuysen Hamiltonian. In the Dirac representation, particles are pure, point-like, structureless electric charges; in the Foldy–Wouthuysen representation they acquire a charge radius and a magnetic-Ref. 867 moment interaction. (We will come to the reasons below, in the section on QED.)

In more detail, the simplest description of an electron (or any other elementary, stable, electrically-charged particle of spin 1/2) is given by the action S and Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \int \mathcal{L}_{\text{QED}} d^4x \quad \text{where} \\ \mathcal{L}_{\text{QED}} &= \overline{\psi}\left(i\hbar c \not{D} - mc^2\right)\psi - \frac{1}{4\mu_0} F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} \quad \text{and where} \\ \not{D}_\mu &= \gamma^\mu\left(\partial_\mu - ieA_\mu\right) \end{aligned} \tag{647}$$

The first, matter term in the Lagrangian leads to the Dirac equation; it describes how elementary, charged, spin 1/2 particles are moved by electromagnetic fields. The second, radiation term leads to Maxwell's equations, and describes how electromagnetic fields are moved by the charged particle wave function. Together, they describe what is usually called *quantum electrodynamics*, or QED for short.

As far as is known today, the relativistic description of the motion of charged matter and electromagnetic fields given by expression (647) is *perfect*: no differences between theory and experiment have ever been found, despite intensive searches and despite a high reward for anybody who would find one. All known predictions completely correspond with the measurements. In the most spectacular cases, the correspondence be-

and quantum theory, predicted antimatter, worked on spin and statistics, predicted magnetic monopoles, speculated on the law of large numbers, and more besides. His introversion, friendliness and shyness, and his deep insights into nature, combined with a dedication to beauty in theoretical physics, made him a legend all over the world during his lifetime. For the latter half of his life he tried, unsuccessfully, to find an alternative to quantum electrodynamics, of which he was the founder, as he was repelled by the problems of infinities. He died in Florida, where he lived and worked after his retirement from Cambridge.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

tween theory and measurement extends to more than fourteen digits. But even more interesting than the precision of QED are certain of its features that are missing in classical electrodynamics. Let's have a quick tour.

– CS – more to come here – CS –

Antimatter

'Antimatter' is now a household term. Interestingly, the concept appeared *before* there was any experimental evidence for it. Indeed, the antimatter companion of the electron was predicted in 1926 by Paul Dirac from his equation. Unaware of this prediction, Carl Anderson discovered it in 1932, and called it the *positron*. (The correct name would have been 'positon', without the 'r'. Indeed, this correct form is used in the French language.) Anderson was studying cosmic rays, and noticed that some 'electrons' were turning the wrong way in the magnetic field he had applied to his apparatus. He checked his apparatus thoroughly, and finally deduced that he had found a particle with the same mass as the electron but with positive electric charge.

The existence of positrons has many strange implications. Already in 1928, before their discovery, the Swedish theorist Oskar Klein had pointed out that Dirac's equation for electrons makes a strange prediction: when an electron hits a sufficiently steep potential wall, the reflection coefficient is larger than unity. Such a wall will reflect *more* than is thrown at it. In 1935, after the discovery of the positron, Werner Heisenberg and Hans Euler explained the paradox. They found that the Dirac equation predicts that whenever an electric field exceeds the critical value of

Ref. 868

$$E_c = \frac{m_e c^2}{e\lambda_e} = \frac{m_e^2 c^3}{e\hbar} = 1.3\,\mathrm{EV/m}\,, \tag{648}$$

the vacuum will spontaneously generate electron–positron pairs, which are then separated by the field. As a result, the original field is reduced. This so-called *vacuum polarization* is the reason for the reflection coefficient greater than unity found by Klein, as steep potentials correspond to high electric fields.

Later on we will describe truly gigantic examples of vacuum polarization, around charged black holes.

Page 1211

Such effects show that, in contrast to everyday life, the *number* of particles is not a constant in the microscopic domain. Only the *difference* between particle number and antiparticle number turns out to be conserved. We will expand on this issue in the chapter on the nucleus.

Of course, the generation of electron–positron pairs is not a *creation* out of nothing, but a *transformation* of energy into matter. Such processes are part of every relativistic description of nature. Unfortunately, physicists have a habit of calling this transformation 'pair creation', thus confusing the issue somewhat.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Curiosities and fun challenges about colour

If atoms contain orbiting electrons, the rotation of the Earth, via the Coriolis acceleration, should have an effect on their motion. This beautiful prediction is due to Mark Silverman; Ref. 865 the effect is so small, however, that is has not yet been measured.

* *

Light is diffracted by material gratings. Can matter be diffracted by light gratings? Surprisingly, it actually can, as predicted by Dirac and Kapitza in 1937. This was accom- Ref. 870 plished for the first time in 1986, using atoms. For free electrons, the feat is more difficult; the clearest confirmation came in 2001, when new laser technology was used to perform a beautiful measurement of the typical diffraction maxima for electrons diffracted by a light grating.

* *

Light is totally reflected when it is directed to a dense material at a large enough angle so that it cannot enter the material. A group of Russian physicists have shown that if Ref. 865 the dense material is excited, the totally-reflected beam can be *amplified*. It is unclear whether this will ever lead to applications.

* *

Where is the sea bluest? Sea water is blue because it absorbs red and green light. Sea water can also be of bright colour if the sea floor reflects light. Sea water can also be green, when it contains small particles that scatter or absorb blue light. Most often, these particles are soil or plankton. (Satellites can determine plankton content from the 'greenness' of the sea.) Thus the sea is especially blue if it is deep, quiet and cold; in that case, the ground is distant, soil is not mixed into the water, and the plankton content is low. The Sargasso Sea is deep, quiet and cold for most of the year. It is often called the bluest of the Earth's waters.

The strength of electromagnetism

The great physicist Wolfgang Pauli used to say that after his death, the first thing he would ask the devil would be to explain Sommerfeld's fine-structure constant. (Others used to comment that after the devil had explained it to him, he would think a little, and then snap: 'Wrong!')

Page 1046 Ref. 871 The *fine-structure constant* was introduced by Arnold Sommerfeld. It is the dimensionless constant of nature given by

$$\alpha = \frac{e^2}{4\pi\varepsilon_0\hbar c} \approx \frac{1}{137.035\,999\,710(96)} \approx 0.007\,297\,352\,5359(51)\ . \tag{649}$$

This number first appeared in explanations of the fine structure of certain atomic colour spectra; hence its strange name. Sommerfeld was the first to understand its general importance. It is central to quantum electrodynamics for several reasons. First of all, it describes the *strength* of electromagnetism. Since all charges are multiples of the electron

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

charge, a higher value would mean a stronger attraction or repulsion between charged bodies. Thus the value of α determines the sizes of atoms, and indeed of all things, as well as all colours in nature.

Secondly, it is only because this number is so small that we are able to talk about particles at all. The argument is somewhat involved; it will be given in detail later on. In any case, the small value of the fine-structure constant makes it possible to distinguish particles from each other. If the number were near to or larger than one, particles would interact so strongly that it would not be possible to observe them or to talk about them at all.

This leads on to the third reason for the importance of the fine-structure constant. Since it is a dimensionless number, it implies some yet-unknown mechanism that fixes its value. Uncovering this mechanism is one of the challenges remaining in our adventure. As long as the mechanism remains unknown – as is the case in 2007– we do not understand the colour and size of a single thing around us.

Small changes in the strength of electromagnetic attraction between electrons and protons would have numerous important consequences. Can you describe what would happen to the size of people, to the colour of objects, to the colour of the Sun, or to the workings of computers, if the strength were to double? And what if it were to gradually drop to half its usual value?

Challenge 1414 ny

Since the 1920s, explaining the value of α has been seen as one of the toughest challenges facing modern physics. That is the reason for Pauli's request to the devil. In 1946, during his Nobel Prize lecture, he repeated the statement that a theory that does not determine this number cannot be complete. Since that time, physicists seem to have fallen into two classes: those who did not dare to take on the challenge, and those who had no clue. This fascinating story still awaits us.

Ref. 872

The problem of the fine-structure constant is so deep that it leads many astray. For example, it is sometimes said that it is impossible to change physical units in such a way that $\hbar$, c and e are all equal to 1 at the same time, because to do so would change the number $\alpha = 1/137.036\ldots$. Can you show that the argument is wrong?

Challenge 1415 s

To continue with the greatest efficiency on our path across quantum theory, we next look at two important topics: the issue of indistinguishability, and the issue of the interpretation of its probabilities.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 37

PERMUTATION OF PARTICLES – ARE PARTICLES LIKE GLOVES?

Why are we able to distinguish twins from each other? Why can we distinguish what looks alike, such as a copy from an original? Most of us are convinced that whenever we compare an original with a copy, we can find a difference. This conviction turns out to be correct. In fact, this conviction is in contrast with classical physics. The possibility to distinguish originals from copies is a pure quantum effect.

Indeed, quantum theory has a lot to say about copies and their differences. Think about any method that allows to distinguish objects: you will find that it runs into trouble for point-like particles. Therefore in the quantum domain something must change about our ability to distinguish particles and objects. Let us explore the issue.

Challenge 1416 s

Some usually forgotten properties of objects are highlighted by studying a pretty combinatorial puzzle: the *glove problem*. It asks:

> How many surgical gloves (for the right hand) are necessary if m doctors need to operate w patients in a hygienic way, so that nobody gets in contact with the body fluids of anybody else?

The same problem also appears in other settings. For example, it also applies to condoms, men and women – and is then called the *condom problem* – or to computers, interfaces and computer viruses. To be clear, the optimal number of gloves is *not* the product mw. In fact, the problem has three subcases.

Ref. 873

Challenge 1417 s

— The simple case $m = w = 2$ already provides the most important ideas needed. Are you able to find the optimal solution and procedure?

Challenge 1418 e

— In the case $w = 1$ and m odd or the case $m = 1$ and w odd, the solution is $(m+1)/2$ gloves. This is the optimal solution, as you can easily check yourself.

Ref. 874

— A solution with a simple procedure for all other cases is given by $\lceil 2w/3 + m/2 \rceil$ gloves, where $\lceil x \rceil$ means the smallest integer greater than or equal to x. For example, for two doctors and three patients this gives only three gloves. (However, this formula does not always give the optimal solution; better values exist in certain subcases.)

Challenge 1419 e

Two basic properties of gloves determine the solution to the puzzle. First, gloves have two sides, an interior and an exterior one. Secondly, gloves can be distinguished from each other. Do these two properties also apply to particles? We will discuss the issue of double-sidedness in the last part of the mountain ascent. In fact, the question whether particles can be turned inside out will be of importance for their description and their motion. (In fact, particles do behave like gloves in the sense that one can distinguish right-

Page 1445

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Page 1277 handed from left-handed ones.) In the present chapter we concentrate on the second issue, namely whether objects and particles can always be distinguished. We will find that *elementary* particles do not behave like gloves but in an even more surprising manner.

In everyday life, distinction of objects can be achieved in two ways. We are able to distinguish objects – or people – from each other because they differ in their *intrinsic properties*, such as their mass, colour, size or shape. In addition, we are also able to distinguish objects if they have the *same* intrinsic properties. Any game of billiard suggests that by following the path of each ball, we can distinguish it from the others. In short, objects with identical properties can also be distinguished using their *state*.

The state of a billiard ball is given by its position and momentum. In the case of billiard balls, the state allows distinction because the measurement error for the position of the ball is much smaller than the size of the ball itself. However, in the microscopic domain this is not the case. Let us take single atoms. Atoms of the same type have the same intrinsic properties. To distinguish them in collisions, we would need to keep track of their motion. But we have no chance to achieve this. Already in the nineteenth century it was shown experimentally that even nature itself is not able to do it! This profound result was discovered studying systems which incorporate a large number of colliding atoms of the same type: *gases*.

Page 282 The calculation of the entropy S of a simple gas, made of N simple particles of mass m moving in a volume V, gives

$$\frac{S}{kN} = \ln\left[\frac{V}{\Lambda^3}\right] + \frac{3}{2} + \frac{\ln \alpha}{N} \tag{650}$$

where k is the Boltzmann constant, ln the natural logarithm, T the temperature, and $\Lambda = \sqrt{2\pi\hbar^2/mkT}$ is the thermal wavelength (approximately the de Broglie wavelength of the particles making up the gas). In this formula, the pure number α is equal to 1 if the particles are distinguishable like billiard balls, and equal to $1/N!$ if they are not distinguishable at all. Measuring the entropy thus allows us to determine α and therefore whether particles are distinguishable. It turns out that only the second case describes nature. This can easily be checked without even performing the measurement: only in the second case, $\alpha = 1/N!$ does the entropy of two volumes of identical gas *add* up.* The result, often called *Gibbs' paradox*,** thus proves that the microscopic components of matter are *indistinguishable*: in a system of microscopic particles, there is no way to say which particle is which. Indistinguishability is an experimental property of nature.***

Challenge 1420 e

Ref. 875

Challenge 1421 d

* Indeed, the entropy values observed by experiment, for a monoatomic gas, are given by the so-called Sackur–Tetrode formula

$$\frac{S}{kN} = \ln\left[\frac{V}{N\Lambda^3}\right] + \frac{5}{2} \tag{651}$$

which follows when $\alpha = 1/N!$ is inserted above. It was deduced independently by the German physicist Otto Sackur (1880–1914) and the Dutch physicist Hugo Tetrode (1895–1931). Note that the essential parameter is the ratio between V/N, the volume per particle, and Λ^3, the de Broglie volume of a particle.

** Josiah Willard Gibbs (1839–1903), US-American physicist who was, with Maxwell and Planck, one of the three founders of statistical mechanics and thermodynamics; he introduced the concept of *ensemble* and the term *thermodynamic phase*.

*** When radioactivity was discovered, people thought that it contradicted the indistinguishability of atoms, as decay seems to single out certain atoms compared to others. But quantum theory then showed that this

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 469 Willard Gibbs (1839–1903)



FIGURE 470 Identical objects with crossing paths

The properties of matter would be completely different without indistinguishability. For example, we will discover that without it, knifes and swords would not cut. In addition, the soil would not carry us; we would fall right through it. To illuminate the issue in more detail, we explore the following question.

Why does indistinguishability appear in nature?

Take two microscopic particles with the same mass, the same composition and the same shape, such as two atoms. Imagine that their paths cross, and that they approach each other to small distances at the crossing, as shown in Figure 470. In a gas, both a collision of atoms or a near miss are examples. Now, experiments show that at small distances it is impossible to say whether the two particles have switched roles or not. This is the main reason that makes it *impossible* in a gas to follow particles moving around and to determine which particle is which. This impossibility is a direct consequence of the quantum of action.

For a path that brings two approaching particles very close to each other, a role switch requires only a small amount of change, i.e., only a small (physical) action. However, we know that there is a smallest observable action in nature. Keeping track of each particle at small distances would require action values *smaller* than the minimal action observed in nature. The existence of a smallest action thus makes it impossible to keep track of microscopic particles when they come too near to each other. Any description of several particles must thus take into account that after a close encounter, it is impossible to say which particle is which.

is not the case and that atoms do remain indistinguishable.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

If we remember that quantum theory describes particles as clouds, the indistinguishability appears more natural. Whenever two clouds meet and depart again, it is impossible to say which one is which.

If two particles are kept distant enough, one does have an effective distinguishability; indistinguishability thus appears only when the particles come close. In short, indistinguishability is a consequence of the existence of a minimal action in nature. This result leads straight away to the next question:

Can particles be counted?

In everyday life, objects can be counted because they can be distinguished. Since quantum particles cannot always be distinguished, we need some care in determining how to count them. The first step in counting particles is the definition of what is meant by a situation without any particle at all. This seems an easy thing to do, but later on we will encounter situations where already this step runs into difficulties. In any case, the first step is thus the *specification of the vacuum*. Any counting method requires that the situation without particles is clearly separated from situations with particles.

The second step is the specification of an observable useful for determining particle number. The easiest way is to chose one of those quantum numbers which add up under composition, such as electric charge.* Counting is then performed by measuring the total charge and dividing by the unit charge.

This method has several advantages. First of all, it is not important whether particles are distinguishable or not; counting always works. Secondly, virtual particles are not counted. This is a welcome state of affairs, as we will see, because for virtual particles, i.e., particles for which $E^2 \neq p^2c^2 + m^2c^4$, there is *no way* to define a particle number anyway.

Page 1192

The side effect of the counting method is that antiparticles count negatively! Also this consequence is a result of the quantum of action. We saw above that the quantum of action implies that even in vacuum, particle–antiparticle pairs are observed at sufficiently high energies. As a result, an antiparticle must count as minus one particle. In other words, any way of counting particles can produce an error due to this effect. In everyday life this limitation plays no role, as there is no antimatter around us. The issue does play a role at higher energies, however. It turns out that there is no general way to count the exact number of particles and antiparticles separately; only the sum can be defined. In short, quantum theory shows that particle counting is never perfect.

In summary, nature does provide a way to count particles even if they cannot be distinguished, though only for everyday, low energy conditions; due to the quantum of action, antiparticles count negatively. Antiparticles thus provide a limit to the counting of particles at high energies, when the mass–energy relation becomes important.

What is permutation symmetry?

Since particles are countable but indistinguishable, there exists a symmetry of nature for systems composed of several identical particles. *Permutation symmetry*, also called

* In everyday life, the weight or mass is commonly used as observable. However, it cannot be used in the quantum domain, except for simple cases. Can you give at least two reasons, one from special relativity and one from general relativity?

Challenge 1422 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

exchange symmetry, is the property of nature that observations are unchanged under exchange of identical particles. Together with space-time symmetry, gauge symmetry and the not yet encountered renormalization symmetry, permutation symmetry forms one of the four pillars of quantum theory. Permutation symmetry is a property of *composed* systems, i.e., of systems made of many (identical) subsystems. Only for such systems does indistinguishability play a role.

In other words, 'indistinguishable' is not the same as 'identical'. Two particles are not the *same*; they are more like *copies* of each other. On the other hand, everyday life experience shows us that two copies can always be distinguished under close inspection, so that the term is not fully appropriate either. In the microscopic domain, particles are countable and completely indistinguishable.* Particles are perfect copies of each other.

We will discover shortly that permutation is partial rotation. Permutation symmetry thus is a symmetry under partial rotations. Can you find out why?

Challenge 1423 e

Indistinguishability and symmetry

The indistinguishability of particles leads to important conclusions about the description of their state of motion. This happens because it is impossible to formulate a description of motion that includes indistinguishability right from the start. (Are you able to confirm this?) We need to describe a n-particle state with a state $\Psi_{1\dots i\dots j\dots n}$ which assumes that distinction is possible, as expressed by the ordered indices in the notation, and we introduce the indistinguishability afterwards.

Challenge 1424 s

Indistinguishability means that the exchange of any two particles results in the same physical system.** Now, two quantum states have the same physical properties if they differ at most by a phase factor; indistinguishability thus requires

$$\Psi_{1\dots i\dots j\dots n} = \mathrm{e}^{i\alpha}\, \Psi_{1\dots j\dots i\dots n} \tag{652}$$

for some unknown angle α. Applying this expression twice, by exchanging the same couple of indices again, allows us to conclude that $\mathrm{e}^{2i\alpha} = 1$. This implies that

$$\Psi_{1\dots i\dots j\dots n} = \pm\, \Psi_{1\dots j\dots i\dots n}\,, \tag{653}$$

in other words, a wave function is either *symmetric* or *antisymmetric* under exchange of indices. (One can also say that the eigenvalue for the exchange operator is either +1 or −1.) *Quantum theory thus predicts that particles can be indistinguishable in one of two distinct ways.**** Particles corresponding to symmetric wave functions – those which transform with a '+' in equation (653) – are called *bosons*, those corresponding to antisymmetric wave functions – those which transform with a '−' in equation (653) – are called *fermions*.****

* The word 'indistinguishable' is so long that many physicists sloppily speak of 'identical' particles nevertheless. Take care.

** We therefore have the same situation that we encountered already several times: *an overspecification of the mathematical description*, here the explicit ordering of the indices, *implies a symmetry of this description*, which in our case is a symmetry under exchange of indices, i.e., under exchange of particles.

*** This conclusion applies to three-dimensional space only. In two dimensions there are more possibilities.

**** The term 'fermion' is derived from the name of the Italian physicist and Nobel Prize winner Enrico

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 471 Two photons and interference

Experiments show that the exchange behaviour depends on the *type* of particle. Photons are found to be bosons. On the other hand, electrons, protons and neutrons are found to be fermions. Also about half of the atoms are found to behave as bosons (at moderate energies), the other half are fermions. In fact, a composite of an *even* number of fermions (at moderate energies) – or of any number of bosons (at any energy) – turns out to be a boson; a composite of an *odd* number of fermions is (always) a fermion.

For example, almost all of the known molecules are bosons (electronically speaking). Fermionic molecules are rather special and even have a special name in chemistry; they are called *radicals* and are known for their eagerness to react and to form normal bosonic molecules. Inside the human body, too many radicals can have adverse effects on health; it is well known that vitamin C is important because it is effective in reducing the number of radicals.

Challenge 1425 s To which class of particles do mountains, trees, people and all other macroscopic objects belong?

The behaviour of photons

A simple experiment allows to determine the behaviour of photons. Take a source that emits two photons of identical frequency and polarization at the same time, as shown in Figure 471. In the laboratory, such a source can be realized with a down-converter, a material that converts a photon of frequency 2ω into two photons of frequency ω. Both photons, after having travelled exactly the same distance, are made to enter the two sides of a beam splitter (for example, a half-silvered mirror). At the two exits of the beam splitter are two detectors. Experiments show that both photons are always detected together on the *same* side, and never separately on opposite sides. This result shows that photons are bosons. Fermions behave in exactly the opposite way; two fermions are always detected separately on *opposite* sides, never together on the same side.

Ref. 877

Fermi (b. 1901 Roma, d. 1954 Chicago) famous for his all-encompassing genius in theoretical and experimental physics. He mainly worked on nuclear and elementary particle physics, on spin and on statistics. For his experimental work he was called 'quantum engineer'. He is also famous for his lectures, which are still published in his own hand-writing, and his brilliant approach to physical problems. Nevertheless, his highly deserved Nobel Prize was one of the few cases in which the prize was given for a discovery which turned out to be incorrect.

'Bosons' are named after the Indian physicist Satyenra Nath Bose (b. 1894 Calcutta, d. 1974 Calcutta) who first described the statistical properties of photons. The work was later expanded by Albert Einstein.

Ref. 876

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 472 Bunching and antibunching of ^{3}He and ^{4}He helium atoms: the measurement result, the detector and the experiment (from atomoptic.iota.u-psud.fr/research/helium/helium.html, photo © Denis Boiron, Jerome Chatin)

Bunching and antibunching

A beautiful way to test the exchange character of a particle is the Hanbury Brown–Twiss experiment described earlier on. First of all, the experiment shows that quantum particles behave differently than classical particles. In addition, compared to classical particles, fermions show antibuching – because of Pauli's exclusion principle – and bosons show bunching. Hanbury Brown and Twiss performed the experiment with photons. In 2005, a French–Dutch research collaboration performed the experiment with atoms. By using an extremely cold helium gas at 500 nK and a clever detector principle, they were able to measure the correlation curves typical for the effect. The result, shown in Figure 472 shows that, as predicted by quantum theory, ^{3}He is a fermion and ^{4}He is a boson.

Page 1003

Ref. 878

The energy dependence of permutation symmetry

If experiments force us to conclude that nobody, not even nature, can distinguish any two particles of the same type, we deduce that they do not form two separate entities, but some sort of unity. Our naive, classical sense of particle as a separate entity from the rest of the world is thus an incorrect description of the phenomenon of 'particle'. Indeed, no experiment can track particles with identical intrinsic properties in such a way that they can be distinguished with certainty. This impossibility has been checked experimentally with all elementary particles, with nuclei, with atoms and with numerous molecules.

How does this fit with everyday life, i.e., with classical physics? Photons do not worry us much here. Let us focus the discussion on matter particles. We know to be able to distinguish electrons by pointing to the wire in which they flow, and we can distinguish

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 473 Particles as localized excitations or clouds

our fridge from that of our neighbour. While the quantum of action makes distinction impossible, everyday life allows it. The simplest explanation is to imagine a microscopic particle, especially an elementary one, as a bulge, i.e., as a localized excitation of the vacuum, or as a tiny cloud. Figure 473 shows two such bulges and two clouds representing particles. It is evident that if particles are too near to each other, it makes no sense to distinguish them; we cannot say any more which is which.

The bulge image shows that either for large distances or for high potential walls separating them, distinction of identical particles does become possible. In such situations, measurements allowing to track them independently do exist. In other words, we can specify a limit energy at which permutation symmetry of objects or particles separated by a distance d becomes important. It is given by

$$E = \frac{c\,\hbar}{d} \,. \tag{654}$$

Challenge 1426 ny Are you able to confirm the expression? For example, at everyday temperatures we *can* distinguish atoms inside a solid from each other, since the energy so calculated is much higher than the thermal energy of atoms. To have fun, you might want to determine at what energy two truly identical human twins become indistinguishable. Estimating at what energies the statistical character of trees or fridges will become apparent is then
Challenge 1427 ny straightforward.

The bulge image of particles thus purveys the idea that distinguishability exists for objects in everyday life but not for particles in the microscopic domain. To sum up, in daily life we are able to distinguish objects and thus people for two reasons: because they are made of *many* parts, and because we live in a *low energy* environment.

The energy issue immediately adds a new aspect to the discussion. How can we describe fermions and bosons in the presence of virtual particles and of antiparticles?

Indistinguishability in quantum field theory

Quantum field theory, as we will see shortly, simply puts the cloudy bulge idea of Figure 473 into mathematical language. A situation with no bulge is called *vacuum state*. Quantum field theory describes all particles of a given type as *excitations* of a single fundamental field. Particles are indistinguishable because each particle is an excitation of the same basic substrate and each excitation has the same properties. A situation with one particle is then described by a vacuum state acted upon by a *creation operator*. Adding

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

a second particle is described by adding a second creation operator, and subtracting a particle by adding a *annihilation operator*; the latter turns out to be the adjoint of the former.

Quantum field theory studies how creation and annihilation operators must behave to describe observations.* It arrives at the following conclusions:

— Fields with half-integer spin are fermions and imply (local) anticommutation.
— Fields with integer spin are bosons and imply (local) commutation.
— For all fields at spacelike separations, the commutator, respectively anticommutator, vanishes.
— Antiparticles of fermions are fermions, and antiparticles of bosons are bosons.
— Virtual particles behave under exchange like their real counterparts.

These connections are at the basis of quantum field theory. They describe how particles are identical. But why are they? Why are all electrons identical? Quantum field theory describes electrons as identical excitations of the vacuum, and as such as identical by construction. Of course, this answer is only partially satisfying. We will find a better one only in the final part of our mountain ascent.

How accurately is permutation symmetry verified?

A simple but effective experiment testing the fermion behaviour of electrons was carried out by Ramberg and Snow. They sent an electric current of 30 A through a copper wire for one month and looked for X-ray emission. They did not find any. They concluded that electrons are always in an antisymmetric state, with a symmetric component of less than

Ref. 879

$$2 \cdot 10^{-26} \tag{657}$$

of the total state. In short, electrons are always in an antisymmetric state: they are fermions.

The reasoning behind this elegant experiment is the following. If electrons would not always be fermions, every now and then an electron could fall into the lowest energy level of a copper atom, leading to X-ray emission. The lack of such X-rays implies that electrons are fermions to a very high accuracy. X-rays could be emitted only if they were bosons, at least part of the time. Indeed, two electrons, being fermions, cannot be in the same quantum state: this restriction is called the Pauli exclusion principle. It applies to all fermions and is our next topic.

* Whenever the relation

$$[b, b^\dagger] = bb^\dagger - b^\dagger b = 1 \tag{655}$$

holds between the creation operator $b^\dagger$ and the annihilation operator b, the operators describe a *boson*. The dagger can thus be seen as describing the operation of adjoiningg; a double dagger is equivalent to no dagger. If the operators for particle creation and annihilation anticommute

$$\{d, d^\dagger\} = dd^\dagger + d^\dagger d = 1 \tag{656}$$

they describe a *fermion*. The so defined bracket is called the *anticommutator bracket*.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Copies, clones and gloves

Can classical systems be indistinguishable? They can: large molecules are examples – provided they are made of exactly the same isotopes. Can *large* classical systems, made of a mole or more particles be indistinguishable? This simple question effectively asks whether a perfect copy, or (physical) *clone* of a system is possible.

It could be argued that any factory for mass-produced goods, such as one producing shirt buttons or paper clips, shows that copies are possible. But the appearance is deceiving. On a microscope there is usually some difference. Is this always the case? In 1982, the Dutch physicist Dennis Dieks and independently, the US-American physicists Wootters and Zurek, published simple proofs that quantum systems cannot be copied. This is the famous *no-cloning theorem*.

Ref. 881

A copying machine is a machine that takes an original, reads out its properties and produces a copy, leaving the original unchanged. This seems definition seems straightforward. However, we know that if we extract information from an original, we have to interact with it. As a result, the system will change at least by the quantum of action. We thus expect that due to quantum theory, copies and originals can never be identical.*

Quantum theory proves this in detail. A copying machine is described by an operator that maps the state of an original system to the state of the copy. In other words, a copying machine is linear. This linearity leads to a problem. Simply stated, if a copying machine were able to copy originals either in state $|A\rangle$ or in state $|B\rangle$, it could not decide what to do if the state of the original were $|A\rangle+|B\rangle$. On one hand, the copy should be $|A\rangle+|B\rangle$; on the other hand, the linearity of the copier forbids this. Indeed, a copier is a device described by an operator U that changes the starting state $|s\rangle_c$ of the copy in the following way:

— If the original is in state $|A\rangle$, a copier acts as

$$U|A\rangle|s\rangle_c = |A\rangle|A\rangle_c \,. \tag{658}$$

— If the original is in state $|B\rangle$, a copier acts as

$$U|B\rangle|s\rangle_c = |B\rangle|B\rangle_c \,. \tag{659}$$

As a result of these two requirements, an original in the state $|A + B\rangle$ is treated by the copier as

$$U|A + B\rangle|s\rangle_c = |A\rangle|A\rangle_c + |B\rangle|B\rangle_c \,. \tag{660}$$

This is in contrast to what we want, which would be

$$U_{\text{wanted}}|A + B\rangle|s\rangle_c = (|A\rangle + |B\rangle)(|A\rangle_c + |B\rangle_c) \,. \tag{661}$$

In other words, a copy machine cannot copy a state completely.** This is the no-cloning theorem.

* This seems to provide a solution against banknote forgeries. In fact, Steve Wiesner proposed to use quantum theory already in 1970; he imagined to use polarizations of stored single photons as bits of serial numbers. Can you explain why this cannot work?

Challenge 1428 ny

** The no-cloning theorem puts severe limitations on quantum computers, as computations often need

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The impossibility of copying is implicit in quantum theory. If we were able to clone systems, we could to measure a variable of a system and a second variable on its copy. We would be thus able to beat the indeterminacy relation. This is impossible. Copies are and always must be imperfect.

Other researchers then explored how near to perfection a copy can be, especially in the case of classical systems. To make a long story short, these investigations show that also the copying or cloning of macroscopic systems is impossible. In simple words, copying machines do not exist. Copies can always be distinguished from originals if observations are made with sufficient care. In particular, this is the case for biological clones; biological clones are identical twins born following separate pregnancies. They differ in their finger prints, iris scans, physical and emotional memories, brain structures, and in many other aspects. (Can you specify a few more?) In short, biological clones, like identical twins, are not copies of each other.

Ref. 882

Challenge 1429 s

The lack of quantum mechanical copying machines is disappointing. Such machines, or teleportation devices, could be fed with two different inputs, such as a lion and a goat, and produce a superposition: a chimaera. Quantum theory shows that all these imaginary beings cannot be realized.

In summary, everyday life objects such as photocopies, billiard balls or twins are always distinguishable. There are two reasons: first, quantum effects play no role in everyday life, so that there is no danger of unobservable exchange; secondly, perfect clones of classical systems do not exist anyway, so that there always are tiny differences between any two objects, even if they look identical at first sight. Gloves, being classical systems, can thus always be distinguished.



copies of intermediate results. It also shows that faster-than-light communication is impossible in EPR experiments. In compensation, quantum cryptography becomes possible – at least in the laboratory. Indeed, the no-cloning theorem shows that nobody can copy a quantum message without being noticed. The specific ways to use this result in cryptography are the 1984 Bennett–Brassard protocol and the 1991 Ekert protocol.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 38

ROTATIONS AND STATISTICS – VISUALIZING SPIN

We saw above that spin is the observation that matter rays, like light rays, can be polarized. Spin thus describes how particles behave under rotations, and it proves that particles are not simple spheres shrunk to points. We also saw that spin describes a fundamental difference between quantum systems and gloves: spin specifies the indistinguishability of quantum systems. Let us explore this connection in more detail.

Ref. 883 The general background for the appearance of spin was clarified by Eugene Wigner in 1939.* He started by recapitulating that any quantum mechanical particle, if elementary, must behave like an irreducible representation of the set of all viewpoint changes. This set forms the symmetry group of flat space-time, the so-called *inhomogeneous Lorentz group*. We have seen in the chapter on classical mechanics how this connection between Page 213 elementarity and irreducibility arises. To be of physical relevance for quantum theory, representations have to be *unitary*. The full list of irreducible unitary representations of viewpoint changes thus provides the range of possibilities for any particle that wants to be *elementary*.

Cataloguing the possibilities, one finds first of all that every elementary particle is described by four-momentum – no news so far – and by an internal angular momentum, the *spin*. Four-momentum results from the translation symmetry of nature, and spin from its rotation symmetry. The momentum value describes how a particle behaves under translation, i.e., under position and time shift of viewpoints. The spin value describes how an object behaves under rotations in three dimensions, i.e., under orientation change of viewpoints.** As is well known, the magnitude of four-momentum is an invariant property, given by the mass, whereas its orientation in space-time is free. Similarly, the magnitude of spin is an invariant property, and its orientation has various possibilities with respect to the direction of motion. In particular, the spin of massive particles behaves differently from that of massless particles.

For *massive* particles, the inhomogeneous Lorentz group implies that the invariant magnitude of spin is $\sqrt{J(J+1)}\hbar$, often written, by oversimplification, as J. Since the value J specifies the magnitude of the angular momentum, it gives the representation under rotations of a given particle type. The spin magnitude J can be any multiple of $1/2$, i.e., it can take the values $0, 1/2, 1, 3/2, 2, 5/2$, etc. Experiments show that electrons,

* Eugene Wigner (b. 1902 Budapest, d. 1995 Princeton), Hungarian–US-American theoretical physicist, received the Nobel Prize for physics in 1963. He wrote over 500 papers, many about symmetry in physics. He was also famous for being the most polite physicist in the world.

** The group of physical rotations is also called SO(3), since mathematically it is described by the group of Special Orthogonal 3 by 3 matrices.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 474 An argument showing why rotations by 4π are equivalent to no rotation at all

protons and neutrons have spin 1/2, the W and Z particles spin 1 and helium atoms spin 0. In addition, the representation of spin J is $2J + 1$ dimensional, meaning that the spatial orientation of the spin has $2J + 1$ possible values. For electrons there are thus two possibilities; they are usually called 'up' and 'down'.

Spin thus only takes *discrete* values. This is in contrast with linear momentum, whose representations are infinite dimensional and whose possible values form a *continuous* range.

Also *massless* particles are characterized by the value of their spin. It can take the same values as in the massive case. For example, photons and gluons have spin 1. For massless particles, the representations are one-dimensional, so that massless particles are completely described by their *helicity*, defined as the projection of the spin onto the direction of motion. Massless particles can have positive or negative helicity, often also called right-handed and left-handed. There is no other freedom for the orientation of spin in the massless case.

In short, symmetry investigations lead to the classification of particles by their mass, their momentum and their spin. To complete the list, the remaining symmetries must be included. These are motion inversion parity, spatial parity and charge inversion parity. Since these symmetries are parities, each elementary particle has to be described by three additional numbers, called T, P and C, each of which can take values of either +1 or −1. Being parities, they must be *multiplied* to yield the value for a composed system.

Page 1290 A list of the values observed for all elementary particles in nature is given below. Spin and parities together are called *quantum numbers*. As we will discover later on, additional interaction symmetries will lead to additional quantum numbers. But let us return to spin.

A central result of quantum theory is that spin 1/2 is a possibility in nature, even though it does not appear in everyday life. For a system to have spin 1/2 means that for such a system only a rotation of 720 degrees is equivalent to one of 0 degrees, while one of 360 degrees is not, as explained in Table 93. The mathematician Hermann Weyl used Page 52 a simple image explaining this connection.

Take two cones, touching each other at their tips as well as along a line. Hold one cone and roll the other around it, as shown in Figure 474. When the rolling cone, after a full turn around the other cone, has come back to the original position, it has rotated

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 93 Particle spin as representation of the rotation group

Spin [$\hbar$]	System unchanged after rotation by	Massive examples elementary	composite	Massless examples elementary
0	any angle	none [a,b]	mesons, nuclei, atoms	none [b]
1/2	2 turns	e, μ, τ, q, ν_e, ν_μ, ν_τ	nuclei, atoms, molecules	none, as neutrinos have a tiny mass
1	1 turn	W, Z	mesons, nuclei, atoms, molecules, toasters	g, γ
3/2	2/3 turn	none [b]	baryons, nuclei, atoms	none [b]
2	1/2 turn	none	nuclei	'graviton' [c]
5/2	2/5 turn	none	nuclei	none
3	1/3 turn	none	nuclei [d]	none
etc.[d]	etc.[d]	etc.[d]	etc.[d]	etc.[d]

a. Whether the Higgs particle is elementary or not is still unknown.
b. Supersymmetry predicts particles in these and other boxes.
c. The graviton has not yet been observed.
d. Nuclei exist with spins values up to at least 101/2 and 51 (in units of $\hbar$). Ref. 885

by some angle. If the cones are wide, the rotation angle is small. If the cones are very thin, almost like needles, the moving cone has rotated by almost 720 degrees. A rotation of 720 degrees is thus similar to one by 0 degrees. If we imagine the cone angle to vary continuously, this visualization also shows that a 720 degree rotation can be continuously deformed into a 0 degree one, whereas a 360 degree rotation cannot.

To sum up, the list of possible representations thus shows that rotations *require* the existence of spin. But why then do experiments show that all fermions have half-integer spin and that all bosons have integer spin? Why do electrons obey the Pauli exclusion principle? At first, it is not clear what the spin has to do with the statistical properties of a particle.

In fact, there are several ways to show that rotations and statistics are connected. The first proof, due to Wolfgang Pauli, used the details of quantum field theory and was so Ref. 884 complicated that its essential ingredients were hidden. It took quite several decades to convince everybody that a simple observation about belts was the central part of the proof.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 475 The belt trick (QuickTime film © Greg Egan)

FIGURE 476 A belt visualizing two spin 1/2 particles



FIGURE 477 Another model for two spin 1/2 particles

The belt trick

The well-known *belt trick* (also called *scissor trick*) was often used by Dirac to explain the features of spin 1/2. Taking Figure 473, which models particles as indistinguishable excitations, it is not difficult to imagine a sort of sheet connecting them, similar to a belt connecting the two parts of the buckle, as shown in Figure 476. If one end of the belt is rotated by 2π along any axis, a twist is inserted into the belt. If the end is rotated for another 2π, bringing the total to 4π, the ensuing double twist can easily be undone without moving or rotating the ends. (See Figure 475.) You may need to experience this yourself in order to believe it.

Ref. 886

Challenge 1430 e

In addition, if you take the two ends and simply *swap* positions, a twist is introduced into the belt. Again, a second swap will undo the twist.

In other words, if we take each end to represent a particle and a twist to mean a factor -1, the belt exactly describes the phase behaviour of spin 1/2 wave functions under exchange and under rotations. In particular, we see that spin and exchange behaviour are related.

The human body has such a belt built in: the *arm*. Just take your hand, put an object on it for clarity such as a cup, and turn the hand and object by 2π by twisting the arm. After a second rotation the whole system will be untangled again.

The trick is even more impressive when many arms are used. You can put your two hands (if you chose the correct starting position) under the cup or you can take a friend or two who each keep a hand attached to the cup. The feat can still be performed: the whole system untangles after two full turns.

Challenge 1431 e

Challenge 1432 e

Another demonstration is to connect two buckles with *many* bands or threads, like in Figure 477. Both a rotation by 2π of one end or an exchange of the two ends produces

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 478 The human arm as spin 1/2 model



FIGURE 479 The extended belt trick, modelling a spin 1/2 particle: independently of the number of bands attached, the two situations can be transformed into each other, either by rotating the central object by 4π or by keeping the central object fixed and moving the bands around it

quite a tangle, even if one takes paths that 'in between' the bands; nevertheless, in both cases a second rotation leads back to the original situation.

There is still another way to show the connection between rotation and exchange. Just glue any number of threads or bands, say half a metre long, to an asymmetric object. Like the arm of a human being, the bands are supposed to go to infinity and be attached there. If any of the objects, which represent the particles, is rotated by 2π, twists appear in its strings. If the object is rotated by an additional turn, to a total of 4π, as shown in Figure 479, all twists and tangles can be made to disappear, without moving or turning the object. You really have to experience this in order to believe it. And the trick really works with *any* number of bands glued to the object.

Even more astonishing is the exchange part of the experiment. Take *two* particles of the type shown on the left side of Figure 479. If you exchange the positions of two such spin 1/2 particles, always keeping the ends at infinity fixed, a tangled mess is created. But incredibly, if you exchange the objects a second time, everything untangles neatly, independently of the number of attached strings. You might want to test yourself that the behaviour is also valid with sets of three or more particles.

Challenge 1433 e

All these observations together form the spin statistics theorem for spin 1/2 particles: *spin and exchange behaviour are related*. Indeed, these almost 'experimental' arguments can be put into exact mathematical language by studying the behaviour of the configuration space of particles. These investigations result in the following statements:

Ref. 887

▷ *Objects of spin 1/2 are fermions.**

* A mathematical observable behaving like a spin 1/2 particle is neither a vector nor a tensor, as you may

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

▷ *Exchange and rotation of spin 1/2 particles are similar processes.*

Note that all these arguments require three dimensions, because there are no tangles (or knots) in fewer dimensions.* And indeed, spin exists only in three or more spatial dimensions.

Here is a challenge. A spin 1/2 object can be modelled with one belt attached to it. If you want to model the spin behaviour with attached one-dimensional *strings* instead of *bands*, what is the minimum number required?

Challenge 1435 s

Angels, Pauli's exclusion principle and the hardness of matter

Why are we able to knock on a door? Why can stones not fly through tree trunks? How does the mountain we are walking on carry us? Why can't we walk across walls? In classical physics, we avoided this issue, by taking solidity as a defining property of matter. But doing so, we cheated: we have seen that matter consists mainly of empty space, so that we have to study the issue without any sneaky way out. The answer is now clear: penetration is made impossible by *Pauli's exclusion principle* between the electrons inside atoms. The exclusion principle states:

▷ *Two fermions cannot occupy the same quantum state.*

All experiments known confirm the statement.

Why do electrons and other fermions obey the Pauli exclusion principle? The answer can be given with a beautifully simple argument. We know that exchanging two fermions produces a minus sign in the total wave function. Imagine these two fermions being, as a classical physicist would say, located at the same spot, or as a quantum physicist would say, in the same state. If that could be possible, an exchange would change nothing in the system. But an exchange of fermions must produce a minus sign for the total state. Both possibilities – no change at all as well as a minus sign – cannot be realized at the same time. There is only one way out: two fermions must avoid to ever be in the same state. This is Pauli's exclusion principle.

Ref. 888

The exclusion principle is the reason that two pieces of matter in everyday life cannot penetrate each other, but have to repel each other. For example, bells only work because of the exclusion principle. A bell would not work if the colliding pieces that produce the sound would interpenetrate. But in any example of two interpenetrating pieces electrons from two atoms would have to be at the same spot: they would have to be in the same states. This is forbidden. Pauli's exclusion principle forbids interpenetration of matter.

Why don't we fall through the floor, even though gravity pulls us down, but remain on the surface? Again, the reason is Pauli's exclusion principle. Why does the floor not fall? It does not fall, because the matter of the Earth cannot be compressed further. Why? Pauli's exclusion principle does not allow atoms to be compressed. In other words, the

Challenge 1434 e

want to check. An additional concept is necessary; such an observable is called a *spinor*. We will introduce it later on.

Page 1047

* Of course, knots and tangles do exist in higher dimensions. Instead of considering knotted one-dimensional lines, one can consider knotted planes or knotted higher-dimensional hyperplanes. For example, deformable planes can be knotted in four dimensions and deformable 3-spaces in five dimensions.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

exclusion principle implies that matter cannot be compressed indefinitely, as at a certain stage an effective Pauli pressure appears, so that a compression limit ensues. For this reason for example, planets or neutron stars do not collapse under their own gravity.

The exclusion principle is the reason that atoms are *extended* electron clouds. In fact, the exclusion principle forces the electrons to form shells, and when one shell is filled, the next one is started. The size of the atom is the size of the last shell. Without the exclusion principle, atoms would be point-like. The same argument applies to the protons (and the neutrons) in nuclei.

The exclusion principle also answers the question about how many angels can dance on the top of a pin. (Note that angels, if at all, must be made of fermions, as you might want to deduce from the information known about them.) Both theory and experiment confirm the answer already given by Thomas Aquinas in the Middle Ages: Only one! The fermion exclusion principle could also be called 'angel exclusion principle'. To stay in the topic, the principle also shows that *ghosts* cannot be objects, as ghosts are supposed to be able to traverse walls.

Challenge 1436 s
Ref. 880

Whatever the interpretation, the exclusion principle keeps things in shape; without it, there would be no three-dimensional objects. Only the exclusion principle keeps the cloudy atoms of nature from merging, holding them apart. This repulsion keeps the size of planets to a finite value, and that of neutron stars. All shapes of solids and fluids are a direct consequence of the exclusion principle. In other words, when we knock on a table or on a door, we prove experimentally that both objects are made of fermions.

Since permutation properties and spin properties of fermions are so well described by the belt model, we could be led to the conclusion that these properties might really be consequence of such belt-like connections between particles and the outside world. Maybe for some reason we only observe the belt buckles, not the belts themselves. In the final part of this walk we will discover whether this idea is correct.

So far, we have only considered spin 1/2 particles. We will not talk much about systems with odd spin of higher value, such as 3/2 or 5/2. Such systems can be seen as being composed of spin 1/2 entities. Can you confirm this?

Challenge 1437 ny

We did not talk about lower spins than 1/2 either. A famous theorem states that a positive spin value below 1/2 is impossible, because the largest angle that can be measured in three dimensions is 4π. There is no way to measure a larger angle;* the quantum of action makes this impossible. Thus there cannot be any spin value between 0 and 1/2.

Spin, statistics and composition

Under rotations, integer spin particles behave differently from half-integer particles. Integer spin particles do not show the strange sign changes under rotations by 2π. In the belt imagery, integer spin particles need no attached strings. The spin 0 particle obviously corresponds to a sphere. Models for other spin values are shown in Figure 480. Exploring their properties in the same way as above, we arrive at the so-called *spin–statistics theorem*:

▷ *Exchange and rotation of objects are similar processes.*

* This statement, like all statements about spin 1/2, is tied to the three-dimensionality of space. In two dimensions, other largest angles and other 'spin' values are possible.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 480 Some visualizations of spin representations

▷ *Objects of half-integer spin are fermions. They obey the Pauli exclusion principle.*

▷ *Objects of integer spin are bosons.*

Challenge 1438 ny You might prove by yourself that this suffices to show the following:

▷ *Composites of bosons, as well as composites of an even number of fermions (at low energy), are bosons; composites of an uneven number of fermions are fermions.*[*]

These connections express basic characteristics of the three-dimensional world in which we live.

Is spin a rotation about an axis?

The spin of a particle behaves experimentally like an intrinsic angular momentum, adds up like angular momentum, is conserved as part of angular momentum, is described like angular momentum and has a name synonymous with angular momentum. Despite all this, for many decades a strange myth was spread in many physics courses and textbooks around the world, namely that spin 1/2 is *not* a rotation about an axis. The myth maintains that any rotating object must have integer spin. Since half integer spin is not possible in classical physics, it is argued that such spin is not due to rotation. It is time to finish with this example of muddled thinking.

Electrons do have spin 1/2 and are charged. Electrons and all other charged particles with spin 1/2 do have a magnetic moment.[**] A magnetic moment is expected for any rotating charge. In other words, spin 1/2 does behave like rotation. However, assuming that a particle consists of a continuous charge distribution in rotational motion gives the wrong value for the magnetic moment. In the early days of the twentieth century, when physicists were still thinking in classical terms, they concluded that spin 1/2 particles thus cannot be rotating. This myth has survived through many textbooks. The correct deduction is that the assumption of continuous charge distribution is wrong. Indeed,

* This sentence implies that spin 1 and higher can also be achieved *with* tails; can you find such a representation? Challenge 1439 ny

Note that composite fermions can be bosons only up to that energy at which the composition breaks down. Otherwise, by packing fermions into bosons, we could have fermions in the same state.

** This can easily be measured in a an experiment; however, not one of the Stern–Gerlach type. Why not? Challenge 1440 ny

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

charge is quantized; nobody today expects that elementary charge is continuously spread over space, as that would contradict its quantization.

Let us remember what rotation is. Both the belt trick for spin 1/2 as well as the integer spin case remind us: a *rotation* of one body around another is a fraction or a multiple of an exchange. What we call a rotating body in everyday life is a body continuously exchanging the positions of its parts. Rotation and exchange are the same.

Above we found that spin is exchange behaviour. Since rotation is exchange and spin is exchange, it follows that spin *is* rotation. Since we deduced, like Wigner, spin from rotation invariance, this consequence is not a surprise.

The belt model of a spin 1/2 particle tells us that such a particle can rotate continuously
Page 1066 without any hindrance. In short, we are allowed to maintain that spin is rotation about an axis, without any contradiction to observations, even for spin 1/2. The belt model helps to keep two things in mind: we must assume that in the belt model only the buckle can
Ref. 889 be observed and does interact, not the belt, and we must assume that elementary charge is pointlike.*

Why is fencing with laser beams impossible?

When a sword is approaching dangerously, we can stop it with a second sword. Many old films use such scenes. When a laser beam is approaching, it is impossible to fend it off with a second beam, despite all science fiction films showing so. Banging two laser beams against each other is impossible.

The above discussion shows why. The electrons in the swords are fermions and obey the Pauli exclusion principle. Fermions make matter impenetrable. On the other hand, photons are bosons. Two bosons *can* be in the same state; bosons allow interpenetration. Matter is impenetrable because at the fundamental level it is composed of fermions. Radiation is composed of bosons. The distinction between fermions and bosons thus explains why objects can be touched while images cannot. In the first part of our mountain ascent
Page 89 we started by noting this difference; now we know its origin.

Rotation requires antiparticles

The connection between rotation and antiparticles may be the most astonishing conclusion from the experiments showing the existence of spin. So far, we have seen that rotation requires the existence of spin, that spin appears when relativity is introduced into
Page 444 quantum theory, and that relativity requires antimatter. Taking these three statements together, the conclusion of the title is not surprising any more. Interestingly, there is a simple argument making the same point directly, without any help of quantum theory, when the belt model is extended from space alone to full *space-time*.

To learn how to think in space-time, let us take a particle spin 1, i.e., a particle looking like a detached belt buckle in three dimensions. When moving in a 2+1 dimensional
Challenge 1441 ny space-time, it is described by a ribbon. Playing around with ribbons in space-time, in-

* Obviously, the detailed structure of the electron still remains unclear at this point. Any angular momentum S is given classically by $S = \Theta\omega$; however, neither the moment of inertia Θ, connected to the rotation radius and electron mass, nor the angular velocity ω are known at this point. We have to wait quite a while, until the final part of our adventure, to find out more.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 481 Equivalence of exchange and rotation in space-time



FIGURE 482 Belts in space-time: rotation and antiparticles

stead of belts in space, provides many interesting conclusions. For example, Figure 481 shows that wrapping a rubber ribbon around the fingers can show that a rotation of a body by 2π in presence of a second one is the same as exchanging the positions of the two bodies.* Both sides of the hand transform the same initial condition, at one edge of the hand, to the same final condition at the other edge. We have thus successfully extended a known result from space to space-time. Interestingly, we can also find a smooth sequence of steps realizing this equivalence.

If you think that Figure 481 is not a satisfying explanation, you are right. A more complete (yet equivalent) explanation is given by Figure 482. We assume that each particle is described by a segment; in the figure, they lie horizontally. The leftmost diagram shows two particles: one at rest and one being rotated by 2π. The deformation of the ribbons shows that this process is equivalent to the exchange in position of two particles, which is shown in the rightmost diagram. Again, one notes that the sequence that shows the equivalence between rotation and exchange requires the use of a particle–antiparticle pair. Without antiparticles, the equivalence of rotation and exchange would not hold. Rotation in space-time indeed requires antiparticles.

A summary on spin and indistinguishability

The quantum of action implies that physical systems are made of two types of indistinguishable particles: bosons and fermions. The two possible exchange behaviours are re-

* Obviously, the next step would be to check the full spin 1/2 model of Figure 479 in four-dimensional space-time. But this is not an easy task; there is no generally accepted solution yet.

Challenge 1442 ny

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

lated to their spin value, because exchange is related to rotation.

Radiation is made of elementary particles that behave as bosons. They have integer spin. Two or more bosons, such as two photons, can share the same state. This sharing makes laser light possible.

Matter is made of elementary particles that behave as fermions. They have half-integer spin. They obey Pauli's exclusion principle: two fermions cannot be in the same state. The exclusion principle between electrons explains the structure and (partly) the size of atoms, as well as the chemical behaviour of atoms, as we will find out later on. Together with the electrostatic repulsion of electrons, the exclusion principle explains the incompressibility of matter and its lack of impenetrability.

Despite the indistinguishability of particles, the quantum of action also implies that exact copies of macroscopic objects cannot be produced, because quantum states for macroscopic objects cannot be copied.

Finally, the connection between spin and rotation implies that antiparticles exist. It also implies that spin is intrinsically a three-dimensional phenomenon.

Limits and open questions of quantum statistics

The topic of statistics is an important research field in theoretical and experimental physics. In particular, researchers have searched and still are searching for generalizations of the possible exchange behaviours of particles.

In two spatial dimensions, the result of an exchange of the wave function is not described by a sign, but by a continuous phase. Two-dimensional objects behaving in this way, called *anyons* because they can have 'any' spin, have experimental importance, since in many experiments in solid state physics the set-up is effectively two-dimensional. The fractional quantum Hall effect, perhaps the most interesting discovery of modern experimental physics, has pushed anyons onto the stage of modern research.

Page 1178

Other theorists generalized the concept of fermions in other ways, introducing parafermions, parabosons, plektons and other hypothetical concepts. Oscar Greenberg has spent most of his professional life on this issue. His conclusion is that in $3+1$ space-time dimensions, only fermions and bosons exist. (Can you show that this implies that the ghosts appearing in Scottish tales do not exist?)

Ref. 890

Challenge 1443 s

From a different viewpoint, the belt model of spin 1/2 invites to study the behaviour of braids, open links and knots. (In mathematics, braids and open links are made of strands extending to infinity.) This fascinating part of mathematical physics has become important with in modern unfied theories, which all state that particles, especially at high energies, are not point-like, but extended entities.

Still another generalization of statistical behaviour at high energies is the concept of quantum group. In all of these cases, the quest is to understand what happens to permutation symmetry in a unified theory of nature. A glimpse of the difficulties appears already above: how can Figures 473, 479 and 482 be reconciled and combined? We will settle this issue in the final part of our mountain ascent.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 39

SUPERPOSITIONS AND PROBABILITIES – QUANTUM THEORY WITHOUT IDEOLOGY

> The fact that an adequate philosophical presentation has been so long delayed is no doubt caused by the fact that Niels Bohr brainwashed a whole generation of theorists into thinking that the job was done fifty years ago.
>
> Murray Gell-Mann

Ref. 891

Why is this famous physical issue arousing such strong emotions? In particular, who is brainwashed, Gell-Mann, the discoverer of the quarks, or most of the world's physicists working on quantum theory who follow Niels Bohr's opinion? In the twentieth century, quantum mechanics has thrown many in disarray. Indeed, it radically changed the two most basic concepts of classical physics: state and system. The *state* is not described any more by the specific values taken by position and momentum, but by the specific wave function 'taken' by the position and momentum operators.* In addition, in classical physics a *system* was described as a set of permanent aspects of nature; permanence was defined as negligible interaction with the environment. Quantum mechanics shows that this definition has to be modified as well.

The description of nature with quantum theory is unfamiliar for two reasons: it allows superpositions and it leads to probablilities. Let us clarify these issues. A clarification is essential if we want to avoid getting lost on our way to the top of Motion Mountain, as happened to quite a number of people since quantum theory appeared, including Gell-Mann.

WHY ARE PEOPLE EITHER DEAD OR ALIVE?

The evolution equation of quantum mechanics is *linear* in the wave function; linearity implies the existence of superpositions. Therefore we can imagine and try to construct systems where the state ψ is a superposition of two radically distinct situations, such as those of a dead and of a living cat. This famous fictional animal is called *Schrödinger's cat* after the originator of the example. Is it possible to produce it? And how would it evolve in time? We can ask the same two questions in other situations. For example, can

* It is equivalent, but maybe conceptually clearer, to say that the state is described by a complete set of commuting operators. In fact, the discussion is somewhat simplified in the Heisenberg picture. However, here we study the issue in the Schrödinger picture, using wave functions.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 483 An artist's impression of a macroscopic superposition is impossible

we produce a superposition of a state where a car is inside a closed garage with a state where the car is outside? What happens then?

Such strange situations are not usually observed in everyday life. The reason for this rareness is an important aspect of what is often called the 'interpretation' of quantum mechanics. In fact, such strange situations *are* possible, and the superposition of macroscopically distinct states has actually been observed in a few cases, though not for cats, people or cars. To get an idea of the constraints, let us specify the situation in more detail.*

The object of discussion are linear superpositions of the type $\psi = a\psi_a + b\psi_b$, where ψ_a and ψ_b are macroscopically distinct states of the system under discussion, and where a and b are some complex coefficients. States are called *macroscopically distinct* when each state corresponds to a different macroscopic situation, i.e., when the two states can be distinguished using the concepts or measurement methods of classical physics. In particular, this means that the physical action necessary to transform one state into the other must be much larger than $\hbar$. For example, two different positions of any body composed of a large number of molecules are macroscopically distinct.

A 'strange' situation is thus a superposition of macroscopically distinct states. Let us work out the essence of macroscopic superpositions more clearly. Given two macroscopically distinct states ψ_a and ψ_b, a superposition of the type $\psi = a\psi_a + b\psi_b$ is called a *pure state*. Since the states ψ_a and ψ_b can interfere, one also talks about a *(phase) coherent superposition*. In the case of a superposition of macroscopically distinct states, the scalar product $\psi_a^\dagger \psi_b$ is obviously vanishing. In case of a coherent superposition, the coefficient product $a^* b$ is different from zero. This fact can also be expressed with the help of the *density matrix* ρ of the system, defined as $\rho = \psi \otimes \psi^\dagger$. In the present case it is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{\text{pure}} = \psi \otimes \psi^\dagger &= |a|^2 \psi_a \otimes \psi_a^\dagger + |b|^2 \psi_b \otimes \psi_b^\dagger + a\, b^* \psi_a \otimes \psi_b^\dagger + a^*\, b\, \psi_b \otimes \psi_a^\dagger \\ &= (\psi_a, \psi_b) \begin{pmatrix} |a|^2 & a\, b^* \\ a^*\, b & |b|^2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_a^\dagger \\ \psi_b^\dagger \end{pmatrix} . \end{aligned} \tag{662}$$

We can then say that whenever the system is in a pure state, its density matrix, or *density functional*, contains off-diagonal terms of the same order of magnitude as the diagonal

* Most what can be said about this topic has been said by two people: John von Neumann, who in the nineteen-thirties stressed the differences between evolution and decoherence, and by Hans Dieter Zeh, who in the nineteen-seventies stressed the importance of baths and the environment in the decoherence process.
Ref. 892
Ref. 893

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

ones.* Such a density matrix corresponds to the above-mentioned strange situations that we do not observe in daily life.

We now have a look at the opposite situation, a density matrix for macroscopic distinct states with *vanishing* off-diagonal elements. For two state, the example

$$\begin{aligned}\rho &= |a|^2 \psi_a \otimes \psi_a^\dagger + |b|^2 \psi_b \otimes \psi_b^\dagger \\ &= (\psi_a, \psi_b) \begin{pmatrix} |a|^2 & 0 \\ 0 & |b|^2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_a^\dagger \\ \psi_b^\dagger \end{pmatrix}\end{aligned} \tag{664}$$

describes a system which possesses *no* phase coherence at all. (Here, $\otimes$ denotes the non-commutative dyadic product or tensor product which produces a tensor or matrix starting from two vectors.) Such a diagonal density matrix cannot be that of a pure state; it describes a system which is in the state ψ_a with probability $|a|^2$ and which is in the state ψ_b with probability $|b|^2$. Such a system is said to be in a *mixed state*, because its state is *not known*, or equivalently, to be in a *(phase) incoherent superposition*, because interference effects cannot be observed in such a situation. A system described by a mixed state is always *either* in the state ψ_a *or* in the state ψ_b. In other words, a diagonal density matrix for macroscopically distinct states is not in contrast, but in agreement with everyday experience. In the picture of density matrices, the non-diagonal elements contain the difference between normal, i.e., incoherent, and unusual, i.e., coherent, superpositions.

The experimental situation is clear: for macroscopically distinct states, only diagonal density matrices are observed in everyday life. Any system in a coherent macroscopic superposition somehow loses its off-diagonal matrix elements. How does this process of *decoherence*** take place? The density matrix itself shows the way.

Ref. 894 In thermodynamics, the density matrix for a large system is used for the definition of its entropy and of all its other thermodynamic quantities. These studies show that

Challenge 1444 ny

$$S = -k \operatorname{tr}(\rho \ln \rho) \tag{665}$$

where tr denotes the *trace*, i.e., the sum of all diagonal elements. We also remind ourselves that a system with a large and constant entropy is called a *bath*. In simple physical terms, a bath is a system to which we can ascribe a temperature. More precisely, a *(physical) bath*, or *(thermodynamic) reservoir*, is any large system for which the concept of *equilibrium* can be defined. Experiments show that in practice, this is equivalent to the condition that a bath consists of many interacting subsystems. For this reason, all macroscopic quantities describing the state of a bath show small, irregular *fluctuations*, a fact that will be of central importance shortly.

* Using the density matrix, we can rewrite the evolution equation of a quantum system:

$$\dot{\psi} = -iH\psi \quad \text{becomes} \quad \frac{\mathrm{d}\rho}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\frac{i}{\hbar}[H, \rho] \,. \tag{663}$$

Both are completely equivalent. (The new expression is sometimes also called the *von Neumann equation*.) We won't actually do any calculations here. The expressions are given so that you recognize them when you encounter them elsewhere.

** In certain settings, decoherence is called *disentanglement*, as we will see below.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

An everyday bath is also a thermodynamic bath in the physical sense: indeed, a thermodynamic bath is similar to an extremely large warm water bath, one for which the temperature does not change even if one adds some cold or warm water to it. Examples of physical baths are an intense magnetic field, a large amount of gas, or a large solid. (The meanings of 'intense' and 'large' of course depend on the system under study.) The physical concept of bath (or *reservoir*) is thus an abstraction and a generalization of the everyday concept of bath.

Challenge 1445 s

It is easy to see from the definition (665) of entropy that the loss of off-diagonal elements corresponds to an increase in entropy. And it is known that any increase in entropy of a reversible system, such as the quantum mechanical system in question, is due to an interaction with a bath.

Where is the bath interacting with the system? It obviously must be outside the system one is talking about, i.e., in its *environment*. Indeed, we know experimentally that any environment is large and characterized by a temperature. Some examples are listed in Table 94. Any environment therefore contains a bath. We can even go further: for every experimental situation, there is a bath *interacting* with the system. Indeed, every system which can be observed is not isolated, as it obviously interacts at least with the observer; and every observer by definition contains a bath, as we will show in more detail shortly. Usually however, the most important baths we have to take into consideration are the atmosphere around a system, the radiation or electromagnetic fields interacting with the system, or, if the system itself is large enough to have a temperature, those degrees of freedom of the system which are not involved in the superposition under investigation.

Since every system is in contact with baths, every density matrix of a macroscopic superposition will lose its diagonal elements eventually. At first sight, this direction of thought is not convincing. The interactions of a system with its environment can be made extremely small by using clever experimental set-ups; that would imply that the time for decoherence can be made extremely large. Thus we need to check how much time a superposition of states needs to decohere. It turns out that there are two standard ways to estimate the *decoherence time:* either by modelling the bath as large number of colliding particles, or by modelling it as a continuous field.

Challenge 1446 ny

If the bath is described as a set of particles randomly hitting the microscopic system, it is best characterized by the effective wavelength λ_{eff} of the particles and by the average interval t_{hit} between two hits. A straightforward calculation shows that the decoherence time t_d is in any case smaller than this time interval, so that

$$t_d \leqslant t_{\text{hit}} = \frac{1}{\varphi\sigma} \,, \tag{666}$$

where φ is the flux of particles and σ the cross-section for the hit.* Typical values are

* The decoherence time is derived by studying the evolution of the density matrix $\rho(x, x')$ of objects localized at two points x and x'. One finds that the off-diagonal elements follow $\rho(x, x', t) = \rho(x, x', 0)\mathrm{e}^{-\Lambda t(x-x')^2}$, where the localization rate Λ is given by

$$\Lambda = k^2 \varphi \sigma_{\text{eff}} \tag{667}$$

where k is the wave number, φ the flux and σ_{eff} the cross-section of the collisions, i.e., usually the size of the macroscopic object.

Ref. 895

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 94 Common and less common baths with their main properties

Bath type	Temperature	Wavelength	Particle flux	Cross section (atom)	Hit time $1/\sigma\varphi$ for	
					atom[a]	ball[a]
	T	λ_{eff}	φ	σ		
matter baths						
solid, liquid	300 K	10 pm	$10^{31}\,/\text{m}^2\text{s}$	$10^{-19}\,\text{m}^2$	10^{-12} s	10^{-25} s
air	300 K	10 pm	$10^{28}\,/\text{m}^2\text{s}$	$10^{-19}\,\text{m}^2$	10^{-9} s	10^{-22} s
laboratory vacuum	50 mK	10 µm	$10^{18}\,/\text{m}^2\text{s}$	$10^{-19}\,\text{m}^2$	10 s	10^{-12} s
photon baths						
sunlight	5800 K	900 nm	$10^{23}\,/\text{m}^2\text{s}$		10^{-4} s	10^{-17} s
'darkness'	300 K	20 µm	$10^{21}\,/\text{m}^2\text{s}$		10^{-2} s	10^{-15} s
cosmic microwaves	2.7 K	2 mm	$10^{17}\,/\text{m}^2\text{s}$		10^{2} s	10^{-11} s
terrestrial radio waves						
Casimir effect					very large	
Unruh radiation of Earth	40 zK				very large	
nuclear radiation baths						
radioactivity		10 fm	$1\,/\text{m}^2\text{s}$	$10^{-25}\,\text{m}^2$	10^{25} s	10^{12} s
cosmic radiation	>1000 K	10 fm	$10^{-2}\,/\text{m}^2\text{s}$	$10^{-25}\,\text{m}^2$	10^{27} s	10^{14} s
solar neutrinos	≈ 10 MK	10 fm	$10^{11}\,/\text{m}^2\text{s}$	$10^{-47}\,\text{m}^2$	10^{36} s	10^{15} s
cosmic neutrinos	2.0 K	3 mm	$10^{17}\,/\text{m}^2\text{s}$	$10^{-62}\,\text{m}^2$	10^{45} s	10^{24} s
gravitational baths						
gravitational radiation	$5 \cdot 10^{31}$ K	10^{-35} m			very large	

a. Values are rough estimates. The macroscopic ball is assumed to have a 1 mm size.

given in Table 94. We easily note that for macroscopic objects, decoherence times are extremely short. (We also note that nuclear and gravitational effects lead to large decoherence times and can thus all be neglected.) Scattering leads to fast decoherence. However, for atoms or smaller systems, the situation is different, as expected.

A second method to estimate the decoherence time is also common. Any interaction of a system with a bath is described by a relaxation time t_r. The term *relaxation* designates any process which leads to the return to the equilibrium state. The terms *damping* and *friction* are also used. In the present case, the relaxation time describes the return to equilibrium of the combination bath and system. Relaxation is an example of an irreversible evolution. A process is called *irreversible* if the reversed process, in which every component moves in opposite direction, is of very low probability.* For example, it is usual that

One also finds the surprising result that a system hit by a particle of energy E_{hit} collapses the density matrix roughly down to the de Broglie (or thermal de Broglie) wavelength of the hitting particle. Both results together give the formula above. Ref. 896

* Beware of other definitions which try to make something deeper out of the concept of irreversibility, such

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

a glass of wine poured into a bowl of water colours the whole water; it is very rarely observed that the wine and the water separate again, since the probability of all water and wine molecules to change directions together at the same time is rather low, a state of affairs making the happiness of wine producers and the despair of wine consumers.

Now let us simplify the description of the bath. We approximate it by a single, unspecified, scalar field which interacts with the quantum system. Due to the continuity of space, such a field has an infinity of degrees of freedom. They are taken to model the many degrees of freedom of the bath. The field is assumed to be in an initial state where its degrees of freedom are excited in a way described by a temperature T. The interaction of the system with the bath, which is at the origin of the relaxation process, can be described by the repeated transfer of small amounts of energy E_{hit} until the relaxation process is completed.

The objects of interest in this discussion, like the mentioned cat, person or car, are described by a mass m. Their main characteristic is the maximum energy E_r which can be transferred from the system to the environment. This energy describes the interactions between system and environment. The superpositions of macroscopic states we are interested in are solutions of the Hamiltonian evolution of these systems.

The initial coherence of the superposition, so disturbingly in contrast with our every-
Ref. 897 day experience, disappears exponentially within a *decoherence time* t_d given by*

$$t_d = t_r \frac{E_{\text{hit}}}{E_r} \frac{e^{E_{\text{hit}}/kT} - 1}{e^{E_{\text{hit}}/kT} + 1} \tag{670}$$

where k is the *Boltzmann constant* and like above, E_r is the maximum energy which can be transferred from the system to the environment. Note that one always has $t_d \leqslant t_r$. After the decoherence time t_d is elapsed, the system has evolved from the coherent to the incoherent superposition of states, or, in other words, the density matrix has lost its off-diagonal terms. One also says that the phase coherence of this system has been destroyed. Thus, after a time t_d, the system is found either in the state ψ_a or in the state ψ_b, respectively with the probability $|a|^2$ or $|b|^2$, and not any more in a coherent superposition which is so much in contradiction with our daily experience. Which final state is selected depends on the precise state of the bath, whose details were eliminated from the calculation by taking an *average* over the states of its microscopic constituents.

---

as claims that 'irreversible' means that the reversed process is *not at all* possible. Many so-called 'contradictions' between the irreversibility of processes and the reversibility of evolution equations are due to this mistaken interpretation of the term 'irreversible'.

* This result is derived as in the above case. A system interacting with a bath always has an evolution given
Ref. 898 by the general form

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = -\frac{i}{\hbar}[H, \rho] - \frac{1}{2t_o}\sum_j [V_j\rho, V_j^\dagger] + [V_j, \rho V_j^\dagger] \,, \tag{668}$$

where ρ is the density matrix, H the Hamiltonian, V the interaction, and t_o the characteristic time of the
Challenge 1447 ny interaction. Are you able to see why? Solving this equation, one finds for the elements far from the diagonal $\rho(t) = \rho_0 e^{-t/t_0}$. In other words, they disappear with a characteristic time t_o. In most situations one has a relation of the form

$$t_0 = t_r \frac{E_{\text{hit}}}{E_r} = t_{\text{hit}} \tag{669}$$

or some variations of it, as in the example above.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The important result is that for all macroscopic objects, the decoherence time t_d is extremely small. In order to see this more clearly, we can study a special simplified case. A macroscopic object of mass m, like the mentioned cat or car, is assumed to be at the same time in two locations separated by a distance l, i.e., in a superposition of the two corresponding states. We further assume that the superposition is due to the object moving as a quantum mechanical oscillator with frequency ω between the two locations; this is the simplest possible system that shows superpositions of an object located in two different positions. The energy of the object is then given by $E_r = m\omega^2 l^2$, and the smallest transfer energy $E_{\text{hit}} = \hbar\omega$ is the difference between the oscillator levels. In a macroscopic situation, this last energy is much smaller than kT, so that from the preceding expression
Ref. 899 we get

$$t_d = t_r \frac{E_{\text{hit}}^2}{2E_r\, kT} = t_r \frac{\hbar^2}{2mkTl^2} = t_r \frac{\lambda_T^2}{l^2} \tag{671}$$

in which the frequency ω has disappeared. The quantity $\lambda_T = \hbar/\sqrt{2mkT}$ is called the *thermal de Broglie wavelength* of a particle.

It is straightforward to see that for practically all macroscopic objects the typical decoherence time t_d is extremely short. For example, setting $m = 1\,\text{g}$, $l = 1\,\text{mm}$ and $T = 300\,\text{K}$ we get $t_d/t_r = 1.3 \cdot 10^{-39}$. Even if the interaction between the system and the environment would be so weak that the system would have as relaxation time the age of the universe, which is about $4 \cdot 10^{17}\,\text{s}$, the time t_d would still be shorter than $5 \cdot 10^{-22}\,\text{s}$, which is over a million times faster than the oscillation time of a beam of light (about 2 fs for green light). For Schrödinger's cat, the decoherence time would be even shorter. These times are so short that we cannot even hope to *prepare* the initial coherent superposition, let alone to observe its decay or to measure its lifetime.

For microscopic systems however, the situation is different. For example, for an electron in a solid cooled to liquid helium temperature we have $m = 9.1 \cdot 10^{-31}\,\text{kg}$, and typically $l = 1\,\text{nm}$ and $T = 4\,\text{K}$; we then get $t_d \approx t_r$ and therefore the system can stay in a coherent superposition until it is relaxed, which confirms that for this case coherent effects can indeed be observed if the system is kept isolated. A typical example is the behaviour
Ref. 900 of electrons in superconducting materials. We will mention a few more below.

In 1996 the first actual measurement of decoherence times was published by the Paris
Ref. 901 team around Serge Haroche. It confirmed the relation between the decoherence time and the relaxation time, thus showing that the two processes have to be distinguished at microscopic scale. In the meantime, other experiments confirmed the decoherence
Ref. 902 process with its evolution equation, both for small and large values of t_d/t_r. A particularly
Ref. 903 beautiful experiment has been performed in 2004, where the disappearance of two-slit interference for C_{70} molecules was observed when a bath interacts with them.

Summary on decoherence, life and death

Our exploration showed that *decoherence results from coupling to a bath in the environment.* Decoherence is a statistical, thermodynamic effect.

The estimates of decoherence times in everyday life told us that both the preparation and the survival of superpositions of macroscopically different states is made impossible by the interaction with any bath found in the environment. This is the case even if the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

usual measure of this interaction, given by the friction of the motion of the system, is very small. Even if a macroscopic system is subject to an extremely low friction, leading to a very long relaxation time, its decoherence time is still vanishingly short. Only carefully designed and expensive laboratory systems can reach substantial decoherence times.

Our everyday environment is full of baths. Therefore, *coherent superpositions of macroscopically distinct states never appear in everyday life.* Cars cannot be in and out of a garage at the same time. In short, we cannot be dead and alive at the same time.

WHAT IS A SYSTEM? WHAT IS AN OBJECT?

In classical physics, a system is a part of nature which can be isolated from its environment. However, quantum mechanics tells us that isolated systems do not exist, since interactions cannot be made vanishingly small. The results above allow us to define the concept of system with more accuracy. A *system* is any part of nature which interacts *incoherently* with its environment. In other words, an *object* is a part of nature interacting with its environment only through baths.

In particular, a system is called *microscopic* or *quantum mechanical* and can described by a wave function ψ whenever

— it is almost isolated, with $t_{\text{evol}} = \hbar/\Delta E < t_{\text{r}}$, and
Ref. 904 — it is in *incoherent* interaction with its environment.

In short, a microscopic or quantum mechanical system that is described by a wave function interacts incoherently and weakly with its environment. (For such a system, the energy indeterminacy ΔE is larger than the relaxation energy.) In contrast, a bath is never isolated in the sense just given, because the evolution time of a bath is always much larger than its relaxation time. Since all macroscopic bodies are in contact with baths – or even contain one – they cannot be described by a wave function. In particular, it is impossible to describe any measuring apparatus with the help of a wave function.

We thus conclude that a *macroscopic system* is a system with a decoherence time much shorter than any other evolution time of its constituents. Obviously, macroscopic systems also interact incoherently with their environment. Thus cats, cars and television news speakers are all macroscopic systems.

One possibility is left over by the two definitions: what happens in the situation in which the interactions with the environment are *coherent*? We will encounter some examples shortly. Following the definition, they are neither microscopic and macroscopic systems; they are not described by a wave function, and strictly speaking, they are *not* systems. In these situations, when the interaction is coherent, one speaks of *entanglement* or of entangle 'systems'; such a particle or set of particles is said to be *entangled* with its environment.

Entangled, coherently interacting systems can be divided, but must be disentangled when doing so. The act of division leads to detached entities; detached entities interact incoherently. Quantum theory shows that nature is not made of detached entities, but that it is made of *detachable* entities. In quantum theory, the criterion of detachment is the incoherence of interaction. Coherent superpositions imply the surprising consequence

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 484 Quantum mechanical motion: an electron wave function (actually its module squared) from the moment it passes a slit until it hits a screen

that there are systems which, even though they look being made of detached parts, are not. Entanglement poses a limit to detachment. All surprising properties of quantum mechanics, such as Schrödinger's cat, are consequences of the classical prejudice that a system made of two or more parts can obviously be detached into two subsystems without disturbance. But coherent superpositions, or entangled systems, do not allow detachment without disturbance. Whenever we assume to be able to detach entangled systems, we get strange or incorrect conclusions, such as apparent faster-than-light propagation, or, as one says today, non-local behaviour. Let us have a look at a few typical examples.

Is quantum theory non-local? – A bit about the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox

> [Mr. Duffy] lived a little distance away from his body ...
>
> James Joyce, *A Painful Case*

We now explore non-locality in quantum mechanics.* To do this, we explore wave function collapse in some detail.

We imagine an electron hitting a screen after passing a slit. Following the description just deduced, the process proceeds schematically as depicted in Figure 484. A film of the same process can be seen in the lower left corners on these pages, starting at page 1074. The process has a surprising aspect: due to the short decoherence time, during this (and any other) wave function collapse the maximum of the wave function changes position faster than light. Is this reasonable?

A situation is called *acausal* or *non-local* if energy is transported faster than light. Using Figure 484 you can determine the energy velocity involved, using the results on sig-

Challenge 1448 s

* This continues a topic that we know already: we have explored a different type of non-locality, in general relativity, earlier on.

Page 622

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

nal propagation. The result is a value smaller than c. A wave function maximum moving faster than light does *not* imply energy moving faster than light.

Page 751

In other words, quantum theory has speeds greater than light, but no energy speeds greater than light. In classical electrodynamics, the same happens with the scalar and the vector potentials if the Coulomb gauge is used. We have also encountered speeds faster than that of light in the motion of shadows and in many other observations. Any physicist now has two choices: he can be straight, and say that there is no non-locality in nature; or he can be less straight, and claim there is. In the latter case, he has to claim that even classical physics is non-local. However, this never happens. On the other hand, there is a danger in this more provoking usage: a small percentage of those who say that the world is non-local after a while start to believe that there really are faster-than-light effects in nature. These people become prisoners of their muddled thinking; on the other hands, muddled thinking helps to get more easily into newspapers. In short, even though the definition of non-locality is not unanimous, here we stick to the stricter one, and define non-locality as energy transport faster than light.

Ref. 905

Page 435

An often cited Gedanken experiment that shows the pitfalls of non-locality was proposed by Bohm* in the discussion around the so-called Einstein–Podolsky–Rosen paradox. In the famous EPR paper the three authors try to find a contradiction between quantum mechanics and common sense. Bohm translated their rather confused paper into a clear Gedanken experiment. When two particles in a spin 0 state move apart, measuring one particle's spin orientation implies an *immediate* collapse also of the other particle's spin, namely in the exactly opposite direction. This happens instantaneously over the whole separation distance; no speed limit is obeyed. In other words, entanglement seems to lead to faster-than-light communication.

Ref. 906, Ref. 907

However, in Bohm's experiment, no energy is transported faster than light. No non-locality is present, despite numerous claims of the contrary by certain authors. The two entangled electrons belong to one system: assuming that they are separate only because the wave function has two distant maxima is a conceptual mistake. In fact, no signal can be transmitted with this method; the decoherence is a case of prediction which looks like a signal without being one. Bohm's experiment, like any other EPR-like experiment, does not allow communication faster than light. We already discussed such cases in the section on electrodynamics.

Page 757

Bohm's experiment has actually been performed. The first and most famous realization was realized in 1982 by Alain Aspect; he used photons instead of electrons. Like all latter tests, it has fully confirmed quantum mechanics.

Ref. 908

In fact, experiments such as the one by Aspect confirm that it is impossible to treat either of the two particles as a system by itself; it is impossible to ascribe any physical property, such as a spin orientation, to either of them alone. (The Heisenberg picture would express this restriction even more clearly.)

The mentioned two examples of apparent non-locality can be dismissed with the remark that since obviously no energy flux faster than light is involved, no problems with causality appear. Therefore the following example is more interesting. Take two identical

* David Joseph Bohm (1917–1992) American–British physicist. He codiscovered the Aharonov–Bohm effect; he spent a large part of his later life investigating the connections between quantum physics and philosophy.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 485 Bohm's Gedanken experiment

atoms, one in an excited state, one in the ground state, and call l the distance that separates them. Common sense tells that if the first atom returns to its ground state emitting a photon, the second atom can be excited only after a time $t = l/c$ has been elapsed, i.e., after the photon has travelled to the second atom.

Surprisingly, this conclusion is wrong. The atom in its ground state has a non-zero probability to be excited at the same moment in which the first is de-excited. This has been shown most simply by Gerhard Hegerfeldt. The result has even been confirmed experimentally.

Ref. 909

More careful studies show that the result depends on the type of superposition of the two atoms at the beginning: coherent or incoherent. For incoherent superpositions, the intuitive result is correct; the counter-intuitive result appears only for coherent superpositions. Again, a careful discussion shows that no real non-locality of energy is involved.

In summary, faster-than-light speeds in wave function collapse do not contradict the limit on energy speed of special relativity. Collapse speeds are phase velocities. In nature, phase velocities are unlimited; unlimited phase velocities never imply energy transport faster than light.

Curiosities and fun challenges about superpositions

Challenge 1449 s Can a photograph show an object at two different places at the same time?

* *

In a few cases, the superposition of different macroscopic states can actually be observed by lowering the temperature to sufficiently small values and by carefully choosing suitably small masses or distances. Two well-known examples of coherent superpositions are those observed in gravitational wave detectors and in Josephson junctions. In the first case, one observes a mass as heavy as 1000 kg in a superposition of states located

Ref. 899

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

at different points in space: the distance between them is of the order of 10^{-17} m. In the second case, in superconducting rings, superpositions of a state in which a macroscopic current of the order of 1 pA flows in clockwise direction with one where it flows in counter-clockwise direction have been produced.

Ref. 917

* *

Ref. 911 Superpositions of magnetization in up and down direction at the same time have also be observed for several materials.

* *

Some people wrongly state that an atom that is in a superposition of states centred at different positions has been photographed. (This lie is even used by some sects to attract believers.) Why is this not true?

Challenge 1450 s

* *

Since the 1990s, the sport of finding and playing with new systems in coherent macroscopic superpositions has taken off across the world. The challenges lie in the clean experiments necessary. Experiments with single atoms in superpositions of states are among the most popular ones.

Ref. 913

Ref. 914

* *

Ref. 915 In 1997, coherent atom waves were extracted from a cloud of sodium atoms.

* *

Macroscopic objects usually are in incoherent states. This is the same situation as for light. The world is full of 'macroscopic', i.e., incoherent light: daylight, and all light from lamps, from fire and from glow-worms is incoherent. Only very special and carefully constructed sources, such as lasers or small point sources, emit coherent light. Only these sources allow to study interference effects. In fact, the terms 'coherent' and 'incoherent' originated in optics, since for light the difference between the two, namely the capacity to interfere, had been observed centuries before the case of matter.

Coherence and incoherence of light and of matter manifest themselves differently, because matter can stay at rest but light cannot and because matter is made of fermions, but light is made of bosons. Coherence can be observed easily in systems composed of bosons, such as light, sound in solids, or electron pairs in superconductors. Coherence is less easily observed in systems of fermions, such as systems of atoms with their electron clouds. However, in both cases a decoherence time can be defined. In both cases coherence in many particle systems is best observed if all particles are in the same state (superconductivity, laser light) and in both cases the transition from coherent to incoherent is due to the interaction with a bath. A beam is thus incoherent if its particles arrive randomly in time and in frequency. In everyday life, the rarity of observation of coherent matter superpositions has the same origin as the rarity of observation of coherent light.

Page 1071

* *

We will discuss the relation between the environment and the *decay* of unstable systems later on. The phenomenon is completely described by the concepts given here.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

Challenge 1451 ny Can you find a method to measure the *degree* of entanglement? Can you do so for a system made of many particles?

* *

The study of entanglement leads to a simple conclusion: *teleportation contradicts correlation*. Can you confirm the statement?
Challenge 1452 ny

* *

Challenge 1453 s Are ghost images in TV sets, often due to spurious reflections, examples of interference?

* *

Challenge 1454 d What happens when two monochromatic electrons overlap?

* *

Some people say that quantum theory could be used for quantum computing, by using coherent superpositions of wave functions. Can you give a general reason that makes this aim very difficult –even though not impossible – even without knowing how such a quantum computer might work, or what the so-called *qubits* might be?
Ref. 919
Challenge 1455 s

WHAT IS ALL THE FUSS ABOUT MEASUREMENTS IN QUANTUM THEORY?

Measurements in quantum mechanics are disturbing. They lead to statements in which *probabilities* appear. For example, we speak about the probability of finding an electron at a certain distance from the nucleus of an atom. Statements like this belong to the general type 'when the observable A is measured, the probability to find the outcome a is p.' In the following we will show that the probabilities in such statements are inevitable for any measurement, because, as we will show, any measurement and any observation is a special case of decoherence or disentanglement process. (Historically, the process of measurement was studied *before* the more general process of decoherence. That explains in part why the topic is so confused in many peoples' minds.)

Page 812 What is a measurement? As already mentioned earlier on, a measurement is any interaction which produces a record or a memory. (Any effect of everyday life is a record; but this is not true in general. Can you give some examples of effects that are records and some effects which are not?) Measurements can be performed by machines; when they are performed by people, they are called *observations*. In quantum theory, the process of measurement is not as straightforward as in classical physics. This is seen most strikingly when a quantum system, such as a single electron, is first made to pass a diffraction slit, or better – in order to make its wave aspect become apparent – a double slit and then is made to hit a photographic plate, in order to make also its particle aspect appear. Experiment shows that the blackened dot, the spot where the electron has hit the screen, cannot be determined in advance. (The same is true for photons or any other particle.) However, for large numbers of electrons, the spatial distribution of the black dots, the
Challenge 1456 ny

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 486 A system showing probabilistic behaviour

so-called *diffraction pattern*, can be calculated in advance with high precision.

The outcome of experiments on microscopic systems thus forces us to use probabilities for the description of microsystems. We find that the probability distribution $p(\boldsymbol{x})$ of the spots on the photographic plate can be calculated from the wave function ψ of the electron at the screen surface and is given by $p(\boldsymbol{x}) = |\psi^\dagger(\boldsymbol{x})\psi(\boldsymbol{x})|^2$. This is in fact a special case of the general *first property of quantum measurements*: the measurement of an observable A for a system in a state ψ gives as result one of the eigenvalues a_n, and the probability P_n to get the result a_n is given by

$$P_n = |\varphi_n^\dagger \psi|^2 \,, \tag{672}$$

Page 889 where φ_n is the eigenfunction of the operator A corresponding to the eigenvalue a_n. This experimental result requires an explanation.

Experiments also show a *second property of quantum measurements:* after the measurement, the observed quantum system is in the state φ_n corresponding to the measured eigenvalue a_n. One also says that during the measurement, the wave function has *collapsed* from ψ to φ_n. By the way, these experimental results can also be generalized to the more general cases with degenerate and continuous eigenvalues.

Ref. 916

At first sight, the sort of probabilities encountered in quantum theory are different from the probabilities we encounter in everyday life. Take roulette, dice, pachinko machines or the direction in which a pencil on its tip falls: all have been measured experimentally to be random (assuming no cheating by the designer or operators) to a high degree of accuracy. These everyday systems do not puzzle us. We unconsciously assume that the random outcome is due to the small, but uncontrollable variations of the starting conditions or the environment every time the experiment is repeated.*

But microscopic systems seem to be different. The two properties of quantum measurements just mentioned express what physicists observe in every experiment, even if the initial conditions are taken to be *exactly* the same every time. But why then is the position for a single electron, or most other observables of quantum systems, not predictable? In other words, what happens during the collapse of the wave function? How

* To get a feeling for the limitations of these unconscious assumptions, you may want to read the already mentioned story of those physicists who built a machine that could predict the outcome of a roulette ball from the initial velocity imparted by the croupier.

Ref. 79

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

long does it take? In the beginning of quantum theory, there was the perception that the observed unpredictability is due to the lack of information about the state of the particle. This lead many to search for so-called 'hidden variables'. All these attempts were doomed to fail, however. It took some time for the scientific community to realize that the unpredictability is *not* due to the lack of information about the state of the particle, which is indeed described *completely* by the state vector ψ.

In order to uncover the origin of probabilities, let us recall the nature of a measurement, or better, of a general observation. *Any observation is the production of a record.* The record can be a visual or auditive memory in our brain, or a written record on paper, Page 811 or a tape recording, or any such type of object. As explained in a previous chapter, an object is a record if it cannot have arisen or disappeared by chance. To avoid the influence of chance, all records have to be protected as much as possible from the *external* world; e.g. one typically puts archives in earthquake safe buildings with fire protection, keeps documents in a safe, avoids brain injury as much as possible, etc.

On top of this, records have to be protected from their *internal* fluctuations. These internal fluctuations are due to the many components any recording device is made of. If the fluctuations were too large, they would make it impossible to distinguish between the possible contents of a memory. Now, fluctuations decrease with increasing size of a system, typically with the square root of the size. For example, if a hand writing is too small, it is difficult to read if the paper gets brittle; if the magnetic tracks on tapes are too small, they demagnetize and lose the stored information. In other words, a record is rendered stable against internal fluctuations by making it of sufficient size. Every record thus consists of many components and shows small fluctuations.

The importance of size can be expressed in another way: every system with memory, i.e., every system capable of producing a record, contains a *bath*. In summary, the statement that any observation is the production of a record can be expressed more precisely as: *Any observation of a system is the result of an interaction between that system and a bath in the recording apparatus.**

In addition, any observation measuring a physical quantity uses an interaction *depending* on that same quantity. With these seemingly trivial remarks, we can describe in more detail the process of observation, or, as it is usually called in the quantum theory, the measurement process.

Any measurement apparatus, or *detector*, is characterized by two main aspects, shown in Figure 487: the interaction it has with the microscopic system, and the bath it contains Ref. 912 to produce the record. Any description of the measurement process thus is the description of the evolution of the microscopic system *and* the detector; therefore one needs the Hamiltonian for the particle, the interaction Hamiltonian, and the bath properties (such as the relaxation time t_r). The interaction specifies what is measured and the bath realizes the memory.

We know that only classical thermodynamic systems can be irreversible; quantum systems are not. We therefore conclude: a measurement system *must* be described classically: otherwise it would have no memory and would not be a measurement system: it would not produce a record! Memory is a classical effect. (More precisely, memory is an effect that only appears in the classical limit.) Nevertheless, let us see what happens if we

* Since baths imply friction, we can also say: memory needs friction.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009


the quantum mechanical system
apparatus, e.g. eye, ear, or machine, with memory, i.e. coupled to a bath
H
H int
t r
describes its possible states
is determined by the type of measurement
describes its friction, e.g. due to heat flow

FIGURE 487 The concepts used in the description of measurements

describe the measurement system quantum mechanically.

Let us call A the observable which is measured in the experiment and its eigenfunctions φ_n. We describe the quantum mechanical system under observation – often a particle – by a state ψ. The full state of the system can always be written as

$$\psi = \psi_p \, \psi_{\text{other}} = \sum_n c_n \varphi_n \, \psi_{\text{other}} \,. \tag{673}$$

Here, ψ_p is the aspect of the (particle or system) state that we want to measure, and ψ_{other} represents all other degrees of freedom, i.e., those not described – *spanned*, in mathematical language – by the operator A corresponding to the observable we want to measure. The numbers $c_n = |\varphi_n^\dagger \psi_p|$ give the expansion of the state ψ_p, which is taken to be normalized, in terms of the basis φ_n. For example, in a typical position measurement, the functions φ_n would be the position eigenfunctions and ψ_{other} would contain the information about the momentum, the spin and all other properties of the particle.

How does the system–detector interaction look like? Let us call the state of the apparatus before the measurement χ_{start}. The measurement apparatus itself, by definition, is a device which, when it is hit by a particle in the state $\varphi_n \psi_{\text{other}}$, changes from the state χ_{start} to the state χ_n. One then says that the apparatus has *measured* the eigenvalue a_n corresponding to the eigenfunction φ_n of the operator A. The index n is thus the record of the measurement; it is called the *pointer* index or variable. This index tells us in which state the microscopic system was before the interaction. The important point, taken from our previous discussion, is that the states χ_n, being records, are macroscopically distinct, precisely in the sense of the previous section. Otherwise they would not be records, and the interaction with the detector would not be a measurement.

Of course, during measurement, the apparatus sensitive to φ_n changes the part ψ_{other} of the particle state to some other situation $\psi_{\text{other},n}$, which depends on the measurement and on the apparatus; we do not need to specify it in the following discussion.* But let

* How does the interaction look like mathematically? From the description we just gave, we specified the final state for every initial state. Since the two density matrices are related by

$$\rho_{\text{f}} = T \rho_{\text{i}} T^\dagger \tag{674}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

us have an intermediate check of our reasoning. Do apparatuses as described here exist? Yes, they do. For example, any photographic plate is a detector for the position of ionizing particles. A plate, and in general any apparatus measuring position, does this by changing its momentum in a way depending on the measured position: the electron on a photographic plate is stopped. In this case, χ_{start} is a white plate, φ_n would be a particle localized at spot n, χ_n is the function describing a plate blackened at spot n and $\psi_{\text{other,n}}$ describes the momentum and spin of the particle after it has hit the photographic plate at the spot n.

Now we are ready to look at the measurement process itself. For the moment, let us disregard the bath in the detector, and let us just describe it with a state as well, which we call χ_{start}. In the time before the interaction between the particle and the detector, the combined system (including the detector) was in the initial state ψ_i given simply by

$$\psi_i = \psi_p \chi_{\text{start}} = \sum_n c_n \varphi_n \psi_{\text{other}} \chi_{\text{start}} \,, \tag{676}$$

where ψ_p is the (particle or system) state. After the interaction, using the just mentioned, experimentally known characteristics of the apparatus, the combined state ψ_a is

$$\psi_a = \sum_n c_n \varphi_n \psi_{\text{other},n} \chi_n \,. \tag{677}$$

This evolution from ψ_i to ψ_a follows from the evolution equation applied to the particle–detector combination. Now, the combined state ψ_a is a superposition of macroscopically distinct states: it is a superposition of distinct macroscopic states of the detector. In our example ψ_a could correspond to a superposition of one state where a spot on the left upper corner is blackened on an otherwise white plate with another state where a spot on the right lower corner of the otherwise white plate is blackened. Such a situation is never observed. Let us see why.

The density matrix ρ_a of the combined state ψ_a after the measurement, given by

$$\rho_a = \psi_a \otimes \psi_a^\dagger = \sum_{n,m} c_n c_m^* (\varphi_n \psi_{\text{other},n} \chi_n) \otimes (\varphi_m \psi_{\text{other},m} \chi_m)^\dagger \,, \tag{678}$$

contains large non-diagonal terms, i.e., terms for $n \neq m$, whose numerical coefficients are different from zero. Now let us take the bath back in. From the previous section we know the effect of a bath on such a macroscopic superposition. We found that a density matrix such as ρ_a decoheres extremely rapidly. We assume here that the decoherence time is negligibly small, in practice thus instantaneous,* so that the off-diagonal terms

Challenge 1457 ny

we can deduce the Hamiltonian from the matrix T. Are you able to see how?

By the way, one can say in general that an apparatus measuring an observable A has a system interaction Hamiltonian depending on the pointer variable A, and for which one has

$$[H + H_{\text{int}}, A] = 0 \,. \tag{675}$$

* Note however, that an *exactly* vanishing decoherence time, which would mean a *strictly* infinite number of degrees of freedom of the environment, is in contradiction with the evolution equation, and in particu-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

vanish, and only the final, diagonal density matrix ρ_f, given by

$$\rho_f = \sum_n |c_n|^2 (\varphi_n \psi_{\text{other},n} \chi_n) \otimes (\varphi_n \psi_{\text{other},n} \chi_n)^\dagger \tag{679}$$

has experimental relevance. As explained above, such a density matrix describes a mixed state and the numbers $P_n = |c_n|^2 = |\varphi_n^\dagger \psi_p|^2$ give the probability of measuring the value a_n and of finding the particle in the state $\varphi_n \psi_{\text{other,n}}$ as well as the detector in the state χ_n. But this is precisely what the two properties of quantum measurements state.

We therefore find that describing a measurement as an evolution of a quantum system interacting with a macroscopic detector, itself containing a bath, we can *deduce* the two properties of quantum measurements, and thus the collapse of the wave function, from the quantum mechanical evolution equation. The decoherence time t_d of the previous section becomes the time of collapse in the case of a measurement; in addition we find

$$t_{\text{collapse}} = t_d < t_r \,. \tag{680}$$

In other words, the collapse tie is always smaller than the relaxation time of the bath. We thus have a formula for the time the wave function takes to collapse. The first experimen-
Ref. 918 tal measurements of the time of collapse have appeared and confirmed this result.

Hidden variables

A large number of people are not satisfied with the arguments just presented. They long for more mystery in quantum theory. They do not like the idea that probabilities are due to baths. The most famous prejudice they cultivate is the idea that the probabilities are due to some hidden aspect of nature which is still unknown to humans. These imagined, unknown aspects are called *hidden variables*.

The beautiful thing about quantum mechanics is that it allows both conceptual and experimental tests on whether such hidden variables exist without the need of knowing them. Hidden variables controlling the evolution of microscopic system would contradict the result that action values below $\hbar/2$ cannot be detected. This minimum observable action is the reason for the random behaviour of microscopic systems. A minimal action thus excludes hidden variables.

Historically, the first argument against hidden variables was given by John von Neumann.*

– CS – to be written – CS –

lar with unitarity, locality and causality. It is essential in the whole argument not to confuse the logical consequences of a extremely small decoherence time with those of an exactly vanishing decoherence time.

* János von Neumann (b. 1903 Budapest, d. 1957 Washington DC) Hungarian mathematician. One of the greatest and clearest minds of the twentieth century, he settled already many questions, especially in applied mathematics and quantum theory, that others still struggle with today. He worked on the atomic and the hydrogen bomb, on ballistic missiles, and on general defence problems. In another famous project, he build the first US-American computer, building on his extension of the ideas of Konrad Zuse.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

An additional no-go theorem for hidden variables was published by Kochen and Specker in 1967, (and independently by Bell in 1969). It states that non-contextual hidden variables are impossible, if the Hilbert space has a dimension equal or larger than three. The theorem is about non-contextual variables, i.e., about hidden variables *inside* the quantum mechanical system. The Kochen–Specker theorem thus states that there is no non-contextual hidden variables model, because mathematics forbids it. This result essentially eliminates all possibilities, because usual quantum mechanical systems have Hilbert space dimensions much larger than three.

Ref. 920

Of course, one cannot avoid noting that about *contextual* hidden variables, i.e., variables in the environment, there are no restricting theorems; indeed, their necessity was shown earlier in this section.

But also common sense eliminates hidden variables, without any recourse to mathematics, with an argument often overlooked. If a quantum mechanical system had internal hidden variables, the measurement apparatus would have zillions of them.* And that would mean that it could not work as a measurement system.

Despite all these results, people have also looked for experimental tests on hidden variables. Most tests are based on the famed *Bell's equation*, a beautifully simple relation published by John Bell** in the 1960s.

The starting idea is to distinguish quantum theory and locally realistic theories using hidden variables by measuring the polarizations of two correlated photons. Quantum theory says that the polarization of the photons is fixed only at the time it is measured, whereas local realistic theories say that it is fixed already in advance. Experiment can be used to decide which approach is correct.

Imagine the polarization is measured at two distant points A and B, each observer can measure 1 or −1 in each of his favourite direction. Let each observer choose two directions, 1 and 2, and call their results a_1, a_2, b_1 and b_2. Since the measurement results all are either 1 or −1, the value of the specific expression $(a_1 + a_2)b_1 + (a_2 - a_1)b_2$ has always the value ±2.

Ref. 921

Imagine you repeat the experiment many times, assuming that the hidden variables appear statistically. You then can deduce (a special case of) Bell's inequality for two hidden variables; it predicts that

Challenge 1458 e

$$|(a_1 b_1) + (a_2 b_1) + (a_2 b_2) - (a_1 b_2)| \leqslant 2 \,. \tag{681}$$

Here, the expressions in brackets are the averages of the measurement products over a large number of samples. This result holds independently of the directions of the involved polarizers.

On the other hand, for the case that the polarizers 1 and 2 at position A and the corresponding ones at position B are chosen with angles of $\pi/4$, quantum theory predicts that

$$|(a_1 b_1) + (a_2 b_1) + (a_2 b_2) - (a_1 b_2)| = 2\sqrt{2} > 2 \,. \tag{682}$$

* Which leads to the definition: one zillion is 10^{23}.

** John Stewart Bell (1928–1990), theoretical physicist who worked mainly on the foundations of quantum theory.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

This prediction is in complete contradiction with the hidden variable result.

All experimental checks of Bell's equation have confirmed standard quantum mechanics. No evidence for hidden variables has ever been found. This is not really surprising, since the search for such variables is based on a misunderstanding of quantum mechanics or on personal desires on how the world should be, instead of relying on experimental evidence.

Another measurable contradiction between quantum theory and locally realistic theories has been predicted by Greenberger, Horn and Zeilinger. Experiments trying to check the result are being planned. Again, no deviation from quantum theory is expected.

Summary on probabilities and determinism

> Geometric demonstramus quia facimus; si physics demonstrare possemus, faceremus.
> Giambattista Vico*

From the arguments presented here we draw a number of conclusions which we need for the rest of our mountain ascent. Note that these conclusions are not yet shared by all physicists! The whole topic is still touchy.

— Probabilities do not appear in measurements because the state of the quantum system is unknown or fuzzy, but because the detailed state of the bath in the environment is unknown. *Quantum mechanical probabilities are of statistical origin and are due to baths in the environment (or in the measurement apparatus).* The probabilities are due to the large number of degrees of freedom contained in any bath. These large numbers make the outcome of experiments unpredictable. If the state of the bath were known, the outcome of an experiment could be predicted. The probabilities of quantum theory are 'thermodynamic' in origin.

  In other words, there are *no* fundamental probabilities in nature. All probabilities in nature are due to decoherence; in particular, all probabilities are due to the statistics of the many particles – some of which may be virtual – that are part of the baths in the environment. Modifying well-known words by Albert Einstein, 'nature really does not play dice.' We therefore called ψ the *wave function* instead of 'probability amplitude', as is often done. An even better name would be *state function*.

— Any observation in everyday life is a special case of decoherence. What is usually called the 'collapse of the wave function' is a decoherence process due to the interaction with the baths present in the environment or in the measuring apparatus. Because humans are warm-blooded and have memory, humans themselves are thus measurement apparatuses. The fact that our body temperature is 37 °C is thus the reason that we see only a single world, and no superpositions. (Actually, there are many additional reasons; can you name a few?) Challenge 1459 s

— A measurement is complete when the microscopic system has interacted with the bath in the measuring apparatus. Quantum theory as a description of nature does not

* 'We are able to demonstrate geometrical matters because we make them; if we could prove physical matters we would be able to make them.' Giovanni Battista Vico (b. 1668 Napoli, d. 1744 Napoli) important Italian philosopher and thinker. In this famous statement he points out a fundamental distinction between mathematics and physics.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

require detectors; the evolution equation describes all examples of motion. However, *measurements* do require the existence of detectors. Detectors, being machines that record observations, have to include a bath, i.e., have to be classical, macroscopic objects. In this context one speaks also of a *classical apparatus*. This necessity of the measurement apparatus to be classical had been already stressed in the very early stages of quantum theory.

— All measurements, being decoherence processes that involve interactions with baths, are irreversible processes and increase entropy.

— A measurement is a special case of quantum mechanical evolution, namely the evolution for the combination of a quantum system, a macroscopic detector and the environment. Since the evolution equation is relativistically invariant, no causality problems appear in measurements; neither do locality problems and logical problems appear.

— Since both the evolution equation and the measurement process does not involve quantities other than space-time, Hamiltonians, baths and wave-functions, no other quantity plays a role in measurement. In particular, no human observer nor any consciousness are involved or necessary. Every measurement is complete when the microscopic system has interacted with the bath in the apparatus. The decoherence inherent in every measurement takes place even if nobody is looking. This trivial consequence is in agreement with the observations of everyday life, for example with the fact that the Moon is orbiting the Earth even if nobody looks at it.* Similarly, a tree falling in the middle of a forest makes noise even if nobody listens. Decoherence is independent of human observation, of the human mind and of human existence.

— In every measurement the quantum system interacts with the detector. Since there is a minimum value for the magnitude of action, every *observation influences the observed*. Therefore every measurement *disturbs* the quantum system. Any precise description of observations must also include the description of this disturbance. In the present section the disturbance was modelled by the change of the state of the system from ψ_{other} to $\psi_{\text{other,n}}$. Without such a change of state, without a disturbance of the quantum system, a measurement is impossible.

— Since the complete measurement is described by quantum mechanics, unitarity is and remains the basic property of evolution. There are no non-unitary processes in quantum mechanics.

— The description of the collapse of the wave function as a decoherence process is an explanation exactly in the sense in which the term 'explanation' was defined earlier on; it describes the relation between an observation and all the other aspects of reality, in this case the bath in the detector or the environment. The collapse of the wave function has been both calculated and *explained*. The collapse is not a question of 'interpretation', i.e., of opinion, as unfortunately often is suggested.**

Page 866

— It is not useful to speculate whether the evolution for a *single* quantum measurement could be determined if the state of the environment around the system were known.

* The opposite view is sometimes falsely attributed to Niels Bohr. The Moon is obviously in contact with many radiation baths. Can you list a few?

Challenge 1460 s

** This implies that the so-called 'many worlds' interpretation is wishful thinking. The conclusion is confirmed when studying the details of this religious approach. It is a belief system, not based on facts.

Ref. 922

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

> Measurements need baths. But a bath, being irreversible, cannot be described by a wave function, which behaves reversibly.* Quantum mechanics is deterministic. Baths are probabilistic.

In summary, there is *no* irrationality in quantum theory. Whoever uses quantum theory as argument for superstitions, irrational behaviour, new age beliefs or ideologies is guilty of disinformation. The statement by Gell-Mann at the beginning of this chapter is thus such an example. Another is the following well-known, but incorrect statement by Richard Feynman:

Ref. 923

> ... nobody understands quantum mechanics.

Nobel Prizes obviously do not prevent views distorted by ideology.

The process of decoherence allows understanding many other issues. We explore a few interesting ones.

What is the difference between space and time?

Space and time differ. Objects are localized in space but not in time. Why is this the case? In nature, most bath–system interactions are mediated by a potential. All potentials are by definition position dependent. Therefore, every potential, being a function of the position $\boldsymbol{x}$, commutes with the position observable (and thus with the interaction Hamiltonian). The decoherence induced by baths – except if special care is taken – thus first of all destroys the non-diagonal elements for every superposition of states centred at different locations. In short, *objects are localized because they interact with baths via potentials.*

For the same reason, objects also have only one spatial orientation at a time. If the system–bath interaction is spin-dependent, the bath leads to 'localization' in the spin variable. This occurs for all microscopic systems interacting with magnets. As a result, macroscopic superpositions of magnetization are almost never observed. Since electrons, protons and neutrons have a magnetic moment and a spin, this conclusion can even be extended: everyday objects are never seen in superpositions of different rotation states because their interactions with baths are spin-dependent.

As a counter-example, most systems are not localized in time, but on the contrary exist for very long times, because practically all system–bath interactions do *not* commute with time. In fact, this is the way a bath is defined to begin with. In short, *objects are permanent because they interact with baths.*

Challenge 1461 s

Are you able to find an interaction which is momentum-dependent instead of position-dependent? What is the consequence for macroscopic systems?

In other words, in contrast to general relativity, quantum theory produces a distinction between space and time. In fact, we can *define* position as the observable that commutes with interaction Hamiltonians. This distinction between space and time is due to the properties of matter and its interactions. We could not have deduced this distinction

* This very strong type of determinism will be very much challenged in the last part of this text, in which it will be shown that time is not a fundamental concept, and therefore that the debate around determinism looses most of its interest.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

in general relativity.

Are we good observers?

Are humans classical apparatuses? Yes, they are. Even though several prominent physicists claim that free will and probabilities are related, a detailed investigation shows that this in not the case. Our senses are classical machines in the sense described above: they record observations by interaction with a bath. Our brain is also a classical apparatus: the neurons are embedded in baths. Quantum probabilities do not play a determining role in the brain.

Ref. 924

Any observing entity needs a bath and a memory to record its observations. This means that observers have to be made of matter; an observer cannot be made of radiation. Our description of nature is thus severely biased: we describe it from the standpoint of matter. That is a bit like describing the stars by putting the Earth at the centre of the universe. Can we eliminate this basic anthropomorphism? We will find out as we continue.

Page 1416

What connects information theory, cryptology and quantum theory?

Physics means talking about observations of nature. Like any observation, also measurements produce information. It is thus possible to translate much (but not all) of quantum theory into the language of information theory. In particular, the existence of a minimal change in nature implies that the information about a physical system can never be complete, that information transport has its limits and that information can never be fully trusted. The details of these studies form a fascinating way to look at the microscopic world.

The analogy between quantum theory and information theory becomes even more interesting when the statements are translated into the language of cryptology. Cryptology is the science of transmitting hidden messages that only the intended receiver can decrypt. In our modern times of constant surveillance, cryptology is an important tool to protect personal freedom.*

Ref. 925

The quantum of action implies that messages can be sent in an (almost) safe way. Listening to a message is a measurement process. Since there is a smallest action, one can detect whether somebody has tried to listen to a sent message. A man in the middle attack – somebody who pretends to be the receiver and then sends a copy of the message to the real, intended receiver – can be avoided by using *entangled* systems as signals to transmit the information. Quantum cryptologists therefore usually use communication systems based on entangled photons.

The major issue of quantum cryptology is the key distribution problem. All secure communication is based on a secret key that is used to decrypt the message. Even if the communication channel is of the highest security – like entangled photons – one still has

* Cryptology consists of the field of *cryptography*, the art of coding messages, and the field of *cryptoanalysis*, the art of deciphering encrypted messages. For a good introduction to cryptology, see the text by Albrecht Beutelspacher, Jörg Schwenk & Klaus-Dieter Wolfenstätter, *Moderne Verfahren der Kryptographie*, Vieweg 1995.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

to find a way to send the communication partner the secret key necessary for the decryption of the messages. Finding such methods is the main aspect of quantum cryptology, a large research field. However, close investigation shows that all key exchange methods are limited in their security.

In short, due to the quantum of action, nature provides limits on the possibility of sending encrypted messages. The statement of these limits is (almost) equivalent to the statement that change in nature is limited by the quantum of action.

Is the universe a computer?

The quantum of action provides a limit to secure information exchange. This connection also allows to brush aside several incorrect statements often found in the media. Stating that 'the universe is information' or that 'the universe is a computer' is as unreasonable as saying that the universe is an observation, a measurement apparatus, a clockwork or a chewing-gum dispenser. Any expert of motion should beware of these and similarly fishy statements; people who use them either deceive themselves or try to deceive others.

Page 1441

Does the universe have a wave function? And initial conditions?

The wave function of the universe is frequently invoked in discussions about quantum theory. Many deduce conclusions from this idea, for example on the irreversibility of time, on the importance of initial conditions, on changes required to quantum theory and much more. Are these arguments correct?

The first thing to clarify is the meaning of 'universe'. As explained above, the term can have two meanings: either the collection of all matter and radiation, or this collection *plus* all of space-time. Let us also recall the meaning of 'wave function': it describes the *state* of a system. The state distinguishes two otherwise identical systems; for example, position and velocity distinguish two otherwise identical ivory balls on a billiard table. Alternatively and equivalently, the state describes changes in time.

Page 571

Does the universe have a state? If we take the wider meaning of universe, it does not. Talking about the state of the universe is a contradiction: by definition, the concept of state, defined as the non-permanent aspects of an object, is applicable only to *parts* of the universe.

Page 34

We then can take the narrower sense of 'universe' – the sum of all matter and radiation only – and ask the question again. To determine the state of all matter and radiation, we need a possibility to measure it: we need an environment. But the environment of matter and radiation is space-time only; initial conditions cannot be determined since we need measurements to do this, and thus an apparatus. An apparatus is a material system with a bath attached to it; however, there is no such system outside the universe.

In short, quantum theory does not allow for measurements of the universe; therefore the universe has no state. Beware of anybody who claims to know something about the wave function of the universe. Just ask him: If you know the wave function of the universe, why aren't you rich?

Despite this conclusion, several famous physicists have proposed evolution equations for the wave function of the universe. (The best-known is the Wheeler–DeWitt equation.) It seems a silly point, but the predictions of these equations have not been compared to experiments; the arguments just given even make this impossible in principle. Exploring

Ref. 926

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

this direction, so interesting it may seem, must therefore be avoided if we want to reach the top of Motion Mountain.

There are many additional twists to this story. One twist is that space-time itself, even without matter, might be a bath. This speculation will be shown to be correct later on; this result seems to allow speaking of the wave function of all matter. But then again, it turns out that time is *undefined* at the scales where space-time is an effective bath; this implies that the concept of state is not applicable there.

A lack of 'state' for the universe is a strong statement. It also implies a lack of initial conditions! The arguments are precisely the same. This is a tough result. We are so used to think that the universe has initial conditions that we never question the term. (Even in this text the mistake might appear every now and then.) But there are no initial conditions of the universe.

We can retain as summary, valid even in the light of the latest research: the universe has *no* wave function and *no* initial conditions, independently of what is meant by 'universe'.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



BIBLIOGRAPHY

805 Giuseppe Fumagalli, *Chi l'ha detto?*, Hoepli, Milano, 1983. Cited on page 976.

806 The quantum of action was introduced in Max Planck, Über irreversible Strahlungsvorgänge, *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin* pp. 440–480, 1899. In the paper, Planck used the letter *b* for what nowadays is called *h*. Cited on page 977.

807 Bohr explained the indivisibilty of the quantum of action in his famous Como lecture. N. Bohr, *Atomtheorie und Naturbeschreibung*, Springer, 1931. On page 16 he writes: 'No more is it likely that the fundamental concepts of the classical theories will ever become superfluous for the description of physical experience. The recognition of the indivisibility of the quantum of action, and the determination of its magnitude, not only depend on an analysis of measurements based on classical concepts, but it continues to be the application of these concepts alone that makes it possible to relate the symbolism of the quantum theory to the data of experience.' He also writes: '...the fundamental postulate of the indivisibility of the quantum of action is itself, from the classical point of view, an irrational element which inevitably requires us to forgo a causal mode of description and which, because of the coupling between phenomena and their observation, forces us to adopt a new mode of description designated as complementary in the sense that any given application of classical concepts precludes the simultaneous use of other classical concepts which in a different connection are equally necessary for the elucidation of the phenomena ...' and '...the finite magnitude of the quantum of action prevents altogether a sharp distinction being made between a phenomenon and the agency by which it is observed, a distinction which underlies the customary concept of observation and, therefore, forms the basis of the classical ideas of motion.' Other statements about the indivisibility of the quantum of action can be found in N. Bohr, *Atomic Physics and Human Knowledge*, Science Editions, 1961. See also Max Jammer, *The Philosophy of Quantum Mechanics*, Wiley, first edition, 1974, pp. 90–91. Cited on page 977.

808 For some of the rare modern publications emphasizing the quantum of action see M. B. Mensky, The action uncertainty principle and quantum gravity, *Physics Letters A* **162**, p. 219, 1992, and M. B. Mensky, The action uncertainty principle in continuous quantum measurements, *Physics Letters A* **155**, pp. 229–235, 1991.

Schwinger's quantum-action principle is also used in Richard F. W. Bader, *Atoms in Molecules – A Quantum Theory*, Oxford University Press, 1994.

There are a large number of general textbooks on quantum theory. There is one for every taste.

A well-known *conceptual* introduction is Jean-Marc Lévy-Leblond & FranÁoise Balibar, *Quantique – Rudiments*, Masson, 1997, translated into English as *Quantics*, North-Holland, 1990.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

One of the most beautiful books is Julian Schwinger, *Quantum Mechanics – Symbolism of Atomic Measurements*, edited by Berthold-Georg Englert, Springer Verlag, 2001.

A modern approach with a beautiful introduction is Max Schubert & Gerhard Weber, *Quantentheorie – Grundlagen und Anwendungen*, Spektrum Akademischer Verlag, 1993.

A standard beginner's text is C. Cohen-Tannoudji, B. Diu & F. Laloë, *Mécanique quantique I et II*, Hermann, Paris, 1977. It is also available in several translations.

A good text is Asher Peres, *Quantum Theory – Concepts and Methods*, Kluwer, 1995.

For a lively approach, see Vincent Icke, *The Force of Symmetry*, Cambridge University Press, 1994.

New textbooks are published regularly around the world. Cited on page 1030.

809 Max Born, Zur Quantenmechanik der Stoßvorgänge (vorläufige Mitteilung), *Zeitschrift für Physik* **37**, pp. 863–867, 1926, Max Born, Quantenmechanik der Stoßvorgänge, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **38**, pp. 803–827, 1926. Cited on page 981.

810 See for example the papers by Jan Hilgevoord, The uncertainty principle for energy and time, *American Journal of Physics* **64**, pp. 1451–1456, 1996, and by Paul Busch, On the time–energy uncertainty reaction, parts 1 & 2, *Foundations of Physics* **20**, pp. 1–43, 1990. A classic is the paper by Eugene P. Wigner, On the time–energy uncertainty relation, in Abdus Salam & Eugene P. Wigner, editors, *Aspects of Quantum Theory*, Cambridge University Press, 1972. Cited on page 984.

811 See also the booklet by Claus Mattheck, *Warum alles kaputt geht – Form und Versagen in Natur und Technik*, Forschungszentrum Karlsruhe, 2003. Cited on page 987.

812 R. Clifton, J. Bub & H. Halvorson, Characterizing quantum theory in terms of information-theoretic constraints, arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0211089. Cited on page 991.

813 The quotes on motion are found in chapter VI of F. Engels, *Herrn Eugen Dührings Umwälzung der Wissenschaft*, Verlag für fremdsprachliche Literatur, Moskau, 1946. The book is commonly called *Anti-Dühring*. Cited on pages 992 and 1017.

814 Rodney Loudon, *The Quantum Theory of Light*, Oxford University Press, 2000. Cited on page 994.

815 E. M. Brumberg & S. I. Vavilov, *Izvest. Akad. Nauk. Omen* Ser. 7, p. 919, 1933. Cited on page 994.

816 F. Rieke & D. A. Baylor, Single-photon detection by rod cells of the retina, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **70**, pp. 1027–1036, 1998. They also mention that the eye usually works at photon fluxes between $10^8\,/\mu\mathrm{m}^2\mathrm{s}$ (sunlight) and $10^{-2}\,/\mu\mathrm{m}^2\mathrm{s}$ (starlight). The cones in the retina detect, in colour, light intensities in the uppermost seven or eight decades, whereas the rods detect, in black and white, the lower light intensities. Cited on pages 997 and 998.

817 E. Fischbach, H. Kloor, R. A. Langel, A. T. Y. Lui & M. Peredo, New geomagnetic limit on the photon mass and on long-range forces coexisting with electromagnetism, *Physical Review Letters* **73**, pp. 514–517, 1994. Cited on page 998.

818 A. H. Compton, The scattering of X-rays as particles, *American Journal of Physics* **29**, pp. 817–820, 1961. Cited on page 998.

819 The famous paper is R. Hanbury Brown & R. Q. Twiss, *Nature* **178**, p. 1046, 1956. They got the idea to measure light in this way from their earlier work, which used the same method with radio waves: R. Hanbury Brown & R. Q. Twiss, *Nature* **177**, p. 27, 1956, Cited on page 1003.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

820 J. Glanz, First light from a space laser, *Science 269* p. 1336, 8 September 1995. Cited on page 1004.

821 L. Mandel, Configuration-space photon number operators in quantum optics, *Physical Review* **144**, pp. 1071–1077, 1966. No citations.

822 A. Einstein, Über einen die Erzeugung und Umwandlung des Lichtes betreffenden heuristischen Standpunkt, *Annalen der Physik* **17**, pp. 132–184, 1905. Cited on page 1004.

823 See the summary by P. W. Milonni, Answer to question 45: What (if anything) does the photoelectric effect teach us?, *American Journal of Physics* **65**, pp. 11–12, 1997. Cited on page 1005.

824 For a detailed account, See J. J. Prentis, Poincaré's proof of the quantum discontinuity of nature, *American Journal of Physics* **63**, pp. 339–350, 1995. The original papers are Henri PoincarÈ, Sur la théorie des quanta, *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences (Paris)* **153**, pp. 1103–1108, 1911, and Henri PoincarÈ, Sur la théorie des quanta, *Journal de Physique (Paris)* **2**, pp. 5–34, 1912. Cited on page 1005.

825 J. Jacobson, G. Björk, I. Chang & Y. Yamamoto, Photonic de Broglie waves, *Physical Review Letters* **74**, pp. 4835–4838, 1995. The first measurement was published by E. J. S. Fonseca, C. H. Monken & S. de Pádua, Measurement of the de Broglie wavelength of a multiphoton wave packet, *Physical Review Letters* **82**, pp. 2868–2671, 1995. Cited on page 1005.

826 For the three-photon state, see M. W. Mitchell, J. S. Lundeen & A. M. Steinberg, Super-resolving phase measurements with a multiphoton entangled state, *Nature* **429**, pp. 161–164, 2004, and for the four-photon state see, in the same edition, P. Walther, J.-W. Pan, M. Aspelmeyer, R. Ursin, S. Gasparoni & A. Zeilinger, De Broglie wavelength of a non-local four-photon state, *Nature* **429**, pp. 158–161, 2004. Cited on page 1005.

827 For an introduction to spueezed light, see L. Mandel, Non-classical states of the electromagnetic field, *Physica Scripta T* **12**, pp. 34–42, 1986. Cited on page 1005.

828 The famous quote on single-photon interference is found on page 9 of P. A. M. Dirac, *The Principles of Quantum Mechanics*, Clarendon Press, 1930. It is also discussed, in a somewhat confused way, in the otherwise informative article by H. Paul, Interference between independent photons, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **58**, pp. 209–231, 1986. Cited on page 1008.

829 The original papers on coherent states are three: R. J. Glauber, The quantum theory of optical coherence, *Physical Review* **130**, pp. 2529–2539, 1963, J. R. Klauder, Continuous-representation theory, I and II, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **4**, pp. 1055–1058, 1963, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, Equivalence of semiclassical and quantum mechanical descriptions of statistical light beams, *Physical Review Letters* **10**, p. 227, 1963. Cited on page 1010.

830 Richard P. Feynman, *QED - The Strange Theory of Light and Matter*, pp. 73–75, Princeton University Press, 1988, or Richard P. Feynman & Steven Weinberg, *Elementary Particles and the Laws of Physics*, p. 23, Cambridge University Press 1987. Cited on page 1011.

831 R. Kidd, J. Aedini & A. Anton, Evolution of the modern photon, *American Journal of Physics* **57**, pp. 27–35, 1989, Cited on page 1011.

832 Wolfgang Tittel, J. Brendel, H. Zbinden & N. Gisin, Violation of Bell inequalities by photons more than 10 km apart, *Physical Review Letters* **81**, pp. 3563–3566, 26 October 1998. Cited on page 1013.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

833 N. Bohr & L. Rosenfeld, Zur Frage der Meßbarkeit der elektromagnetischen Feldgrößen, *Mat.-fys. Medd. Danske Vid. Selsk.* **12**, p. 8, 1933. The results were later published in English as N. Bohr & L. Rosenfeld, Field and charge measurements in quantum electrodynamics, *Physical Review* **78**, pp. 794–798, 1950. Cited on page 1013.

834 E. I. Butikov, The rigid pendulum – an antique but evergreen physical model, *European Journal of Physics* **20**, pp. 429–441, 1999. Cited on page 1016.

835 The whole bunch of atoms behaves as one single molecule; one speaks of a Bose–Einstein condensate. The first observations, worthy of a Nobel prize, were by M.H. Anderson & al., Observation of Bose–Einstein condensation in a dilute atomic vapour, *Science* **269**, pp. 198–201, 1995, C.C. Bradley, C.A. Sackett, J.J. Tollett & R.G. Hulet, Evidence of Bose–Einstein condensation in an atomic gas with attractive interactions, *Physical Review Letters* **75**, pp. 1687–1690, 1995, K.B. Davis, M.-O. Mewes, M.R. Andrews, N.J. van Druten, D.S. Durfee, D.M. Kurn & W. Ketterle, Bose–Einstein condensation in a gas of sodium atoms, *Physical Review Letters* **75**, pp. 3969–3973, 1995. For a simple introduction, see W. Ketterle, Experimental studies of Bose–Einstein condensation, *Physics Today* pp. 30–35, December 1999. Cited on page 1017.

836 J.L. Costa-Krämer, N. Garcia, P. García-Mochales & P.A. Serena, Nanowire formation in macroscopic metallic contacts: a universal property of metals, *Surface Science Letters* **342**, pp. L1144–L1152, 1995. See also J.L. Costa-Krämer, N. Garcia, P.A. Serena, P. García-Mochales, M. Marqués & A. Correia, Conductance quantization in nanowires formed in macroscopic contacts, *Physical Review B* p. 4416, 1997. Cited on page 1018.

837 The beautiful undergraduate experiments made possible by this discovery are desribed in E.L. Foley, D. Candela, K.M. Martini & M.T. Tuominen, An undergraduate laboratory experiment on quantized conductance in nanocontacts, *American Journal of Physics* **67**, pp. 389–393, 1999. Cited on page 1018.

838 L. de Broglie, *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Sciences* **177**, pp. 507–510, 1923. Cited on page 1019.

839 C. Jönsson, Interferenz von Elektronen am Doppelspalt, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **161**, pp. 454–474, 1961, C. Jönsson, Electron diffraction at multiple slits, *American Journal of Physics* **42**, pp. 4–11, 1974. Because of the charge of electons, this experiment is not easy to perform: any parts of the set-up that are insulating get charged and distort the picture. That is why the experient was performed much later with electrons than with atoms, neutrons and molecules. Cited on page 1020.

840 M. Arndt, O. Nairz, J. Vos-Andreae, C. Keller, van der Zouw & A. Zeilinger, Wave–particle duality of C60 molecules, *Nature* **401**, pp. 680–682, 14 October 1999. See also the observation for tetraphenyleprophyrin and $C_{60}F_{48}$ by the same team, published as L. Hackermüller & al., Wave nature of biomolecules and fluorofullerenes, *Physical Review Letters* **91**, p. 090408, 2003.

No phenomoenon of quantum theory has been experimentally studied as much as quantum intereference. The transition from interference to non-interference has also been explored, as in P. Facchi, A. Mariano & S. Pascazio, Mesoscopic interference, *Recent Developments in Physics* **3**, pp. 1–29, 2002. Cited on page 1020.

841 G. Papini, Shadows of a maximal acceleration, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0211011. Cited on page 1022.

842 J. Perrin, Nobel Prize speech, found at www.nobel.se. H. Nagaoka, Kinetics of a

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

system of particles illustrating the line and the band spectrum and the phenomena of radioactivity, *Philosophical Magazine* S6, 7, pp. 445–455, March 1904. Cited on page 1022.

843 N. Bohr, On the constitution of atoms and molecules: Introduction and Part I – binding of electrons by positive nuclei, *Philosophical Magazine* **26**, pp. 1–25, 1913, On the constitution of atoms and molecules: Part II – systems containing only a single nucleus, ibid., pp. 476–502, On the constitution of atoms and molecules: Part III, ibid., pp. 857–875. Cited on page 1022.

844 Robert H. Dicke & James P. Wittke, *Introduction to Quantum Theory*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts, 1960. See also Stephen Gasiorowicz, *Quantum Physics*, John Wiley & Sons, 1974. Cited on page 1023.

845 P. Carruthers & M. M. Nieto, Phase and angle variables in quantum mechanics, *Review of Modern Physics* **40**, pp. 411–440, 1968. Cited on page 1024.

846 The indeterminacy relation for rotational motion is well explained by W. H. Louisell, Amplitude and phase uncertainty relations, *Physics Letters* 7, p. 60, 1963. Cited on page 1024.

847 S. Franke-Arnold, S. M. Barnett, E. Yao, J. Leach, J. Courtial & M. Padgett, Uncertainty principle for angular position and angular momentum, *New Journal of Physics* **6**, p. 103, 2004. This is a freely accessible online journal. Cited on page 1024.

848 W. Gerlach & O. Stern, Der experimentelle Nachweis des magnetischen Moments des Silberatoms, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **8**, p. 110, 1921. See also the pedagogical explanation by M. Hannout, S. Hoyt, A. Kryowonos & A. Widom, Quantum measurement and the Stern–Gerlach experiment, *American Journal of Physics* **66**, pp. 377–379, 1995. Cited on page 1025.

849 E. Schrödinger, Quantisierung als Eigenwertproblem I, *Annalen der Physik* **79**, pp. 361–376, 1926, and Quantisierung als Eigenwertproblem II, *Annalen der Physik* **79**, pp. 489–527, 1926. Cited on page 1030.

850 C. G. Gray, G. Karl & V. A. Novikov, From Maupertius to Schrödinger. Quantization of classical variational principles, *American Journal of Physics* **67**, pp. 959–961, 1999. Cited on page 1030.

851 Y. Aharonov & D. Bohm, Significance of electromagnetic potentials in the quantum theory, *Physical Review* **115**, pp. 485–491, 1959. Cited on page 1034.

852 G. E. Uhlenbeck & S. Goudsmit, Ersetzung der Hypothese vom unmechanischen Zwang durch eine Forderung bezüglich des inneren Verhaltens jedes einzelnen Elektrons, *Naturwissenschaften* **13**, pp. 953–954, 1925. Cited on page 1035.

853 L. Thomas, The motion of the spinning electron, *Nature* **117**, p. 514, 1926. Cited on page 1035.

854 K. von Meyenn & E. Schucking, Wolfgang Pauli, *Physics Today* pp. 43–48, February 2001. Cited on page 1035.

855 L. L. Foldy & S. A. Wouthuysen, On the Dirac theory of spin 1/2 particles and its nonrelativistic limit, *Physical Review* **78**, pp. 29–36, 1950. Cited on page 1036.

856 John P. Costella & Bruce H. J. McKellar, The Foldy–Wouthuysen transformation, *American Journal of Physics* **63**, pp. 1119–1121, 1995. Cited on page 1036.

857 J. P. Woerdman, G. Nienhuis, I. Kuščer, Is it possible to rotate an atom?, *Optics Communications* **93**, pp. 135–144, 1992. We are talking about atoms rotating around their

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

centre of mass; atoms can of course rotate around other bodies, as discussed by M. P. Silverman, Circular birefringence of an atom in uniform rotation: the classical perspective, *American Journal of Physics* **58**, pp. 310–317, 1990. Cited on page 1039.

858 The nearest anyone has come to an image of a hydrogen atom is found in A. Yazdani, Watching an atom tunnel, *Nature* **409**, pp. 471–472, 2001. The experiments on Bose–Einstein condensates are also candidates for images of hydrogen atoms. The company Hitachi made a fool of itself in 1992 by claiming in a press release that its newest electron microscope could image hydrogen atoms. Cited on page 1039.

859 J. Schmiedmayer, M. S. Chapman, C. R. Ekstrom, T. D. Hammond, S. Wehinger & D. E. Pritchard, Index of refraction of various gases for sodium matter waves, *Physical Review Letters* **74**, p. 1043-1046, 1995. Cited on page 1039.

860 An introduction is given by P. Pinkse & G. Rempe, Wie fängt man ein Atom mit einem Photon?, *Physikalische Blätter* **56**, pp. 49–51, 2000. Cited on page 1040.

861 A. M. Wolsky, Kinetic energy, size, and the uncertainty principle, *American Journal of Physics* **42**, pp. 760–763, 1974. Cited on page 1040.

862 R. Pello, D. Schaerer, J. Richard, J.-F. Le Borgne & J.-P. Kneib, ISAAC/VLT observations of a lensed galaxy at z=10.0, *Astronomy and Astrophysics* **416**, p. L35, 2004. Cited on page 1043.

863 A pedagogical introduction is given by L. J. Curtis & D. G. Ellis, Use of the Einstein–Brillouin–Keller action quantization, *American Journal of Physics* **72**, pp. 1521–1523, 2004. Cited on pages 1044 and 1046.

864 J. Neukammer & al., Spectroscopy of Rydberg atoms at $n \sim 500$, *Physical Review Letters* **59**, pp. 2947–2950, 1987. Cited on page 1045.

865 Mark P. Silverman, *And Yet It Moves: Strange Systems and Subtle Questions in Physics*, Cambridge University Press 1993. A beautiful book by an expert on motion. Cited on pages 1045 and 1050.

866 This is explained by J. D. Hey, Mystery error in Gamow's Tompkins reappears, *Physics Today* pp. 88–89, May 2001. Cited on page 1045.

867 L. L. Foldy, The electromagnetic properties of Dirac particles, *Physical Review* **83**, pp. 688–693, 1951. L. L. Foldy, The electron–neutron interaction, *Physical Review* **83**, pp. 693–696, 1951. L. L. Foldy, Electron–neutron interaction, *Review of Modern Physics* **30**, pp. 471–481, 1952. Cited on page 1048.

868 H. Euler & B. Kockel, *Naturwissenschaften* **23**, p. 246, 1935, H. Euler, *Annalen der Physik* **26**, p. 398, 1936, W. Heisenberg & H. Euler, Folgerung aus der Diracschen Theorie des Electrons, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **98**, pp. 714–722, 1936. Cited on page 1049.

869 The g-factors for composite nuclei are explained by ... See also Hans Dehmelt, Is the electron a composite particle?, *Hyperfine Interactions* **81**, pp. 1–3, 1993. Cited on page 1038.

870 For the atomic case, see P. L. Gould, G. A. Ruff & D. E. Pritchard, Diffraction of atoms by light: the near resonant Kapitza–Dirac effect, *Physical Review Letters* **56**, pp. 827–830, 1986. Many early experimental attempts to observe the diffraction of electrons by light, in particular those performed in the 1980s, were controversial; most showed only the deflection of electrons, as explained by H. Batelaan, *Contemporary Physics* **41**, p. 369, 2000. Later on, he and his group performed the newest and most spectacular experiment, demonstrating real diffraction, including interference effects; it is described in D. L. Freimund, K. Aflatooni & H. Batelaan, Observation of the Kapitza–Dirac effect, *Nature* **413**, pp. 142–143, 2001. Cited on page 1050.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

871 G. Gabrielse, D. Hanneke, T. Kinoshita, M. Nio & B. Odom, New determination of the fine structure constant from the electron g value and QED, *Physical Review Letters* **97**, p. 030802, 2006. Cited on page 1050.

872 Wolfgang Pauli, Exclusion principle and quantum mechanics, Nobel lecture, 13 December 1946, in *Nobel Lectures, Physics*, Volume 3, 1942–1962, Elsevier, 1964. Cited on page 1051.

873 See the paper by Martin Gardner, Science fiction puzzle tales, Clarkson Potter, **67**, pp. 104–105, 1981, or his book *Aha! Insight*, Scientific American & W.H. Freeman, 1978. The rabbit story is from A. Hajnal & P. Lovász, An algorithm to prevent the propagation of certain diseases at minimum cost, in *Interfaces Between Computer Science and Operations Research*, edited by J. K. Lenstra, A. H. G. Rinnooy Kan & Van Emde Boas, Mathematisch Centrum, Amsterdam 1978, whereas the computer euphemism is used by A. Orlitzky & L. Shepp, On curbing virus propagation, Technical memorandum, Bell Labs 1989. Cited on page 1052.

874 A complete discussion of the problem can be found in chapter 10 of Ilan Vardi, *Computational Recreations in Mathematica*, Addison Wesley, Redwood City, California, 1991. Cited on page 1052.

875 On Gibbs' paradox, see your favourite text on thermodynamics or statistical mechanics. See also W. H. Zurek, Algorithmic randomness and physical entropy, *Physical Review A* **40**, pp. 4731–4751, 1989. Zurek shows that the Sackur–Tetrode formula can be derived from algorithmic entropy considerations. Cited on page 1053.

876 S. N. Bose, Plancks Gesetz und Lichtquantenhypothese, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **26**, pp. 178–181, 1924. The theory was then expanded in A. Einstein, Quantentheorie des einatomigen idealen Gases, *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* **22**, pp. 261–267, 1924, A. Einstein, Quantentheorie des einatomigen idealen Gases. Zweite Abhandlung, *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* **23**, pp. 3–14, 1925, A. Einstein, Zur Quantentheorie des idealen Gases, *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* **23**, pp. 18–25, 1925. Cited on page 1057.

877 C. K. Hong, Z. Y. Ou & L. Mandel, Measurement of subpicosecond time intervals between two photons by interference, *Physical Review Letters* **59**, pp. 2044–2046, 1987. Cited on page 1057.

878 M. Schellekens, R. Hoppeler, A. Perrin, J. Viana Gomes, D. Boiron, C. I. Westbrook & A. Aspect, Hanbury Brown Twiss effect for ultracold quantum gases, *Science* **310**, p. 648, 2005, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat/0508466. J. Viana Gomes, A. Perrin, M. Schellekens, D. Boiron, C. I. Westbrook & M. Belsley, Theory for a Hanbury Brown Twiss experiment with a ballistically expanding cloud of cold atoms, *Physical Review A* **74**, p. 053607, 2006, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0606147. T. Jeltes, J. M. McNamara, W. Hogervorst, W. Vassen, V. Krachmalnicoff, M. Schellekens, A. Perrin, H. Chang, D. Boiron, A. Aspect & C. I. Westbrook, Comparison of the Hanbury Brown-Twiss effect for bosons and fermions, *Nature* **445**, p. 402, 2007, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat/0612278. Cited on page 1058.

879 The experiment is described in E. Ramberg & G. A. Snow, Experimental limit on a small violation of the Pauli principle, *Physics Letters B* **238**, pp. 438–441, 1990. Other experimental tests are reviewed in O. W. Greenberg, Particles with small violations of Fermi or Bose statistics, *Physical Review D* **43**, pp. 4111–4120, 1991. Cited on page 1060.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

880 The issue is treated in his *Summa Theologica*, in question 52 of the first part. The complete text, several thousand pages, can be found on the www.newadvent.org website. Cited on page 1069.

881 The original no-cloning theorem is by D. Dieks, Communication by EPR devices, *Physics Letters A* **92**, pp. 271–272, 1982, and by W. K. Wootters & W. H. Zurek, A single quantum cannot be cloned, *Nature* **299**, pp. 802–803, 1982. For a discussion of photon and multiparticle cloning, see N. Gisin & S. Massar, Optimal quantum cloning machines, *Physics Review Letters* **79**, pp. 2153–2156, 1997. The whole topic has been presented in detail by V. Buzek & M. Hillery, Quantum cloning, *Physics World* **14**, pp. 25–29, November 2001. Cited on page 1061.

882 The most recent experimental and theoretical results on physical cloning are described in A. Lamas-Linares, C. Simon, J. C. Howell & D. Bouwmeester, Experimental quantum cloning of single photons, *Science* **296**, pp. 712 – 714, 2002, D. Collins & S. Popescu, A classical analogue of entanglement, preprint arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0107082, 2001, and A. Daffertshofer, A. R. Plastino & A. Plastino, Classical no-cloning theorem, *Physical Review Letters* **88**, p. 210601, 2002. Cited on page 1062.

883 E. Wigner, On unitary representations of the inhomogeneous Lorentz group, *Annals of Mathematics* **40**, pp. 149–204, 1939. This famous paper summarises the work which later brought him the Nobel Prize in Physics. Cited on page 1063.

884 Wolfgang Pauli, The connection between spin and statistics, *Physical Review* **58**, pp. 716– 722, 1940. Cited on page 1065.

885 For a full list of isotopes, see R. B. Firestone, *Table of Isotopes, Eighth Edition, 1999 Update*, with CDROM, John Wiley & Sons, 1999. Cited on page 1065.

886 This famous explanation is given, for example, on page 1148 in C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne & J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, Freeman, 1973. It is called the *scissor trick* on page 43 of volume 1 of R. Penrose & W. Rindler, *Spinors and Spacetime*, 1984. It is also cited and discussed by R. Gould, Answer to question #7, *American Journal of Physics* **63**, p. 109, 1995. Cited on page 1066.

887 M. V. Berry & J. M. Robbins, Indistinguishability for quantum particles: spin, statistics and the geometric phase, *Proceedings of the Royal Society in London A* **453**, pp. 1771–1790, 1997. See also the comments to this result by J. Twamley, Statistics given a spin, *Nature* **389**, pp. 127–128, 11 September 1997. Their newer results are M. V. Berry & J. M. Robbins, Quantum indistinguishability: alternative constructions of the transported basis, *Journal of Physics A (Letters)* **33**, pp. L207–L214, 2000, and M. V. Berry & J. M. Robbins, in *Spin-Statistics*, eds. R. Hilborn & G. Tino, (American Institute of Physics), 2000, pp. 3–15. See also Michael Berry's home page on the www.phy.bris.ac.uk/staff/berry_mv.html website. Cited on page 1067.

888 R. W. Hartung, Pauli principle in Euclidean geometry, *American Journal of Physics* **47**, pp. 900–910, 1979. Cited on page 1068.

889 The point that spin can be seen as a rotation was already made by F. J. Belinfante, On the spin angular momentum of mesons, *Physica* **6**, p. 887, 1939, and taken up again by Hans C. Ohanian, What is spin?, *American Journal of Physics* **54**, pp. 500–505, 1986. See also E. Duran & A. Erschow, *Physikalische Zeitschrift der Sowjetunion* **12**, p. 466, 1937. Cited on page 1071.

890 Generalizations of bosons and fermions are reviewed in the (serious!) paper by O. W. Greenberg, D. M. Greenberger & T. V. Greenbergest, (Para)bosons, (para)fermions, quons and other beasts in the menagerie of particle statistics, at arxiv.org/

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

abs/hep-th/9306225. A newer summary is O. W. Greenberg, Theories of violation of statistics, electronic preprint available at arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0007054, 2000. Cited on page 1073.

891 Gell-Mann wrote this for the 1976 Nobel Conference (not for the Nobel speech; he is the only winner who never published it.) M. Gell-Mann, What are the building blocks of matter?, in D. Huff & O. Prewitt, editors, *The Nature of the Physical Universe*, New York, Wiley, 1979, p. 29. Cited on page 1074.

892 See e.g. the reprints of his papers in the standard collection by John A. Wheeler & Wojciech H. Zurek, *Quantum Theory and Measurement*, Princeton University Press, 1983. Cited on page 1075.

893 H. D. Zeh, On the interpretation of measurement in quantum theory, *Foundations of Physics* **1**, pp. 69–76, 1970. Cited on page 1075.

894 Linda Reichl, *A Modern Course in Statistical Physics*, Wiley, 2nd edition, 1998. An excellent introduction into thermodynamics. Cited on page 1076.

895 E. Joos & H. D. Zeh, The emergence of classical properties through interactions with the environment, *Zeitschrift für Physik B* **59**, pp. 223–243, 1985. See also Erich Joos, *Decoherence and the appearance of a classical world in quantum theory*, Springer Verlag, 2003. Cited on page 1077.

896 M. Tegmark, Apparent wave function collapse caused by scattering, *Foundation of Physics Letters* **6**, pp. 571–590, 1993, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9310032. See also his paper that shows that the brain is not a quantum computer, M. Tegmark, The importance of quantum decoherence in brain processes, *Physical Review E* **61**, pp. 4194–4206, 2000, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9907009. Cited on page 1078.

897 The decoherence time is bound from above by the relaxation time. See A. O. Caldeira & A. J. Leggett, Influence of damping on quantum interference: an exactly soluble model, *Physical Review A* **31**, 1985, pp. 1059–1066. This is the main reference about effects of decoherence for a harmonic oscillator. The general approach to relate decoherence to the influence of the environment is due to Niels Bohr, and has been pursued in detail by Hans Dieter Zeh. Cited on page 1079.

898 G. Lindblad, On the generators of quantum dynamical subgroups, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **48**, pp. 119–130, 1976. Cited on page 1079.

899 Wojciech H. Zurek, Decoherence and the transition from quantum to classical, *Physics Today* pp. 36–44, October 1991. An easy but somewhat confusing article. His reply to the numerous letters of response in *Physics Today, April* 1993, pp. 13–15, and pp. 81–90, exposes his ideas in a clearer way and gives a taste of the heated discussions on this topic. Cited on pages 1080 and 1084.

900 John Bardeen, explained this regularly in the review talks he gave at the end of his life, such as the one the author heard in Tokyo in 2000. Cited on page 1080.

901 The first decoherence measurement was performed by M. Brune & al., Observing progressive decoherence of the "meter" in a quantum measurement, *Physical Review Letters* 77, pp. 4887–4890, 9 December 1996. Cited on page 1080.

902 Later experiments confirming the numerical predictions from decoherence were published by C. Monroe, D. M. Meekhof, B. E. King & D. J. Wineland, A "Schrödinger cat" superposition state of an atom, *Science* **272**, pp. 1131–1136, 1996, W. P. Schleich, Quantum physics: engineering decoherence, *Nature* **403**, pp. 256–257, 2000, C. J. Myatt, B. E. King, Q. A. Turchette, C. A. Sackett, D. Kielpinski, W. M. Itano, C. Monroe & D. J. Wineland, Decoherence of quantum su-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

perpositions through coupling to engineered reservoirs, *Nature* **403**, pp. 269–273, 2000. See also the summary by W. T. Strunz, G. Alber & F. Haake, Dekohärenz in offenen Quantensystemen, *Physik Journal* **1**, pp. 47–52, November 2002. Cited on page 1080.

903 L. Hackermüller, K. Hornberger, B. Brezger, A. Zeilinger & M. Arndt, Decoherence of matter waves by thermal emission of radiation, *Nature* **427**, pp. 711–714, 2004. Cited on page 1080.

904 K. Baumann, Quantenmechanik und Objektivierbarkeit, *Zeitschrift für Naturforschung* **25a**, pp. 1954–1956, 1970. Cited on page 1081.

905 See for example D. Styer, *Physics Today* p. 11, September 2000. Cited on page 1083.

906 David Bohm, *Quantum Theory*, Prentice-Hall, 1951, pp. 614–622. Cited on page 1083.

907 A. Einstein, B. Podolsky & N. Rosen, Can quantum-mechanical description of reality be considered complete?, *Physical Review* **48**, pp. 696–702, 1935. Cited on page 1083.

908 A. Aspect, J. Dalibard & G. Roger, Experimental tests of Bell's inequalities using time-varying analyzers, *Physical Review Letters* **49**, pp. 1804–1807, 1982, Cited on page 1083.

909 G. C. Hergerfeldt, Causality problems for Fermi's two-atom system, *Physical Review Letters* **72**, pp. 596–599, 1994. Cited on page 1084.

910 David Z. Albert, *Quantum Mechanics and Experience*, Harvard University Press, 1994. No citations.

911 On the superposition of magnetization in up and down directions there are numerous papers. Recent experiments on the subject of quantum tunnelling in magnetic systems are described in D. D. Awschalom, J. F. Smith, G. Grinstein, D. P. DiVicenzo & D. Loss, Macroscopic quantum tunnelling in magnetic proteins, *Physical Review Letters* **88**, pp. 3092–3095, 1992, and in C. Paulsen & al., Macroscopic quantum tunnelling effects of Bloch walls in small ferromagnetic particles, *Europhysics Letters* **19**, pp. 643–648, 1992. Cited on page 1085.

912 The prediction that quantum tunnelling could be observable when the dissipative interaction with the rest of the world is small enough was made by Leggett; the topic is reviewed in A. J. Leggett, S. Chahravarty, A. T. Dorsey, M. P. A. Fisher, A. Garg & W. Zwerger, Dynamics of dissipative 2-state systems, *Review of Modern Physics* **59**, pp. 1–85, 1987. Cited on page 1088.

913 For example, superpositions were observed in Josephson junctions by R. F. Voss & R. A. Webb, Macroscopic quantum tunnelling in 1 mm Nb Josephson junctions, *Physical Review Letters* **47**, pp. 265–268, 1981, Cited on page 1085.

914 S. Haroche, Entanglement, decoherence and the quantum-classical transition, *Physics Today* **51**, pp. 36–42, July 1998. An experiment putting atom at two places at once, distant about 80 nm, was published by C. Monroe & al., *Science* **272**, p. 1131, 1996. Cited on page 1085.

915 M.R. Andres & al., Observations of interference between two Bose condensates, *Science* **275**, pp. 637–641, 31 January 1997. See also the www.aip.org/physnews/special.htm website. Cited on page 1085.

916 The most famous reference on the wave function collapse is chapter IV of the book by Kurt Gottfried, *Quantum Mechanics*, Benjamin, New York, 1966, It is the favorite reference by Victor Weisskopf, and cited by him on every occasion he talks about the topic. Cited on page 1087.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

917 An experimental measurement of superpositions of left and right flowing currents with 10^{10} electrons was J. E. Mooij, T. P. Orlando, L. Levitov, L. Tian, van der Wal & S. Lloyd, Josephson persistent-current qubit, *Science* **285**, pp. 1036–1039, 1999. In the year 2000, superpositions of 1 µA clockwise and anticlockwise have been detected; for more details, see J.R. Friedman & al., Quantum superposition of distinct macroscopic states, *Nature* **406**, p. 43, 2000. Cited on page 1085.

918 Collapse times have been measured ... Cited on page 1091.

919 A clear discussion can be found in S. Haroche & J.-M. Raimond, Quantum computing: dream or nightmare?, *Physics Today* **49**, pp. 51–52, 1996, as well as the comments in *Physics Today* **49**, pp. 107–108, 1996. Cited on page 1086.

920 S. Kochen & E. P. Specker, The problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics, **17**, pp. 59–87, 1967. Cited on page 1092.

921 J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony & R. A. Holt, *Physical Review Letters* **23**, p. 880, 1969. The more general and original result is found in J. S. Bell, *Physics* **1**, p. 195, 1964, Cited on page 1092.

922 Bryce de Witt & Neill Graham, eds., *The Many–Worlds Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics*, Princeton University Press, 1973. This interpretation talks about entities which cannot be observed, namely the many worlds, and often assumes that the wave function of the universe exists. Both habits are beliefs and in contrast with facts. Cited on page 1094.

923 'On the other had I think I can safely say that nobody understands quantum mechanics.' From Richard P. Feynman, *The Character of Physical Law*, MIT Press, Cambridge, 1965, p. 129. He repeatedly made this statement, e.g. in the introduction of his otherwise excellent *QED: the Strange Theory of Light and Matter*, Penguin Books, 1990. Cited on page 1095.

924 M. Tegmark, The importance of quantum decoherence in brain processes, *Physical Review D* **61**, pp. 4194–4206, 2000, or also arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9907009. Cited on page 1096.

925 Connections between quantum theory and information theory can be found in ... Cited on page 1096.

926 J. A. Wheeler, pp. 242–307, in *Batelle Recontres: 1967 Lectures in Mathematics and Physics*, C. DeWitt & J. A. Wheeler, editors, W.A. Benjamin, 1968. For a pedagogical explanation, see John W. Norbury, From Newton's laws to the Wheeler-DeWitt equation, arxiv.org/abs/physics/980604 or *European Journal of Physics* **19**, pp. 143–150, 1998. Cited on page 1097.

927 E. Fermi, Quantum theory of radiation, *Review of Modern Physics* **4**, p. 87, 1932. No citations.

928 G. Hegerfeldt, Causality problems for Fermi's two-atom system, *Physical Review Letters* **72**, pp. 596–599, 1994, No citations.

929 The beautiful analogy between optics and two-dimensional electron systems, in GaAs at helium temperature, has been studied in detail in C. W. J. Beenakker & van Houten, Solid State Physics, **44**, pp. 1–228, 1991, No citations.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



CHALLENGE HINTS AND SOLUTIONS

Challenge 1330, page 976: Classical physics fails in explaining any material property, such as colour or softness. Material properties result from nature's interactions; they are inevitably quantum. Explanations always require particles and their quantum properties.

Challenge 1331, page 977: Classical physics allows any observable to change *smoothly* with time. There is no minimum value for any observable physical quantity.

Challenge 1332, page 979: The higher the mass, the smaller the motion fuzziness induced by the quantum of action, because action is mass times speed times distance: For a large mass, the speed and distance variations are small.

Challenge 1333, page 979: The simplest time is $\sqrt{2G\hbar/c^5}$. The factor 2 is obviously not fixed; it is explained later on. Including it, this time is the shortest time measurable in nature.

Challenge 1334, page 980: The electron charge is special to the electromagnetic interactions; it does not take into account the nuclear interactions or gravity. It is unclear why the length defined with the elementary charge e should be of importance for neutral systems or for the vacuum. On the other hand, the quantum of action $\hbar$ is valid for all interactions and observations. However, one can also argue that the two options to define a fundamental length are not too different, as the electron charge is related to the quantum of action by $e = \sqrt{4\pi\varepsilon_0 \alpha c\hbar}$.

Challenge 1336, page 980: On purely dimensional grounds, the radius of an atom must be

$$r \approx \frac{\hbar^2 4\pi\varepsilon_0}{me^2} \tag{683}$$

This is about 160 nm; indeed, this guessed equation is simply π times the Bohr radius.

Challenge 1337, page 980: Due to the quantum of action, atoms in all people, be they giants or dwarfs, have the same size. That giants do not exist was shown already by Galilei. The argument is based on the given strength of materials, which thus implies that atoms are the same everywhere. That dwarfs cannot exist is due to the same reason; nature is not able to make people smaller than usual (except in the womb) as this would require smaller atoms.

Page 254

Challenge 1340, page 985: A disappearance of a mass m in a time Δt is an action change $mc^2\Delta t$. That is much larger than $\hbar$ for all objects of everyday life.

Challenge 1342, page 987: Tunnelling of a lion would imply action values S of the order of $S = 100\,\mathrm{kg}1\,\mathrm{m}1\,\mathrm{m/s} \ll \hbar$. This cannot happen spontaneously.

Challenge 1345, page 987: Yes! Many beliefs and myths are due to the neglect of quantum effects.

Challenge 1346, page 987: Continuous flow is in contrast to the fuzziness of motion induced by the quantum of action.

Challenge 1347, page 988: The impossibility of following particles appears when their distance d is smaller than their position indeterminacy due to their relative momentum p, thus when $d < \hbar/p$. Check the numbers with electrons, atoms, molecules, bacteria, people and galaxies.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1348, page 988: Also photons are indistinguishable. See page 1011.

Challenge 1350, page 992: The big bang cannot have been an event, for example.

Challenge 1351, page 992: The total angular momentum counts, including the orbital angular momentum. The orbital angular momentum $\boldsymbol{L}$ is given, using the radius and the linear momentum, $\boldsymbol{L} = \boldsymbol{r} \times \boldsymbol{p}$.

Challenge 1352, page 992: Yes, we could have!

Challenge 1353, page 992: That is just the indeterminacy relation. Bohr expanded this to idea to all sort of other pairs of concepts, more in the philosophical domain, such as clarity and precision of explanations: both cannot be high at the same time.

Challenge 1354, page 993: Growth is not proportional to light intensity or to light frequency, but shows both intensity and frequency thresholds. That is a quantum effects.

Challenge 1355, page 993: All effects mentioned above, such as tunnelling, interference, decay, transformation, non-emptiness of the vacuum, indeterminacy and randomness, are also observed in the nuclear domain.

Challenge 1356, page 993: This is not evident from what was said so far, but it turns out to be correct. In fact, there is no other option, as you will see when you try to find one.

Challenge 1368, page 1006: To be observable to the eye, the interference fringes need to be visible for around 0.1 s. That implies a maximum frquency difference between the two beams of around 10 Hz. This is achievable only if either a single beam is split into two or if the two beams come from high-precision, stabilized lasers.

Challenge 1382, page 1017: Use the temperature to calculate the average kinetic energy, and thus the average speed of atoms.

Challenge 1383, page 1017: The atoms cannot be fully distinguished; they form a state of matter with peculiar properties, called a *condensate*. The condensate is not at rest either; but due to its large mass, its fluctuations are greatly reduced, compared to those of a single atom.

Challenge 1386, page 1021: Use $\Delta E < E$ and $a\ \Delta t < c$.

Challenge 1394, page 1033: Terabyte chips would need to have small memory cells. Small cells imply thin barriers. Thin barriers imply high probabilities for tunneling. Tunneling implies lack of memory.

Challenge 1400, page 1039: The difficulties to see hydrogen atoms are due to their small size and their small number of electrons. As a result, hydrogen atoms produce only weak contrasts in X-ray images. For the same reasons it is difficult to image them using electrons; the Bohr radius of hydrogen is only slightly larger than the electron Compton wavelength.

Challenge 1404, page 1040: $r = 86\,\mathrm{pm}$, thus $T = 12\,\mathrm{eV}$. That compares to the actual value of 13.6 eV. The trick for the derivation of the formula is to use $< \psi | r_x^2 | \psi >= \frac{1}{3} < \psi | \boldsymbol{r}\boldsymbol{r} | \psi >$, a relation valid for states with no orbital angular momentum. It is valid for all coordinates and also for the three momentum observables, as long as the system is non-relativistic.

Challenge 1415, page 1051: A change of physical units such that $\hbar = c = e = 1$ would change the value of ε_0 in such a way that $4\pi\varepsilon_\mathrm{o} = 1/\alpha = 137.036\ldots$

Challenge 1416, page 1052: Point particles cannot be marked; nearby point particles cannot be distinguished, due to the quantum of action.

Challenge 1417, page 1052: The solution is *two* gloves. In other words, if two men and two women want to make love without danger and , they need only *two* condoms. You can deduce the procedure by yourself.

Challenge 1421, page 1053: The Sackur–Tetrode formula is best deduced in the following way. We start with an ideal monoatomic gas of volume V, with N particles, and total energy U. In

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

phase space, *state sum* Z is given by

$$Z = \frac{V^N}{N!}\frac{1}{\Lambda^{3N}} \,. \tag{684}$$

We use Stirling's approximation $N! \approx N^N/e^N$, and the definition of the entropy as $S = \partial(kT \ln Z)/\partial T$. Inserting the definition of Λ, this gives the Sackur–Tetrode equation.

Challenge 1422, page 1055: For a large number of particles, the interaction energy will introduce errors. For very large numbers, the gravitational binding energy will do so as well.

Challenge 1424, page 1056: Two write two particles on paper, one has to distinguish them, even if the distinction is arbitrary.

Challenge 1425, page 1057: Trees, like all macroscopic objects, have a spin value that depends on their angular momentum. Being classical objects whose phase can be observed, the spin value is uncertain. (But even large multiples of $\hbar$ are too small to be measurable in everyday life.) Generally speaking, trees, mountains and people are spin 1 objects. The spin 1 value implies that these objects are unchanged after a full rotation. (How does a block of silver, made of an odd number of silver atoms, each with spin 1/2, relate to this answer?)

Challenge 1429, page 1062: Twins differ in the way their intestines are folded, in the lines of their hands and other skin folds. Sometimes, but not always, features like black points on the skin are mirror inverted on the two twins.

Challenge 1435, page 1068: Three.

Challenge 1436, page 1069: Angels can be distinguished by name, can talk and can sing; thus they are made of a large number of fermions. In fact, many angels are human sized, so that they do not even fit on the tip of a pin.

Challenge 1443, page 1073: Ghosts, like angels, can be distinguished by name, can talk and can be seen; thus they contain fermions. However, they can pass through walls and they are transparent; thus they cannot be made of fermions, but must be images, made of bosons. That is a contradiction.

Challenge 1445, page 1077: The loss of non-diagonal elements leads to an increase in the diagonal elements, and thus of entropy.

Challenge 1448, page 1082: The energy speed is given by the advancement of the outer two tails; that speed is never larger than the speed of light.

Challenge 1449, page 1084: No, as taking a photo implies an interaction with a bath, which would destroy the superposition.

Challenge 1450, page 1085: A photograph requires illumination; illumination is a macroscopic electromagnetic field; a macroscopic field is a bath; a bath implies decoherence; decoherence destroys superpositions.

Challenge 1453, page 1086: It depends. They can be due to interference or to intensity sums. In the case of radio the effect is clearer. If at a particular frequency the signals changes periodically from one station to another, one has a genuine interference effect.

Challenge 1455, page 1086: Such a computer requires clear phase relations between components; such phase relations are extremely sensitive to outside disturbances. At present, they do not hold longer than a microsecond, whereas long computer programs require minutes and hours to run.

Challenge 1459, page 1093: Any other bath also does the trick, such as the atmosphere, sound vibrations, electromagnetic fields, etc.

Challenge 1460, page 1094: The Moon is in contact with baths like the solar wind, falling meteorites, the electromagnetic background radiation of the deep universe, the neutrino flux from the Sun, cosmic radiation, etc.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1461, page 1095: Spatially periodic potentials have the property. Decoherence then leads to momentum diagonalization.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

CREDITS

Since May 2007, the production and distribution of this text is generously supported by the Klaus Tschira Foundation.

Film credits

The hydrogen orbital image and animation of page 1022 were produced with a sponsored copy of Dean Dauger's software package *Atom in a Box*, available at daugerresearch.com. The animation of the belt trick on page 1066 is copyright and courtesy by Greg Egan; it can be found on his website gregegan.customer.netspace.net.au/APPLETS/21/21.html.

Image credits

The photograph of a glow worm on page 973 is copyright and courtesy of John Tyler, and found on his beautiful website at www.johntyler.co.uk/gwfacts.htm. The photograph of page 977 is a present to the author by Ata Masafumi, who owns the copyright. The graphics of the colour spectrum on page 995 is copyright and courtesy of Andrew Young and explained on his website mintaka.sdsu.edu/GF/explain/optics/rendering.html. The pictures of the low-intensity photon interference experiment of page 996 are copyright of the Delft University of Technology, courtesy of Silvania Pereira, and found on the website http://www.optica.tn.tudelft.nl/education/photons.asp. The blue sky photograoh on page 1015 is courtesy and copyright Giorgio di Iorio, and found on his website http://www.flickr.com/photos/gioischia/. The famous photograph of electron diffraction on page 1019 is copyright and courtesy of Claus Jönsson. The almost equally famous image that shows the build-up of electron diffraction on page 1020 is courtesy and copyright Tonomura Akira/Hitachi: it is found on the http://www.hqrd.hitachi.co.jp/em/doubleslit.cfm website. The photographs of the Aharonov–Bohm effect on page 1034 are copyright and courtesy of Doru Cuturela. The measured colour spectrum on page 1042 is copyright and courtesy of Nigel Sharp, NOAO, FTS, NSO, KPNO, AURA and NSF. The hydrogen orbital image and animation of page 1022 were produced with a sponsored copy of Dean Dauger's software package *Atom in a Box*, available at http://daugerresearch.com. The experiment pictures of the bunching and anti-bunching of ^{3}He and ^{4}He on page 1058 are from the website atomoptic.iota.u-psud.fr/research/helium/helium.html and courtesy and copyright of Denis Boiron and Jerome Chatin.

The historical portraits of physicists in the text do not have copyright, except where mentioned. All drawings not explicitly mentioned are copyright © 1997 – 2009 by Christoph Schiller. If you suspect that a copyright is not correctly given or obtained, this has not done on purpose, and you are kindly asked to contact the author.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Fifth Part

Pleasure, Technology and Stars

In our quest to understand how things move
as a result of a minimal change in nature, we discover
that interactions are exchanges of radiation particles,
why the floor does not fall but keeps on carrying us,
why a smallest change is necessary to make pleasure possible,
why empty space pulls mirrors together,
why the stars shine,
and why swimming and flying is not so easy.

Contents

1119 40 Motion for enjoying life

1119 **Biological machines**

Reproduction 1120 • Quantum machines 1121 • How do we move? – Molecular motors 1122 • Linear molecular motors 1125 • Curiosities and fun challenges about biology 1126

1131 **The physics of pleasure**

The nerves and the brain 1134 • Living clocks 1134 • When do clocks exist? 1135 • The precision of clocks 1136 • Why are predictions so difficult, especially of the future? 1138 • Decay and the golden rule 1138 • The present in quantum theory 1139 • Why can we observe motion? 1140 • Rest and the quantum Zeno effect 1141 • Consciousness – a result of the quantum of action 1141 • Why can we observe motion? – Again 1142 • Curiosities and fun challenges about quantum experience 1142 • Summary on pleasure 1145

1146 41 Changing the world with quantum theory

1146 **Chemistry – from atoms to DNA**

Bonds 1147 • Ribonucleic acid and deoxyribonucleic acid 1149 • Curiosities and fun challenges about chemistry 1150

1152 **Materials science**

Why does the floor not fall? 1152 • Rocks and stones 1153 • Some interesting crystals 1153 • How can one look through matter? 1160 • What is necessary to make matter invisible? 1160 • The causes of colour 1163 • How does matter behave at the lowest temperatures? 1170 • Curiosities and fun challenges about materials science 1171

1176 **Quantum technology**

Motion without friction – superconductivity and superfluidity 1176 • The fractional quantum Hall effect 1178 • Lasers and other spin-one vector boson launchers 1183 • Can two photons interfere? 1185 • Can two electron beams interfere? 1186 • Challenges, dreams and fun curiosities about quantum technology 1186

1189 42 Quantum electrodynamics – the origin of virtual reality

Ships, mirrors and the Casimir effect 1189 • The Lamb shift 1191 • The QED Lagrangian 1192 • Interactions and virtual particles 1192 • Vacuum energy 1192 • Moving mirrors 1192 • Photons hitting photons 1193 • Is the vacuum a bath? 1194 • Renormalization – why is an electron so light? 1194 • Curiosities and fun challenges of quantum electrodynamics 1195 • How can one move on perfect ice? – The ultimate physics test 1200 • A summary of quantum electrodynamics 1200 • Open questions in QED 1202

1204 43 Quantum mechanics with gravitation – the first approach

The phase of wave functions 1204 • Playing table tennis with neutrons 1204 • The gravitational Bohr atom 1206 • Gravitation and limits to disorder 1206 • Measuring acceleration with a thermometer – Fulling–Davies–Unruh radiation 1207 • Black holes aren't black 1208 • Gamma ray bursts 1211 • Material properties of black holes 1213 • How do black holes evaporate? 1214 • The information paradox of black holes 1214 • More paradoxes 1216 • Curiosities about quantum theory and gravity 1216 • Quantum mechanics of gravitation 1217 • Do gravitons exist? 1218 • Space-time foam 1218 • Decoherence of space-time 1219 • Quantum theory as the

enemy of science fiction 1219 • No vacuum means no particles 1220 • Summary on quantum theory and gravity 1220

1222 44 The structure of the nucleus – the densest clouds

A physical wonder – magnetic resonance imaging 1222 • The size of nuclei 1224 • Nuclei are composed 1227 • Nuclei can move alone – cosmic rays 1229 • Nuclei decay 1235 • Why is hell hot? 1236 • Nuclei can form composites 1237 • Nuclei have colours and shapes 1238 • The four types of motion in the nuclear domain 1239 • Nuclei react 1240 • Bombs and nuclear reactors 1241 • Curiosities and challenges on radioactivity 1242 • Summary on nuclei 1247

1248 45 The sun, the stars and the birth of matter

The Sun 1248 • Why do the stars shine? 1249 • Why are fusion reactors not common yet? 1252 • Where do our atoms come from? 1254 • Curiosities about the stars 1255 • Summary on stars 1256

1257 46 The strong interaction

The feeble side of the strong interaction 1257 • Bound motion, the particle zoo and the quark model 1258 • The Lagrangian of quantum chromodynamics 1260 • Experimental consequences of the quark model 1263 • Confinement of quarks – and elefants 1265 • Asymptotic freedom 1268 • The sizes and masses of quarks 1269 • The mass, shape and colour of protons 1270 • Curiosities about the strong interactions 1271 • A summary of QCD 1273

1275 47 The weak nuclear interaction and the handedness of nature

Transformation of elementary particles 1275 • The weakness of the weak nuclear interaction 1276 • Distinguishing left from right 1277 • Distinguishing particles and antiparticles, CP violation 1279 • Weak charge, mixings and symmetry breaking 1280 • The Lagrangian of the electroweak interaction 1282 • Curiosities about the weak interaction 1284 • A summary of the electroweak interaction 1288

1290 48 The standard model of elementary particle physics – as seen on television

Summary and open questions 1293

1295 49 Dreams of unification

Grand unification 1295 • The data 1296 • The state of grand unification 1297 • Searching for higher symmetries 1298 • Supersymmetry 1298 • Dualities – the most incredible symmetries of nature 1299 • Collective aspects of quantum field theory 1301 • A summary on higher symmetries 1302

1303 50 Bacteria, flies and knots

Bumblebees and other miniature flying systems 1303 • Swimming 1307 • Rotation, falling cats and the theory of shape change 1310 • Swimming in curved space 1313 • Turning a sphere inside out 1314 • Clouds 1315 • Vortices and the Schrödinger equation 1316 • Fluid space-time 1319 • Dislocations and solid space-time 1320 • Polymers 1322 • Knots and links 1324 • The hardest open problems that you can tell your grandmother 1325 • Curiosities and fun challenges on knots and wobbly entities 1327 • Summary on wobbly objects 1330

1332 51 Quantum physics in a nutshell

Achievements in precision 1332 • Physical results of quantum theory 1334 • Results of quantum field theory 1336 • Is quantum theory magic? 1338 • The dangers of buying a can of beans 1339 • The essence of quantum theory 1340 • What is unex-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

plained by quantum theory and general relativity? 1340 • How to delude oneself that one has reached the top of Motion Mountain 1343 • What awaits us? 1346

1348 E Composite particle properties

1363 Bibliography

1383 Challenge hints and solutions

1390 Credits

Film credits 1390 • Image credits 1390

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 40

MOTION FOR ENJOYING LIFE

> Homo sum, humani nil a me alienum puto.*
>
> Terence

Since we now can look at quantum effects without ideological baggage, let us have some serious fun in the world of quantum theory. The quantum of action has significant consequences for medicine, biology, chemistry, material science, and engineering. We will only explore a cross-section of these topics, but it will be worth it. But also art, the colours and materials it uses, the creative process in the artist, are based on quantum physics.** From a physics standpoint, all these domains study small motions of electric charges; thus understanding the details requires quantum theory – though usually not much.

Three special forms of electromagnetic motion are of special importance to humans: life, reproduction and death. We mentioned at the start of quantum theory that none of them can be described by classical physics. Life, sexuality and death are quantum effects. Let us see why.

BIOLOGICAL MACHINES

Living beings can be described as objects showing metabolism, information processing, information exchange, reproduction and motion. Obviously, all these properties follow from a single one, to which the others are enabling means:

▷ *Living beings are objects able to (self-)reproduce.****

From your biology lessons in secondary school you might remember the main properties of heredity. Reproduction is characterized by random changes from one generation to the next. The statistics of mutations, for example Mendel's 'laws' of heredity, and the lack of intermediate states, are direct consequences of quantum theory. In other words, reproduction and growth are quantum effects.

---

* 'I am a man and nothing human is alien to me.' Terence is Publius Terentius Afer (*c.* 190–159 BCE), the important roman poet. He writes this in his play *Heauton Timorumenos*, verse 77.

** The photograph on page 1115 shows a soap bubble, the motion of the fluid in it, and the interference colours; it was taken and is copyright by Jason Tozer for Creative Review/Sony.

*** However, there are examples of objects which reproduce and which nobody would call living. Can you find some examples, together with a sharper definition? Challenge 1462 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

In order to reproduce, living beings must be able to move in self-directed ways. An object able to perform self-directed motion is called a *machine*. All self-reproducing beings are machines.

Since reproduction and growth is simpler the smaller the system is, most living beings are extremely small machines for the tasks they perform, especially when compared to human made machines. This is the case even though the design of human machines has considerably fewer requirements: human-built machines do not need to be able to reproduce; as a result, they do not need to be made of a single piece of matter, as all living beings have to. Indeed, despite all the restrictions nature has to live with, living beings hold many miniaturization world records:

— The brain has the highest processing power per volume of any calculating device so far. Just look at the size of chess champion Gary Kasparov and the size of the computer against which he played. Or look at the size of any computer that attempts to speak.
— The brain has the densest and fastest memory of any device so far. The set of compact discs (CDs) or digital versatile discs (DVDs) that compare with the brain is many thousand times larger. Page 813
— Motors in living beings are many orders of magnitude smaller than human-built ones. Just think about the muscles in the legs of an ant.
— The motion of living beings beats the acceleration of any human-built machine by orders of magnitude. No machine moves like a grasshopper.
— Living being's sensor performance, such as that of the eye or the ear, has been surpassed by human machines only recently. For the nose this feat is still far away. Nevertheless, the sensor sizes developed by evolution – think also about the ears or eyes of a common fly – are still unbeaten.
— Living beings that fly, swim or crawl – such as fruit flies, plankton or amoebas – are still thousands of times smaller than anything built by humans. In particular, the navigation systems built by nature are far smaller than anything built by human technology.
— Can you spot more examples? Challenge 1463 s

The superior miniaturization of living beings – compared to human-built machines – is due to their continuous strife for efficient construction. In the structure of living beings, everything is connected to everything: each part influences many others. Indeed, the four basic processes in life, namely metabolic, mechanical, hormonal and electrical, are intertwined in space and time. For example, breathing helps digestion; head movements pump liquid through the spine; a single hormone influences many chemical processes. In addition, all parts in living systems have more than one function. For example, bones provide structure and produce blood; fingernails are tools and shed chemical waste.

The miniaturization, the reproduction, the growth and the functioning of living beings all rely on the quantum of action. Let us see how.

Reproduction

> Life is a sexually transmitted disease.
>
> Anonymous

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 488 A quantum machine (© Elmar Bartel)

All the astonishing complexity of life is geared towards reproduction. *Reproduction* is the ability of an object to build other objects similar to itself. Quantum theory told us that only a *similar* object is possible, as an exact copy would contradict the quantum of action, as we found out above.

Page 1061

Since reproduction requires mass increase, reproducing objects show both metabolism and growth. In order that growth can lead to an object similar to the original, a construction plan is necessary. This plan must be similar to the plan used by the previous generation. Organizing growth with a construction plan is only possible if nature is made of smallest entities which can be assembled following that plan.

We can thus deduce that reproduction implies that matter is made of smallest entities. If matter were not made of smallest entities, there would be no way to realize reproduction. The observation of reproduction thus implies the existence of atoms and the necessity of quantum theory. Indeed, without the quantum of action there would be no DNA molecules and there would be no way to inherit our own properties – our own construction plan – to children.

Passing on a plan requires that living beings have ways to store information. Living beings must have some built-in memory. We know already that a system with memory must be made of many particles. There is no other way to store information. The large number of particles is mainly necessary to protect the information from the influences of the outside world.

Our own construction plan, made of what biologists call genes, is stored in DNA molecules. Reproduction is thus first of all a transfer of parent's genes to the next generation. We will come back to the details below. We first have a look on how our body moves itself and its genes around.

Page 1149

Quantum machines

Living beings are machines. How do these machines work? From a physical point of view, we need only a few sections of our walk so far to describe them: universal gravity and QED. Simply stated, life is an electromagnetic process taking place in weak gravity.*

* In fact, also the nuclear interactions play some role for life: cosmic radiation is one source for random mutations, which are so important in evolution. Plant growers often use radioactive sources to increase

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

But the details of this statement are tricky and interesting. Table 95 gives an overview of motion processes in living beings. Interestingly, all motion in living beings can be summarized in a few classes by asking for the motor driving it.

Nature only needs few small but powerful devices to realize all motion types used by humans and all other living beings: *pumps* and *motors*. Given the long time that living systems have been around, these devices are extremely efficient. In fact, ion pumps, chemical pumps, rotational and linear molecular motors are all specialized molecular machines. Ion and chemical pumps are found in membranes and transport matter. Rotational and linear motor move structures against membranes. In short, all motion in living beings is due to molecular motors. Even though there is still a lot to be learned about them, what is known already is spectacular enough.

How do we move? – Molecular motors

How do our muscles work? What is the underlying motor? One of the beautiful results of modern biology is the elucidation of this issue. It turns out that muscles work because they contain molecules which change shape when supplied with energy. This shape change is repeatable. A clever combination and repetition of these molecular shape changes is then used to generate macroscopic motion. There are three basic classes of molecular motors: linear motors, rotational motors and pumps.

1. *Linear motors* are at the basis of muscle motion; other linear motors separate genes during cell division. They also move organelles inside cells and displace cells through the body during embryo growth, when wounds heal, or in other examples of cell motility. A typical molecular motor consumes around 100 to 1000 ATP molecules per second, thus about 10 to 100 aW. The numbers are small; however, we have to take into account that the power due to the white noise of the surrounding water is 10 nW. In other words, in every molecular motor, the power of the environmental noise is eight to nine orders of magnitude higher than the power consumed by the motor. The ratio shows what a fantastic piece of machinery such a motor is.

Challenge 1464 s

2. We encountered *rotational motors* already above; nature uses them to rotate the cilia of many bacteria as well as sperm tails. Researchers have also discovered that evolution produced molecular motors which turn around DNA helices like a motorized bolt would turn around a screw. Such motors are attached at the end of some viruses and insert the DNA into virus bodies when they are being built by infected cells, or extract the DNA from the virus after it has infected a cell. Another rotational motor, the smallest known so far – 10 nm across and 8 nm high – is ATP synthase, a protein that synthesizes most ATP in cells.

Page 86
Ref. 931
Ref. 932

3. *Molecular pumps* are essential to life. They pump chemicals, such as ions or specific molecules, into every cell or out of it, using energy, even if the concentration gradient

Ref. 930 mutation rates. But obviously, radioactivity can also terminate life.

The nuclear interactions are also implicitly involved in several other ways. They were necessary to form the materials – carbon, oxygen, etc. – required for life. Nuclear interactions are behind the main mechanism for the burning of the Sun, which provides the energy for plants, for humans and for all other living beings (except a few bacteria in inaccessible places).

Summing up, the nuclear interactions play a role in the appearance and in the in destruction of life; but they play no (known) role for the actions of particular living beings.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 95 Motion and motors found in living beings

Motion type	Examples	Involved motors
Growth	collective molecular processes in cell growth	ion pumps
	gene turn-on and turn-off	linear molecular motors
	ageing	linear molecular motors
Construction	material types and properties (polysaccharides, lipids, proteins, nucleic acids, others)	material transport through muscles
	forces and interactions between biomolecules	cell membrane pumps
Functioning	muscle working	linear molecular motors
	metabolism (respiration, digestion)	muscles, ion pumps
	thermodynamics of whole living system and of its parts	muscles
	nerve signalling	ion motion, ion pumps
	brain working, thinking	ion motion, ion pumps
	memory: long-term potentiation	chemical pumps
	hormone production	chemical pumps
	illnesses	cell motility, chemical pumps
	viral infection of a cell	rotational molecular motors for RNA transport
Defence	the immune system	cell motility, linear molecular motors
	blood clotting	chemical pumps
Sensing	eye	chemical pumps, ion pumps
	ear	hair motion sensors, ion pumps
	smell	ion pumps
	touch	ion pumps
Reproduction	information storage and retrieval	linear molecular motors inside cells, sometimes rotational motors, as in viruses
	cell division	linear molecular motors inside cells
	sperm motion	rotational molecular motors
	courting	muscles, brain, linear molecular motors
	evolution	muscles, linear molecular motors

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 489 Myosin and actin: the building bricks and the working of a linear molecular motor (image and QuickTime film © San Diego State University, Jeff Sale and Roger Sabbadini)



FIGURE 490 Sea urchin egg and sperm, or molecular motors in action: molecular motors make sperm move, make fecundation happen, and make cell division occur (photo by Kristina Yu, © Exploratorium www.exploratorium.edu)

tries to do the opposite. Molecular pumps are thus essential in ensuring that life is a process *far* from equilibrium. Malfunctioning molecular pumps are responsible for many problems, for example the water loss in cholera.

In the following, we concentrate on linear motors. The ways molecules produce move-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Ref. 933 ment in linear motors was uncovered during the 1990s. The results started a wave of research on all other molecular motors found in nature. All molecular motors share several characteristic properties: molecular motors do not involve temperature gradients involved, as car engines do, they do not involve electrical currents, as electrical motors do, and they do not rely on concentration gradients, as chemically induced motion, such as the rising of a cake, does.

Linear molecular motors

The central element of the most important linear molecular motor is a combination of two protein molecules, namely myosin and actin. Myosin changes between two shapes and literally *walks* along actin. It moves in regular small steps, as shown in Figure 489. The motion step size has been measured with beautiful experiments to always be an inte-
Ref. 933 ger multiple of 5.5 nm. A step, usually forward, but sometimes backwards, results whenever an ATP (adenosine triphosphate) molecule, the standard biological fuel, hydrolyses to ADP (adenosine diphosphate), thus releasing its energy. The force generated is about 3 to 4 pN; the steps can be repeated several times a second. Muscle motion is the result of thousand of millions of such elementary steps taking place in concert.

How do molecular motors work? Molecular motors are are so small that the noise due to the molecules of the liquid around them is not negligible. But nature is smart: with two tricks it takes advantage of Brownian motion and transforms it into macroscopic molecular motion. Molecular motors are therefore also called *Brownian motors*. The transformation of disordered molecular motion into ordered macroscopic motion is one of the great wonders of nature. The first trick of nature is the use of an asymmetric, but periodic potential, a so-called *ratchet*.* The second trick of nature is a temporal variation of the potential, together with an energy input to make it happen. The most
Ref. 934 important realizations are shown in Figure 491.

The periodic potential variation in a molecular motor ensures that for a short, recurring time interval the free Brownian motion of the moving molecule – typically 1 µm/s – affects its position. Subsequently, the molecule is fixed again. In most of the short time intervals of free Brownian motion, the position will not change. But if the position does change, the intrinsic asymmetry of the ratchet shape ensures that with high probability the molecule advances in the preferred direction. (The animation of Figure 489 lacks this irregularity.) Then the molecule is fixed again, waiting for the next potential change. On average, the myosin molecule will thus move in one direction. Nowadays the motion of single molecules can be followed in special experimental set-ups. These experiments confirm that muscles use such a ratchet mechanism. The ATP molecule adds energy to the system and triggers the potential variation through the shape change it induces in the myosin molecule. That is how our muscles work.

Another well-studied linear molecular motor is the kinesin–microtubule system that carries organelles from one place to the other within a cell. As in the previous example, also in this case chemical energy is converted into unidirectional motion. Researchers were able to attach small silica beads to single molecules and to follow their motion. Using laser beams, they could even apply forces to these single molecules. Kinesin was

* It was named by Walt Disney after by Ratchet Gearloose, the famous inventor from Duckburg.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 491 Two types of Brownian motors: switching potential (left) and tilting potential (right)

found to move with around 800 nm/s, in steps lengths which are multiples of 8 nm, using one ATP molecule at a time, and exerting a force of about 6 pN.

Quantum ratchet motors do not exits only in living systems; they also exist as human-built systems. Examples are electrical ratchets that move single electrons and optical ratchets that drive small particles. Extensive experimental research is going on in these fields.

Classical ratchets exist in many forms. For example, many piezoelectric actuators work as ratchets. All atomic force microscopes and scanning electron microscopes use such actuators.

Curiosities and fun challenges about biology

> Una pelliccia è una pelle che ha cambiato bestia.*
>
> Girolamo Borgogelli Avveduti

Discuss the following argument: If nature were classical instead of quantum, there would not be just *two* sexes – or any other discrete number of them – but there would be a *continuous range* of them. In a sense, there would be an infinite number of sexes. True? Challenge 1465 s

* *

Biological evolution can be summarized in three statements:

1. All living beings are different – also in a species.
2. All living beings have a tough life – due to competition.
3. Living beings with an advantage will survive and reproduce.

* 'A *fur* is a skin that has changed beast.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

As a result of these three points, with each generation, *species and living beings can change*. The result of accumulated generational change is called biological evolution. The last point is often called the 'survival of the fittest'.

These three points explain, among others, the change from unicellular to multicellular life, from fish to land animals, and from animals to people.

We note that quantum physics enters in every point that makes up evolution. For example, the differences mentioned in the first point are due to quantum physics: perfect copies of macroscopic systems are impossible. And of course, life and metabolism are quantum effects. The second point mentions competition; that is a type of measurement, which, as we saw, is only possible due to the existence of a quantum of action. The third point mentions reproduction: that is again a quantum effect, based on the copying of genes, which are quantum structures. In short, both life and its evolution are quantum effects.

* *

Challenge 1466 s How would you determine which of two identical twins is the father of a baby?

* *

Can you give at least five arguments to show that a human clone, if there will ever be one, Challenge 1467 s is a completely different person than the original?

It is well known that the first cloned cat, *copycat*, born in 2002, looked completely different from the 'original' (in fact, its mother). The fur colour and its patch pattern were completely different from that of the mother. Analogously, identical human twins have different finger prints, iris scans, blood vessel networks and intrauterine experiences, among others.

* *

A famous unanswered question: how did the first *kefir grains* form? Kefir grains produce the kefir drink when covered with milk for about 8 to 12 hours. The grains consist of a balanced mixture of about 40 types of bacteria and yeasts. All kefir grains in the world Challenge 1468 r are related. But how did the first ones form, about 1000 years ago?

* *

Many molecules found in living beings, such as sugar, have mirror molecules. However, in all living beings only one of the two sorts is found. Life is intrinsically asymmetric. Challenge 1469 s How can this be?

* *

How is it possible that the genetic difference between man and chimpanzee is regularly given as about 1 %, whereas the difference between man and woman is one chromosome Challenge 1470 s in 46, in other words, about 2.2 %?

* *

What is the longest time a single bacterium has survived? Not 5000 years as the bacteria Ref. 935 found in Egyptian mummies, not even 25 million years as the bacteria spores resurrected from the intestines in insects enclosed in amber. It is much longer, namely an astonishing

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 96 Approximate number of living species

Life group	Described species	Estimated species min.	Estimated species max.
Viruses	4 000	$50 \cdot 10^3$	$1 \cdot 10^6$
Prokaryotes ('bacteria')	4 000	$50 \cdot 10^3$	$3 \cdot 10^6$
Fungi	72 000	$200 \cdot 10^3$	$2.7 \cdot 10^6$
Protozoa	40 000	$60 \cdot 10^3$	$200 \cdot 10^3$
Algae	40 000	$150 \cdot 10^3$	$1 \cdot 10^6$
Plants	270 000	$300 \cdot 10^3$	$500 \cdot 10^3$
Nematodes	25 000	$100 \cdot 10^3$	$1 \cdot 10^6$
Crustaceans	40 000	$75 \cdot 10^3$	$200 \cdot 10^3$
Arachnids	75 000	$300 \cdot 10^3$	$1 \cdot 10^6$
Insects	950 000	$2 \cdot 10^6$	$100 \cdot 10^6$
Molluscs	70 000	$100 \cdot 10^3$	$200 \cdot 10^3$
Vertebrates	45 000	$50 \cdot 10^3$	$55 \cdot 10^3$
Others	115 000	$200 \cdot 10^3$	$800 \cdot 10^3$
Total	$1.75 \cdot 10^6$	$3.6 \cdot 10^6$	$112 \cdot 10^6$

250 million years. This is the time that bacteria discovered in the 1960s by Hans Pflug in (low-radioactivity) salt deposits in Fulda (Germany) have hibernated there before being Ref. 936 brought back to life in the laboratory. The result has been recently confirmed by the discovery of another bacterium in a North-American salt deposit in the Salado formation.

* *

Molecular motors are quite capable. The molecular motors in the sooty shearwater (*Puffinus griseus*), a 20 cm long bird, allow it to fly 74 000 km in a year, with a measured record of 1094 km a day.

* *

In 1967, a TV camera was deposited on the Moon. Unknown to everybody, it contained a small patch of *Streptococcus mitis*. Three years later, the camera was brought back to Ref. 937 Earth. The bacteria were still alive. They had survived for three years without food, water or air. Life can be resilient indeed.

* *

In biology, classifications are extremely useful. (This is similar to the situation in astrophysics, but in full contrast to the situation in physics.) Table 96 gives an overview of the Ref. 938 magnitude of the task. This wealth of material can be summarized in one graph, shown in Figure 492. Newer research seems to suggest some slight changes to the picture. So far however, there still is only a single root to the tree.

* *

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 492 A modern version of the evolutionary tree

Muscles produce motion through electrical stimulation. Can technical systems do the same? There is a candidate. So-called electroactive polymers change shape when they are activated with electrical current or with chemicals. They are lightweight, quiet and simple to manufacture. However, the first arm wrestling contest between human and artificial muscles held in 2005 was won by a teenage girl. The race to do better is ongoing.

* *

Life is not a clearly defined concept. The definition used above, the ability to reproduce, has its limits when applied to old animals, to a hand cut off by mistake, to sperm or to ovules. It also gives problems when trying to apply it to single cells. Is the definition of life as 'self-determined motion in the service of reproduction' more appropriate? Or is the definition of living beings as 'what is made of cells' more precise?

Challenge 1471 ny

* *

Also growth is a type of motion. Some is extremely complex. Take the growth of acne. It requires a lack of zinc, a weak immune system, several bacteria, as well as the help of *Demodex brevis*, a mite (a small insect) that lives in skin pores. With a size of 0.3 mm, somewhat smaller than the full stop at the end of this sentence, this and other animals living on the human face can be observed with the help of a strong magnifying glass.

Humans have many living beings on board. For example, humans need bacteria to live. It is estimated that 90% of the bacteria in the human mouth alone are not known yet; only 500 species have been isolated so far. These useful bacteria help us as a defence against the more dangerous species.

* *

How do trees grow? When a tree – a *monopodal phanerophyte* – grows and produces leaves, between 40% and 60% of the mass it consists of, namely the water and the min-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

erals, has to be lifted upwards from the ground. (The rest of the mass comes from the CO_2 in the air.) How does this happen? The materials are pulled upwards by the water columns inside the tree; the pull is due to the negative pressure that is created when the top of the column evaporates. This is called the *transpiration-cohesion-tension model*. (This summary is the result of many experiments.) In other words, no energy is needed for the tree to pump its materials upwards.

Due to the energyless water transport system, a tree grows purely by adding material to its surface. This implies that when a tree grows, a branch that is formed at a given height is also found at that *same* height during the rest of the life of that tree. Just check this observation with the trees in your garden.

Challenge 1472 e

* *

Mammals have a narrow operating temperature. In contrast to machines, humans function only if the internal temperature is within a narrow range. Why? And does this requirement also apply to extraterrestrials – provided they exist?

Challenge 1473 d

* *

How did the first cell arise? This question is still open. However, researchers have found several substances that spontaneously form closed membranes in water. Such substances also form foams. It might well be that life formed in foam. Other options discussed are that life formed underwater, at the places where magma rises into the ocean. Elucidating the question is one of the great open riddles of biology.

Challenge 1474 r

* *

Challenge 1475 s Could life have arrived to Earth from outer space?

* *

What could *holistic medicine* mean to a scientist, i.e., avoiding bullshit and beliefs? Holistic medicine means treating illness with view on the whole person. That translates to four domains:

— *physical* support, to aid mechanical or thermal healing processes in the body;
— *chemical* support, with nutrients or vitamines;
— *signalling* support, with electrical or chemical means, to support the signalling system of the body;
— *psychicological* support, to help all above processes.

When all theses aspects are taken care of, healing is as rapid and complete as possible. However, one main rule remains: *medicus curat, natura sanat*.*

* *

What are the effects of environmental pollution on life? Answering this question is an intense topic of modern research. Here are some famous stories.

— Herbicides and many genetically altered organisms kill bees. For this reason, bees are dying (in 2007) in the United States; as a result, many crops – such as almonds and or-

* The physician helps, but nature heals

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

anges – are endangered there. In countries where the worst herbicides and genetically modified crops have been banned, bees have no problems.
— Chemical pollution leads to malformed babies. In mainland China, one out of 16 children is malformed for this reason (in 2007). In Japan, malformations have been much reduced – though not completely – since strict anti-pollution laws have been passed.
— Radioactive pollution kills. In Russia, the famous Karachay lake had to be covered by concrete because its high radioactivity killed anybody that walked along it for half an hour.
— Smoking kills – though slowly. Countries that have lower smoking rates or that have curbed smoking have reduced rates for cancer and several other illnesses.
— Eating tuna is dangerous for your health, because of the heavy metals it contains.
— Cork trees are disappearing. The wine industry has started large research programs to cope with this problem.
— Even arctic animals have livers full of human-produced chemical poisons.
— Burning fuels rises the CO_2 level of the atmosphere. This leads to many effects for the Earth's climate, including a rise in average temperature and sea level.

Ecological research is uncovering many additional connections. Let us hope that the awareness for these issues increases across the world.

* *

In the twentieth century, biological research has uncovered several mechanisms responsible for aging and death. One of the most well-known mechanisms limits the number of division that a cell can undergo. The number of cell divisions, typically between 50 and 200, is finite for most cell types. (An exception are reproductory cells – we would not exist if they would not be able to divide endlessly.) The cell division counter has been identified; it is embodied in the *telomeres*, special structures of DNA and proteins found at both ends of each chromosome. These structures are reduced by a small amount during each cell division. When the structures are too short, cell division stops.

THE PHYSICS OF PLEASURE

> What is mind but motion in the intellectual sphere?
> Oscar Wilde (1854–1900) *The Critic as Artist*.

Pleasure is a quantum effect. The reason is simple. Pleasure comes from the senses. All senses measure. And all measurements rely on quantum theory. The human body, like an expensive car, is full of sensors. Evolution has build these sensors in such a way that they trigger pleasure sensations whenever we do with our body what we are made for.

Of course, no scientist will admit that he studies pleasure. Therefore he will say that he studies the senses. (Pleasure, or indeed, all human sensors, exist to let life continue. Pleasure is highest when life is made to continue. In the distant past, the appearance of new sensors has always had important effects of evolution, for example during the Cambrian explosion.) Researching pleasure and sensors is a fascinating field that is still evolving; here we can only have a quick tour of the present knowledge.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 493 The different speed of the eye's colour sensors, the cones, lead to a strange effect when this picture (in colour version) is shaken right to left in *weak* light

Among the most astonishing aspects of our body sensors is their sensitivity. The *ear* is so sensitive and at the same time so robust against large signals that the experts are still studying how it works. No known sound sensor can cover an energy range of 10^{13}; indeed, the detected sound intensities range from 1 pW/m^2 (some say 50 pW/m^2) to 10 W/m^2, the corresponding air pressure variations from 20 μPa to 60 Pa. The lowest intensity is that of a 20 W sound source heard at a distance of 10 000 km, if no sound is lost in between.

Audible sound wavelengths span from 17 m (20 Hz) to 17 mm (20 kHz). In this range, the ear is able to distinguish at least 1500 pitches with its 16 000 to 20 000 hair cells. But the ear is also able to distinguish 400 from 401 Hz using a special pitch sharpening mechanism.

The *eye* is a position dependent photon detector. Each eye contains around 126 million separate detectors on the retina. Their spatial density is the highest possible that makes sense, given the diameter of the lens of the eye. They give the eye a resolving power of 1′ and the capacity to detect down to 60 incident photons in 0.15 s, or 4 absorbed photons in the same time. There are about 6 million not so sensitive colour detectors, the *cones*, whose distribution we have seen earlier on. The different chemicals in the three cone types (red, green, blue) lead to different sensor speeds; this can be checked with the simple test shown in Figure 493. The images of the eye are only sharp if the eye constantly moves in small random motions. If this motion is stopped, for example with chemicals, the images produced by the eye become unsharp.

Page 764

Ref. 939

The eye also contains 120 million highly sensitive general light intensity detectors, the *rods*. Rods cannot distinguish colours. The sensitivity difference between rods and cones is the reason that at night all cats are grey. Until recently, human built light sensors with the same sensitivity as rods had to be helium cooled, because technology was not able to build sensors at room temperature that were as sensitive as the human eye.

The *touch sensors* are distributed over the skin, with a surface density which varies from one region to the other. It is lowest on the back and highest in the face and on the tongue. There are separate sensors for pressure, for deformation, for vibration, for tickling, for heat, for coldness, and for pain. Some react proportionally to the stimulus intensity, some differentially, giving signals only when the stimulus changes. Many of

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

these sensors are also found inside the body.

The taste mechanisms of *tongue* are only partially known. Since 2005, the tongue is known to produces six taste signals* – sweet, salty, bitter, sour, proteic and fat – and the mechanisms are just being unravelled. (The sense for proteic, also called umami, has been discovered in 1907, by Ikeda Kikunae; the sense for 'fat' has been discovered only in 2005.) Democritus imagined that taste depends on the shape of atoms. Today it is known that sweet taste is connected with certain shape of molecules. Despite all this, no sensor with a distinguishing ability of the same degree as the tongue has yet been built by humans.

Ref. 940

The *nose* has about 350 different smell receptors; through combinations it is estimated that it can smell about 10 000 different smells.** Together with the five signals that the sense of taste can produce, the nose also produces a vast range of taste sensations. It protects against chemical poisons, such as smoke, and against biological poisons, such as faecal matter. In contrast, artificial gas sensors exist only for a small range of gases. Good artificial taste and smell sensors would allow to check wine or cheese during their production, thus making its inventor extremely rich.

Challenge 1477 ny

The human body also contains *orientation sensors* in the ear, *extension sensors* in each muscle, and *pain sensors* almost all over the skin and inside the body.

Page 682

Other animals feature additional types of sensors. Sharks can feel electrical fields, snakes have sensors for infrared light; both are used to locate prey. Pigeons, trout and sharks can feel magnetic fields, and use this sense for navigation. Many birds and certain insects can see UV light. Bats and dolphins are able to hear ultrasound up to 100 kHz and more. Whales and elephants can detect and localize infrasound signals.

In summary, the sensors with which nature provides us are state of the art; their sensitivity and ease of use is the highest possible. Since all sensors trigger pleasure or help to avoid pain, nature obviously wants us to enjoy life with the most intense pleasure possible. Studying physics is one way to do this.

Ref. 941

> There are two things that make life worth living:
> Mozart and quantum mechanics.
> Victor Weisskopf***

* Taste sensitivity is *not* separated on the tongue into distinct regions; this is an incorrect idea that has been copied from book to book for over a hundred years. You can perform a falsification by yourself, using sugar or salt grains.

Challenge 1476 s

** Linda Buck and Richard Axel received the 2004 Nobel Prize for medicine and physiology for their unravelling of the working of the sense of smell.

*** Victor Friedrich Weisskopf (b. 1908 Vienna, d. 2002 Cambridge), acclaimed theoretical physicist who worked with Einstein, Born, Bohr, Schrödinger and Pauli. He catalysed the development of quantum electrodynamics and nuclear physics. He worked on the Manhattan project but later in life intensely campaigned against the use of nuclear weapons. During the cold war he accepted the membership in the Soviet Academy of Sciences. He was professor at MIT and for many years director of CERN, in Geneva. He wrote several successful physics textbooks. The author heard him making the above statement at CERN, in 1981, during one of his lectures.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The nerves and the brain

> There is no such thing as perpetual tranquillity of mind while we live here; because life itself is but motion, and can never be without desire, nor without fear, no more than without sense.
> Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679) *Leviathan*.

The main unit processing all the signals arriving from the sensors, the brain, is essential for all feelings of pleasure. The human brain has the highest complexity of all brains known.* In addition, the processing power and speed of the human brain is still larger than any device build by man.

We saw already earlier on how electrical signals from the sensors are transported into the brain. In the brain itself, the arriving signals are classified and stored, sometimes for a short time, sometimes for a long time. The various storage mechanisms, essentially taking place in the structure and the connection strength between brain cells, were elucidated by modern neuroscience. The remaining issue is the process of classification. For certain low level classifications, such as geometrical shapes for the eye or sound harmonies for the ear, the mechanisms are known. But for high-level classifications, such as the ones used in conceptual thinking, the aim is not yet achieved. It is not yet known how to describe the processes of reading, understanding and talking in terms of signal motions. Research is still in full swing and will probably remain so for the largest part of the twenty-first century.

Page 240

In the following we look at a few abilities of our brain, of our body and of other bodies that are important for the pleasures in the study of motion.

Living clocks

> L'horologe fait de la réclame pour le temps.**
> Georges Perros

We have given an overview of living clocks already before. They are common in bacteria, plants and animals.

Page 48

When we sing a musical note that we just heard we are able to reproduce the original frequency with high accuracy. We also know from everyday experience that humans are able to keep the beat to within a few per cent for a long time. When doing sport or when dancing, we are able to keep the timing to high accuracy. (For shorter or longer times, the internal clocks are not so precise.) All these clocks are located in the brain.

Ref. 942

Brains process information. Also computers do this, and like computers, all brains need a clock to work well. Every clock is made up of the same components. It needs an *oscillator* determining the rhythm and a mechanism to feed the oscillator with energy. In addition, every clock needs an oscillation *counter*, i.e., a mechanism that reads out the clock signal, and a means of *signal distribution* throughout the system is required,

* This is not in contrast with the fact that one or two whale species have brains with a slightly larger mass. The larger mass is due to the protection these brains require against the high pressures which appear when whales dive (some dive to depths of 1 km). The number of neurons in whale brains is considerably smaller than in human brains.

** Clocks are ads for time.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

synchronizing the processes attached to it. Finally, a clock needs a *reset mechanism*. If the clock has to cover many time scales, it needs several oscillators with different oscillation frequencies and a way to reset their relative phases.

Even though physicists know fairly well how to build good clocks, we still do not know many aspects of biological clocks. Most biological oscillators are chemical systems; some, like the heart muscle or the timers in the brain, are electrical systems. The general elucidation of chemical oscillators is due to Ilya Prigogine; it has earned him a Nobel Prize for chemistry in 1977. But not all the chemical oscillators in the human body are known yet, not to speak of the counter mechanisms. For example, a 24-minute cycle inside each human cell has been discovered only in 2003, and the oscillation mechanism is not yet fully clear. (It is known that a cell fed with heavy water ticks with 27–minute instead of 24–minute rhythm.) It might be that the daily rhythm, the circadian clock, is made up of or reset by 60 of these 24–minute cycles, triggered by some master cells in the human body. The clock reset mechanism for the circadian clock is also known to be triggered by daylight; the cells in the eye who perform this resetting action have been pinpointed only in 2002. The light signal from these cells is processed by the superchiasmatic nuclei, two dedicated structures in the brain's hypothalamus. The various cells in the human body act differently depending on the phase of this clock.

Ref. 947

Ref. 946

The clock with the longest cycle in the human body controls ageing. A central mechanism for this clock seems to be the number of certain molecules attached to the DNA of the human chromosomes. At every division, one molecule is lost. When the molecules are all lost, the cell dies. Research into the mechanisms and the exceptions to this process, such as cancer and sexual cells, is ongoing.

The basis of the monthly period in women is equally interesting and complex.

Other fascinating clocks are those at the basis of conscious time. Of these, the brain's stopwatch or *interval timer*, has been most intensely studied. Only recently was its mechanism uncovered by combining data on human illnesses, human lesions, magnetic resonance studies, and effects of specific drugs. The basic interval timing mechanism takes place in the striatum in the basal ganglia of the brain. The striatum contains thousands of timer cells with different periods. They can be triggered by a 'start' signal. Due to their large number, for small times of the order of one second, every time interval has a different pattern across these cells. The brain can read these patterns and learn them. In this way we can time music or specific tasks to be performed, for example, one second after a signal.

Ref. 948

Even though not all the clock mechanisms in humans are known, natural clocks share a property with human-built clocks: they are limited by quantum mechanics. Even the simple pendulum is limited by quantum theory. Let us explore the topic.

When do clocks exist?

> Die Zukunft war früher auch besser.*
>
> Karl Valentin.

* 'Also the future used to be better in the past.' Karl Valentin (b. 1882 Munich, d. 1948 Planegg), German author and comedian.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

In general relativity, we found out that purely gravitational clocks do not exist, because there is no unit of time that can be formed using the constants c and G. Clocks, like any measurement standard, need matter and non-gravitational interactions to work. This is the domain of quantum theory. Let us see what the situation is in this case.

Page 620

First of all, in quantum theory, the time operator is not an observable. Indeed, the time operator is not Hermitean. In other words, quantum theory states that there is no physical observable whose value is proportional to time. On the other hand, clocks are quite common; for example, the Sun or Big Ben work to most people's satisfaction. Observations thus encourages us to look for an operator describing the position of the hands of a clock. However, if we look for such an operator we find a strange result. Any quantum system having a Hamiltonian bounded from below – having a lowest energy – lacks a Hermitean operator whose expectation value increases monotonically with time. This result can be proven rigorously. In other words, quantum theory states that time cannot be measured.

Challenge 1478 ny

That time cannot be measured is not really a surprise. The meaning of this statement is that every clock needs to be wound up after a while. Take a mechanical pendulum clock. Only if the weight driving it can fall forever, without reaching a bottom position, can the clock go on working. However, in all clocks the weight has to stop when the chain end is reached or when the battery is empty. In other words, in all real clocks the Hamiltonian is bounded from below.

In short, quantum theory shows that exact *clocks do not exist in nature*. Quantum theory states that any clock can only be *approximate*. Obviously, this result is of importance for high precision clocks. What happens if we try to increase the precision of a clock as much as possible?

High precision implies high sensitivity to fluctuations. Now, all clocks have a motor inside that makes them work. A high precision clock thus needs a high precision motor. In all clocks, the position of the motor is read out and shown on the dial. The quantum of action implies that a precise clock motor has a position indeterminacy. The clock precision is thus limited. Worse, like any quantum system, the motor has a small, but finite probability to stop or to run backwards for a while.

You can check this prediction yourself. Just have a look at a clock when its battery is almost empty, or when the weight driving the pendulum has almost reached the bottom position. It will start doing funny things, like going backwards a bit or jumping back and forward. When the clock works normally, this behaviour is strongly suppressed; however, it is still possible, though with low probability. This is true even for a sundial.

Challenge 1479 ny

In other words, clocks necessarily have to be macroscopic in order to work properly. A clock must be as large as possible, in order to average out its fluctuations. Astronomical systems are good examples. A good clock must also be well-isolated from the environment, such as a freely flying object whose coordinate is used as time variable, as is done in certain optical clocks.

The precision of clocks

Given the limitations due to quantum theory, what is the ultimate precision of a clock? To start with, the indeterminacy relation provides the limit on the mass of a clock. The

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1480 ny mass M must be larger than

$$M > \frac{\hbar}{c^2\tau} \tag{685}$$

Challenge 1481 e which is obviously always fulfilled in everyday life. But we can do better. Like for a pendulum, we can relate the accuracy τ of the clock to its maximum reading time T. The Ref. 943 idea was first published by Salecker and Wigner. They argued that

$$M > \frac{\hbar}{c^2\tau}\frac{T}{\tau} \tag{686}$$

where T is the time to be measured. You might check that this condition directly requires Challenge 1482 e that any clock must be *macroscopic*.

Let us play with the formula by Salecker and Wigner. It can be rephrased in the following way. For a clock that can measure a time t, the size l is connected to the mass m by

$$l > \sqrt{\frac{\hbar t}{m}} \,. \tag{687}$$

Ref. 945 How close can this limit be achieved? It turns out that the smallest clocks known, as well as the clocks with most closely approach this limit, are bacteria. The smallest bacteria, the *mycoplasmas*, have a mass of about $8 \cdot 10^{-17}$ kg, and reproduce every 100 min, with a precision of about 1 min. The size predicted from expression (687) is between 0.09 μm and 0.009 μm. The observed size of the smallest mycoplasmas is 0.3 μm. The fact that bacteria can come so close to the clock limit shows us again what a good engineer evolution has been.

Note that the requirement by Salecker and Wigner is not in contrast with the possibility to make the *oscillator* of the clock very small; researchers have built oscillators made Ref. 944 of a single atom. In fact, such oscillations promise to be the most precise human built Page 1134 clocks. But the oscillator is only one part of any clock, as explained above.

In the real world, the clock limit can be tightened even more. The whole mass M cannot be used in the above limit. For clocks made of atoms, only the binding energy between atoms can be used. This leads to the so-called *standard quantum limit for clocks*; it limits the accuracy of their frequency ν by

$$\frac{\delta\nu}{\nu} = \sqrt{\frac{\Delta E}{E_{\text{tot}}}} \tag{688}$$

where $\Delta E = \hbar/T$ is the energy indeterminacy stemming from the finite measuring time T and $E_{\text{tot}} = NE_{\text{bind}}$ is the total binding energy of the atoms in the metre bar. So far, the quantum limit has not yet been achieved for any clock, even though experiments are getting close to it.

In summary, clocks exist only in the limit of $\hbar$ being negligible. In practice, the errors made by using clocks and metre bars can be made as small as required; it suffices to make the clocks large enough. Clock built into human brains comply with this requirement. We can thus continue our investigation into the details of matter without much worry, at

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

least for a while. Only in the last part of our mountain ascent, where the requirements for precision will be higher and general relativity will limit the size of physical systems, trouble will appear again: the impossibility to build precise clocks will then become a central issue.

Page 1401

Why are predictions so difficult, especially of the future?

> Future: that period of time in which our affairs prosper, our friends are true, and our happiness is assured.
>
> Ambrose Bierce

We have seen that predictions of the future are made difficult by nonlinearities and the divergence from similar conditions; we have seen that many particles make it difficult to predict the future due to the statistical nature of their initial conditions; we have seen that quantum theory makes it often hard to fully determine initial states; we have seen that a non-trivial space-time topology can limit predictability; finally, we will discover that black hole and similar horizons can limit predictability due to their one-way transmission of energy, mass and signals.

If due to the quantum of action perfect clocks do not exist, is determinism still the correct description of nature? Yes and no. We learned that all the mentioned limitations of clocks can be overcome for limited time intervals; in practice, these time intervals can be made so large that the limitations do not play a role in everyday life. As a result, in quantum systems both determinism and time remain applicable, as long as we do not extend it to infinite space and time. However, when extremely large dimensions and intervals need to be taken into account, quantum theory cannot be applied alone; in those cases, general relativity needs to be taken into account.

Page 1396

Decay and the golden rule

> I prefer most of all to remember the future.
>
> Salvador Dal ì

The decoherence of superposition of macroscopically distinct states plays an important role in another common process: the decay of unstable systems or particles. Decay is any spontaneous change. Like the wave aspect of matter, decay is a process with no classical counterpart. It is true that decay, including the ageing of humans, can be observed classically; however, its *origin* is a pure quantum effect.

Experiments show that the prediction of decay, like that of scattering of particles, is only possible on average, for a large number of particles or systems, never for a single one. These results confirm the quantum origin of the process. In every decay process, the superposition of macroscopically distinct states – in this case those of a decayed and an undecayed particle – is made to decohere rapidly by the interaction with the environment. Usually the 'environment' vacuum, with its fluctuations of the electromagnetic, weak and strong fields, is sufficient to induce decoherence. As usual, the details of the involved environment states are unknown for a single system and make any prediction for a specific system impossible.

Decay, including that of radioactive nuclei, is influenced by the environment, even

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

in the case that it is 'only' the vacuum. The statement can be confirmed by experiment. By enclosing a part of space between two conducting plates, one can change the degrees of freedom of the vacuum electromagnetic field contained between them. Putting an electromagnetically unstable particle, such as an excited atom, between the plates, indeed changes the lifetime of the particle. Can you explain why this method is not useful to lengthen the lifespan of humans?

Ref. 949

Challenge 1483 ny

What is the *origin* of decay? Decay is always due to tunnelling. With the language of quantum electrodynamics, we can say that decay is motion induced by the vacuum fluctuations. Vacuum fluctuations are random. The experiment between the plates confirms the importance of the environment fluctuations for the decay process.

For a system consisting of a large number N of identical particles, the decay is described by

$$\dot{N} = -\frac{N}{\tau} \quad \text{where} \quad \frac{1}{\tau} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \left|\langle \psi_{\text{initial}} | H_{\text{int}} | \psi_{\text{final}} \rangle\right|^2 \,. \tag{689}$$

The decay is thus essentially an exponential one, independently of the details of the physical process. In addition, the decay time τ depends on the interaction and on the square modulus of the transition matrix element. This result was named the *golden rule* by Fermi,* because it works so well despite being an approximation whose domain of applicability is not easy to specify.

The golden rule leads to

$$N(t) = N_0 \, \mathrm{e}^{-t/\tau} \,. \tag{690}$$

Decay is thus predicted to follow an exponential law. For over half a century, all experiments confirmed this result.

On the other hand, when quantum theory is used to derive the golden rule, it is found that decay is exponential only in certain special systems. A calculation that takes into account higher order terms predicts two deviations from exponential decay for completely isolated systems: for short times, the decay rate should *vanish*; for long times, the decay rate should follow an *algebraic* – not an exponential – dependence on time, in some cases even with superimposed oscillations. After an intense experimental search, deviations for short times have been observed. The observation of deviations at long times are rendered impossible by the ubiquity of thermal noise. It turns out that decay is exponential only when the environment is noisy, the system made of many weakly interacting particles, or both. Since this is usually the case, the exceptional exponential decay becomes the (golden) rule in observation.

Ref. 950

Ref. 951

The present in quantum theory

> Utere tempore.**
>
> Ovidius

* Originally, the golden rule is a statement from the christian bible, namely the sentence 'Do to others what you want them to do to you'.

** 'Use your time.' *Tristia* 4, 3, 83

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Many thinkers advise to enjoy the present. As shown by perception research, what humans call 'present' has a duration of a few tenths of a second. This leads us to ask whether the *physical* present might have a duration as well.

Ref. 952

In everyday life, we are used to imagine that shortening the time taken to measure the position of a point object as much as possible will approach the ideal of a particle fixed at a given point in space. When Zeno discussed flight of an arrow, he assumed that this is possible. However, quantum theory changes the situation.

We know that the quantum of action makes rest an impossibility. However, the issue here is different: we are asking whether we can say that a moving system is at a given spot at a given time. In order to determine this, we could use a photographic camera whose shutter time can be reduced at will. What would we find? When the shutter time approaches the oscillation period of light, the sharpness of the image would decrease; in addition, the colour of the light would be influenced by the shutter motion. We can increase the energy of the light used, but the smaller wavelengths only shift the problem, they do not solve it. Worse, at extremely small wavelengths, matter becomes transparent, and shutters cannot be realized any more. Whenever we reduce shutter times as much as possible, observations become unsharp. Quantum theory thus does not confirm the naive expectation that shorter shutter times lead to sharper images. In contrast, the quantum aspects of nature show us that there is no way in principle to approach the limit that Zeno was discussing.

This counter-intuitive result is due to the quantum of action: through the indeterminacy relation, the smallest action prevents that moving objects are at a fixed position at a given time. Zeno's discussion was based on an extrapolation of classical physics into domains where it is not valid any more. Every observation, like every photograph, implies a *time average*: observations average interactions over a given time.* For a photograph, the duration is given by the shutter time; for a measurement, the average is defined by the details of the set-up. Whatever this set-up might be, the averaging time is never zero. There is no 'point-like' instant of time that describes the present. The observed *present* is always an average over a non-vanishing interval of time. The present has a duration in nature.

Why can we observe motion?

Zeno was thus wrong in assuming that motion is a sequence of specific positions in space. Quantum theory implies that motion is *not* the change of position with time. The investigation of the issue showed that this statement is only an approximation for low energies or for long observation times.

Why then can we describe motion in quantum theory? Quantum theory shows that motion is the low energy approximation of quantum evolution. Quantum evolution assumes that space and time measurements of sufficient precision can be performed. We know that for any given observation energy, we can build clocks and metre bars with much higher accuracy than required, so that quantum evolution is applicable in all cases. This is the case in everyday life.

Obviously, this pragmatic description of motion rests on the assumption that for any observation energy we can find a still higher energy used by the measurement instru-

Page 1141

* The discussion of the quantum Zeno effect does not change the conclusions of this section.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

ments to define space and time. We deduce that if a highest energy would exist in nature, we would get into big trouble, as quantum theory would then break down. As long as energy has no limits, all problems are avoided, and motion remains a sequence of quantum observables or quantum states, whichever you prefer.

The assumption of energy without limit works extremely well; it lies at the basis of quantum theory, even though it is rather hidden. In the final part of our ascent, we will discover that there indeed is a maximum energy in nature, so that we will need to change our approach. However, this energy value is so huge that it does not bother us at all at this point of our exploration. But it will do so later on.

Page 1475

Rest and the quantum Zeno effect

The quantum of action implies that there is no rest in nature. Rest is always approximate, or a time average. For example, if an electron is bound, not freely moving, one can have the situation that the probability cloud, or density distribution, is stationary in time.

There is another apparent case of rest in quantum theory, the quantum Zeno effect. Usually, observation changes the system. However, for certain systems, observation can have the opposite effect.

– CS – more to be told – CS –

The quantum Zeno effect was partially observed by Wayno Itano and his group in 1990, and definitively observed by Mark Raizen and his group in 2001.

Ref. 953

In a fascinating prediction, Saverio Pascazio and his team have predicted that the quantum Zeno effect can be used to realize X-ray tomography of objects with the lowest radiation levels imaginable.

Ref. 954

Consciousness – a result of the quantum of action

In the pleasures of life, consciousness plays an essential role. Consciousness is our ability to observe what is going on in our mind. This activity, like any type of change, can itself be observed and studied. Obviously, consciousness takes place in the brain. If it were not, there would be no way to keep it connected with a given person. We know that each brain moves with over one million kilometres per hour through the cosmic background radiation; we also observe that consciousness moves along with it.

Page 870

The brain is a quantum system; it is based on molecules and electrical currents. The changes in consciousness that appear when matter is taken away from the brain – in operations or accidents – or when currents are injected into the brain – in accidents, experiments or misguided treatments – have been described in great detail by the medical profession. Also the observed influence of chemicals on the brain – from alcohol to hard drugs – makes the same point. The brain is a quantum system.

Magnetic resonance imaging can detect which parts of the brain work when sensing, remembering or thinking. Not only is sight, noise and thought processed in the brain; we can follow the processing on computer screens. The other, more questionable experimental method, positron tomography, works by letting people swallow radioactive sugar. It confirms the findings on the location of thought and on its dependence on chemical fuel. In addition, we already know that memory depends on the particle nature of matter.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

All these observations depend on the quantum of action.

Not only the consciousness of others, also your own consciousness is a quantum process. Can you give some arguments? Challenge 1484 ny

In short, we know that thought and consciousness are examples of motion. We are thus in the same situation as material scientists were before quantum theory: they knew that electromagnetic fields influence matter, but they could not say *how* electromagnetism was involved in the build-up of matter. We know that consciousness is made from the signal propagation and signal processing in the brain; we know that consciousness is an electrochemical process. But we do not know yet the details of *how* the signals make up consciousness. Unravelling the workings of this fascinating quantum system is the aim of neurological science. This is one of the great challenges of twenty-first century science.

It is sometimes claimed that consciousness is not a physical process. Every expert of motion should be able to convincingly show the opposite, even though the details of consciousness are not clear yet. Can you add a few arguments to the ones given here? Challenge 1485 ny

Why can we observe motion? – Again

Studying nature can be one of the most intense pleasures of life. All pleasures are based on the ability to observe motion. Our human condition is central to this ability. In our adventure so far we found that we experience motion only because we are of finite size, only because we are made of a large but finite number of atoms, only because we have a finite but moderate temperature, only because we are a mixture of liquids and solids, only because we are electrically neutral, only because we are large compared to a black hole of our same mass, only because we are large compared to our quantum mechanical wavelength, only because we have a limited memory, only because our brain forces us to approximate space and time by continuous entities, and only because our brain cannot avoid describing nature as made of different parts. If any of these conditions were not fulfilled we would not observe motion; we would have no fun studying physics.

In addition, we saw that we have these abilities only because our forefathers lived on Earth, only because life evolved here, only because we live in a relatively quiet region of our galaxy, and only because the human species evolved long after than the big bang.

If any of these conditions were not fulfilled, or if we were not animals, motion would not exist. In many ways motion is thus an illusion, as Zeno of Elea had claimed. To say the least, the observation of motion is a result of the limitations of the human condition. A complete description of motion and nature must take this connection into account. Before we do that, we explore a few details of this connection.

Curiosities and fun challenges about quantum experience

Most clocks used in everyday life, those built inside the human body and those made by humans, are electromagnetic. Any clock on the wall, be it mechanical, quartz controlled, radio or solar controlled, is based on electromagnetic effects. Do you know an exception? Challenge 1486 s

* *

The sense of smell is quite complex. For example, the substance that smells most badly to humans is *skatole*, also called *3-methylindole*. This is the molecule to which the human

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

nose is most sensitive. Skatole makes faeces smell bad; it is a result of haemoglobin entering the digestive tract through the bile. (In contrast to humans, skatole attracts flies; it is also used by some plants for the same reason.)

On the other hand, *small* levels of skatole do not smell bad to humans. It is also used by the food industry in small quantities to give smell and taste to vanilla ice cream.

* *

It is worth noting that human senses detect energies of quite different magnitudes. The eyes can detect light energies of about 1 aJ, whereas the sense of touch can detect only energies as large as about 10 μJ. Is one of the two systems relativistic? Challenge 1487 s

* *

Compared to all primates, the human eye is special: it is white, thus allowing others to see the direction in which one looks. Comparison with primates shows that the white colour has evolved to allow more communication between individuals. Ref. 955

* *

Even at perfect darkness, the eye does not yield a black impression, but a slightly brighter one, called *eigengrau*. This is a result of noise created inside the eye, probably triggered by spontaneous decay of rhodopsin, or alternatively, by spontaneous release of neurotransmitters.

* *

The high sensitivity of the ear can be used to hear light. To do this, take an empty 750 ml jam glass. Keeping its axis horizontal, blacken the upper half of the inside with a candle. The lower half should remain transparent. After doing this, close the jam glass with its lid, and drill a 2 to 3 mm hole into it. If you now hold the closed jam glass with the hole to your ear, keeping the black side up, and shining into it from below with a 50 W light bulb, something strange happens: you hear a 100 Hz sound. Why? Challenge 1488 s

* *

Most senses work already before birth. It is well-known that playing the violin to a pregnant mother every day during the pregnancy has an interesting effect. Even if nothing is told about it to the child, it will become a violin player later on.

* *

There is ample evidence that not using the senses is damaging. People have studied what happens when in the first years of life the vestibular sense – the one used for motion detection and balance restoration – is not used enough. Lack of rocking is extremely hard to compensate later in life. Equally dangerous is the lack of use of the sense of touch. Babies, like all small mammals, that are generally and systematically deprived of these experiences tend to violent behaviour during the rest of their life. Ref. 956

* *

Nature has invented the senses to increase pleasure and avoid pain. But neurologists have found out that nature has gone even further; there is a dedicated *pleasure system* in the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 494 The 'neurochemical mobile' model of well-being, with one of the way it can get out of balance

brain, whose central parts are the ventral tegmental area in the midbrain and the nucleus accumbens in the forebrain. The two parts regulate each other mainly through *dopamine* and *GABA*, two important neurotransmitters. Research has shown that dopamine is produced whenever pleasure exceeds expectations. Nature has thus developed a special signal for this situation.

But well-being and pleasure are controlled by a larger number of neurotransmitters and by many additional regulation circuits. Researchers are trying to model the pleasure system with hundreds of coupled differential equations, with the distant aim being to understand addiction and depression, for example. On the other side, also simple models are possible. One, shown in Figure 494, is the 'neurochemical mobile' model of the brain. In this model, well-being is achieved whenever the six most important neurotransmitters are in relative equilibrium. The different possible departures from equilibrium, at each joint of the mobile, can be used to describe depression, schizophrenia, psychosis, the effect of nicotine or alcohol intake, alcohol dependency, delirium, drug addiction, detoxication, epilepsy and more.

Ref. 957

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Summary on pleasure

To increase pleasure and avoid pain, evolution has supplied the human body with numerous sensors and sensor mechanisms. In addition, it has also built a pleasure system deep into the brain.

In short, nature has invented pleasure as a guide for human behaviour. Now, all biological pleasure sensors and systems are based on chemistry and materials science. We therefore explore both fields.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 41

CHANGING THE WORLD WITH QUANTUM THEORY

Quantum theory has changed the world dramatically. The distribution of music, the possibilities of telecommunications and of the internet, and the progress in chemistry, material science, medicine and electronics would not have been possible without quantum theory. In the following, we give a short overview of these connections.

CHEMISTRY – FROM ATOMS TO DNA

It is an old truth that Schrödinger's equation contains all of chemistry.* With quantum theory, for the first time people were able to calculate the strengths of chemical bonds, and what is more important, the angle between them. Quantum theory thus explains the *shape* of molecules and thus indirectly, the shape of all matter.

To understand molecules, the first step is to understand atoms. The early quantum theorists, lead by Niels Bohr, spent a lot of energy in understanding their structure. The main result is that in atoms with more than one electron, the various electron clouds form spherical layers around the nucleus. The layers can be grouped into groups of related clouds, called *shells*. For electrons outside a given shell, the nucleus and the inner shells, the atomic *core*, can often be approximated as a single charged entity.

Shells are numbered from the inside out. This *principal quantum number*, usually written n, is deduced and related to the quantum number that identifies the states in the hydrogen atom.

Quantum theory shows that the first shell has room for two electrons, the second for 8, the third for 18, and the general n-th shell for $2n^2$ electrons. A way to picture this connection is shown in Figure 497. It is called the *periodic table of the elements*. The standard way to show the table is shown in Appendix E.

Ref. 972
Page 1351

– CS – more to be added – CS –

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 495 The principal quantum numbers in hydrogen



FIGURE 496 Atoms and dangling bonds

Bonds

When atoms approach each other, their electron clouds are deformed and mixed. The reason for these changes is the combined influence of the two nuclei. The effect for these changes is highest for the outermost electrons: they form chemical bonds.

The cloud overlap lead to a gain in energy. That is the reason that fire is hot. After the energy has been released, a certain distance between the atoms appears, as shown in Figure 498. A lower distance would lead to electrostatic repulsion between the atomic cores.

Many atoms can bind to several neighbours. In this case, energy minimization leads to specific bond angles, as shown in Figure 499. Do you remember those funny pictures of school chemistry about orbitals and dangling bonds? Well, dangling bonds can now

Ref. 973

* The correct statement is: the *Dirac* equation contains all of chemistry. The relativistic effects that distinguish the two equations are necessary, for example, to understand why gold is yellow and does not like to react or why mercury is liquid.

Ref. 958

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 497 An unusual form of the periodic table of the elements

be seen. Several groups were able to image them using scanning force or scanning tunnelling microscopes. Ref. 974

The repulsion between the clouds of each bond explains why angle values near that of tetrahedral skeletons ($2 \arctan\sqrt{2} = 109.47°$) are so common in molecules. For example, the H-O-H angle in water molecules is 107°. Challenge 1489 e

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 498 The forming of a chemical bond between two atoms



FIGURE 499 Chemical bonds between several atoms

Ribonucleic acid and deoxyribonucleic acid

Probably the most fascinating molecule of all is human deoxyribonucleic acid. The nucleic acids where discovered in 1869 by the Swiss physician Friedrich Miescher (1844–1895) in white blood cells. In 1874 he published an important study showing that the molecule is contained in spermatozoa, and discussed the question if this substance could be related to heredity. With his work, Miescher paved the way to a research field that earned many colleagues Nobel Prizes (though not for himself).

DNA is a polymer, as shown in Figure 500, and is among the longest molecules known. Human DNA molecules, for example, can be up to 10 cm in length. It consists of a double helix of sugar derivates, to which four nuclei acids are attached in irregular order. Nowadays, it is possible to image single DNA molecules, as shown in Figure 501.

Ref. 960

At the start of the twentieth century it became clear that Desoxyribonukleinsäure (DNS) – translated as deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) into English – was precisely what Erwin Schrödinger had predicted to exist in his book *What Is Life?* As central part of the chromosomes contained the cell nuclei, DNA is responsible for the storage and reproduction of the information on the construction and functioning of Eukaryotes. The information is coded in the ordering of the four nucleic acids. DNA is the carrier of hereditary information. DNA determines in great part how the single cell we all once have been grows into the complex human machine we are as adults. For example, DNA determines the hair colour, predisposes for certain illnesses, determines the maximum size one can grow to, and much more. Of all known molecules, human DNA is thus most intimately related to human existence. The large size of the molecules is the reason that understanding its full structure and its full contents is a task that will occupy scientists for several

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 500 Several ways to picture B-DNA, all in false colours (© David Deerfield)

generations to come.

Curiosities and fun challenges about chemistry

One of the most fascinating topics of chemistry is that of poisons. Over 50 000 poisons are known, starting with water (usually kills when drunk in amounts larger than about 10 l) and table salt (can kill when 100 g are ingested) up to polonium 210 (kills in doses as low as 5 ng, much less than a spec of dust). Most countries have publicly accessible poison databases; see for example www.gsbl.de.

Challenge 1490 e

Can you imagine why 'toxicology', the science of poisons, actually means 'bow science' in Greek?

However, not all poisons are chemical. Paraffin and oil for lamps, for example, regularly kill children because the oil enters the lung and forms a thin film over the alveoles, preventing oxygen intake. This so-called *lipoid pneumonia* can be deadly even when only a single drop of oil is in the mouth and then inhaled by a child.

* *

Challenge 1491 ny

A cube of sugar does not burn. However, if you put some cigarette ash on top of it, it burns. Why?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 501 Two ways to image single DNA molecules: by holography with electrons emitted from atomically sharp tips (top) and by fluorescence microscopy, with a commercial optical microscope (bottom) (© Hans-Werner Fink/Wiley VCH)

* *

When one mixes 50 ml of distilled water and 50 ml of ethanol (alcohol), the volume of the mixture has less than 100 ml. Why?

Challenge 1492 e

* *

Why do organic materials burn at much lower temperature than inorganic materials?

Challenge 1493 ny

* *

An important aspect of life is death. When we die, conserved quantities like our energy, momentum, angular momentum and several other quantum numbers are redistributed. They are redistributed because conservation means that nothing is lost. What does all this imply for what happens after death?

Challenge 1494 s

* *

Chemical reactions can be slow but still dangerous. Spilling mercury on aluminium will

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

lead to an amalgam that reduces the strength of the aluminium part after some time. That is the reason that bringing mercury thermometers on aeroplanes is strictly forbidden.

* *

What happens if you take the white power potassium iodide () and the white power lead nitrate ($Pb(NO_3)_2$) and mix them with a masher?(This needs to be done with proper protection and supervision.)

Challenge 1495 s

* *

Writing on paper with a pen filled with lemon juice instead of ink produces invisible writing. Later on, the secret writing can be made visible by carefully heating the paper on top of a candle flame.

MATERIALS SCIENCE

> Did you know that one cannot use a boiled egg as a toothpick?
>
> Karl Valentin

It was mentioned several times that the quantum of action explains all properties of matter. Many researchers in physics, chemistry, metallurgy, engineering, mathematics and biology have cooperated in the proof of this statement. In our mountain ascent we have only a little time to explore this vast topic. Let us walk through a selection.

Why does the floor not fall?

We do not fall through the mountain we are walking on. Some interaction keeps us from falling through. In turn, the continents keep the mountains from falling through them. Also the liquid magma in the Earth's interior keeps the continents from sinking. All these statements can be summarized in two ideas: Atoms do not penetrate each other: despite being mostly empty clouds, atoms keep a distance. And atoms cannot be compressed in size. Both properties are due to Pauli's exclusion principle between electrons. The fermion character of electrons avoids that atoms shrink or interpenetrate – on Earth.

Page 1068

Not all floors keep up due to the fermion character of electrons. Atoms are not impenetrable at all pressures. At sufficiently large pressures, atoms can collapse, and form new types of floors. Some floors are so exciting to study that people have spent their whole life to understand why they do not fall, or when they do, how it happens: the surfaces of stars.

In most stars, the radiation pressure of the light plays only a minor role. Light pressure does play a role in determining the size of red giants, such as Betelgeuse; but for average stars, light pressure is negligible.

In most stars, such as in the Sun, the gas pressure takes the role which the incompressibility of solids and liquids has for planets. The pressure is due to the heat produced by the nuclear reactions.

The next star type appears whenever light pressure, gas pressure and the electronic Pauli pressure cannot keep atoms from interpenetrating. In that case, atoms are com-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

pressed until all electrons are pushed into the protons. Protons then become neutrons, and the whole star has the same mass density of atomic nuclei, namely about $2.3 \cdot 10^{17}\,\mathrm{kg/m^3}$. A drop weighs about 200 000 tons. In these so-called *neutron stars*, the floor – or better, the size – is also determined by Pauli pressure; however, it is the Pauli pressure between neutrons, triggered by the nuclear interactions. These neutron stars are all around 10 km in radius.

Page 1237

If the pressure increases still further, the star becomes a black hole, and never stops collapsing. Black holes have no floor at all; they still have a constant size though, determined by the horizon curvature.

Page 604

The question whether other star types exist in nature, with other floor forming mechanisms – such as quark stars – is still a topic of research.

Rocks and stones

If a geologist takes a stone in his hands, he is usually able to give, within an error of a few per cent, the age of the stone. The full story forms a large part of geology, but the general lines should be known to every physicist.

Every stone arrives in your hand through the *rock cycle*. The rock cycle is a process that transforms magma from the interior of the Earth into *igneous (or magmatic) rocks* through cooling and crystallization. Igneous rocks, such as basalt, can transform through erosion, transport and deposition into *sedimentary rocks*. Either of these two rock types can be transformed through high pressures or temperatures into *metamorphic rocks*, such as marble. Finally, most rocks are generally – but not always – transformed back into magma.

The full rock cycle takes around 110 to 170 million years. For this reason, rocks that are older than this age are much less common on Earth. Any stone is the product of erosion of one of the rock types. A geologist can usually tell, simply by looking at it, the type of rock it belongs to; if he sees the original environment, he can also give the age, without any laboratory.

Some interesting crystals

Every crystal, like every structure in nature, is the result of growth. Every crystal is thus the result of motion. To form a *regular* crystal, the required motion is a *slow* growth of facets from the liquid (or gaseous) basic ingredients. The growth requires a certain pressure, temperature and temperature gradient for a certain time. In the case of gemstones, the conditions are usually quite extreme; this is the reason for their durability. The conditions are realized in specific rocks deep inside the Earth, where the growth process can take thousands of years. Mineral crystals can form in all three types of rocks: igneous (magmatic), metamorphic, and sedimentary. Other crystals can be made in the laboratory in minutes, hours or days and have led to a dedicated industry. Only a few crystals grow from liquids at standard conditions; examples are gypsum and several other sulfates, which can be crystallized at home, potassium bitartrate, which appears in the making of wine, and the crystals grown inside plants or animals, such as teeth, bones or magnetosensitive crystallites.

Page 1153

Growing, cutting, treating and polishing crystals is an important industry. Especially the growth of crystals is a science in itself. Can you show with pencil and paper that

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 97 The types of rocks and stones

Type	Properties	Subtype	Example
Igneous rocks (magmatites)	formed from magma, 95% of all rocks	volcanic or extrusive	basalt (ocean floors, Giant's Causeway), andesite, obsidian
		plutonic or intrusive	granite, gabbro
Sedimentary rocks (sedimentites)	often with fossils	clastic	shale, siltstone, sandstone
		biogenic	limestone, chalk, dolostone
		precipitate	halite, gypsum
Metamorphic rocks (metamorphites)	transformed by heat and pressure	foliated	slate, schist, gneiss (Himalayas)
		non-foliated (grandoblastic or hornfelsic)	marble, skarn, quartzite
Meteorites	from the solar system	rock meteorites	
		iron meteorites	

Challenge 1496 e only the slowest growing facets are found in crystals? In the following, a few important crystals are presented.

* *

Quartz, amethyst (whose colour is due to radiation and iron Fe^{4+} impurities), citrine (whose colour is due to Fe^{3+} impurities), smoky quartz (with colour centres induced by radioactivity), agate and onyx are all forms of crystalline silicon dioxyde or SiO_2. Quartz forms in igneous and in magmatic rocks; crystals are also found in many sedimentary rocks. Quartz crystals can be larger than human. By the way, most amethysts lose their colour with time, so do not waste money buying them.

Quartz is the most common crystal on Earth's crust and is also grown synthetically for many high-purity applications. The structure is rombohedral, and the ideal shape is a six-sided prism with six-sided pyramids at its ends. Quartz melts at 1986 K and is piezo- and pyroelectric. Its piezoelectricity makes it useful as electric oscillator and filter. A film of an oscillating clock quartz is shown on page page 228. Quartz is also used for glass production, in communication fibres, for coating of polymers, in gas lighters, as source of silicon and for many other applications.

* *

Corundum, ruby and sapphire are crystalline variations of alumina. Corundum is pure and colourless Al_2O_3, ruby is Cr doped and blue sapphire is Ti or Fe doped. They have trigonal crystal structure and melt at 2320 K. Natural gems are formed in metamorphic

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 502 Quartz found at St. Gotthard, Switzerland, picture size 12 cm (© Rob Lavinsky)

FIGURE 503 Citrine found on Magaliesberg, South Africa, crystal height 9 cm (© Rob Lavinsky)

FIGURE 504 Amethystine and orange quartz found in the Orange River, Namibia, picture size 6 cm (© Rob Lavinsky)

rocks. Yellow, green, purple, pink, brown, grey and salmon-coloured sapphires also exist, when doped with other impurities. The colours of natural sapphires, like that of many other gemstones, are often changed by baking and other treatments.

Corundum, ruby and sapphire are used in jewelry, as heat sink and growth substrate, and for lasers. Corundum is also used as scratch-resistant 'glass' in watches. Ruby was the first gemstone that was grown synthetically in gem quality, in 1892 by Auguste Verneuil (1856-1913), who made his fortune in this way.

FIGURE 505 Corundum found in Laacher See, Germany, picture size 4 mm (© Stephan Wolfsried)

FIGURE 506 Ruby found in Jagdalak, Afghanistan, picture height 2 cm (© Rob Lavinsky)

FIGURE 507 Sapphire found in Ratnapura, Sri Lanka, crystal size 1.6 cm (© Rob Lavinsky)

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

Tourmaline is a frequently found mineral and can be red, blue, green, orange, yellow, pink or black, depending on its composition. The chemical formula is astonishingly complex and varies from type to type. Tourmaline has trigonal structure and usually forms columnar crystals that have triangular cross-section. It is only used in jewelry. Paraiba tourmalines, a very rare type of green or blue tourmaline, are among the most beautiful gemstones and are, if untreated, more expensive than diamonds.

FIGURE 508 Natural bicoloured tourmaline found in Paprok, Afghanistan, picture size 9 cm (© Rob Lavinsky)

FIGURE 509 Cut Paraiba tourmaline from Brazil, picture size c.3 cm (© Manfred Fuchs)

* *

Garnets are a family of compounds of the type $X_2Y_3(SiO_4)_3$. They have cubic crystal structure. They can have any colour, depending on composition. They show no cleavage and their common shape is a rhombic dodecahedron. Some rare garnets differ in colour when looked at in daylight or in incandescent light. Natural garnets form in metamorphic rocks and are used in jewelry, as abrasive and for water filtration. Synthetic garnets are used in many important laser types.

* *

Alexandrite, a chromium-doped doped variety of chrysoberyl, is used in jewelry and in lasers. Its composition is $BeAl_2O_4$; the crystal structure is orthorhombic. Chrysoberyl melts at 2140 K. Alexandrite is famous for its colour-changing property: it is green in daylight or fluorescent light but amethystine in incandescent light, as shown in Figure 510. The effect is due to its chromium content: the ligand field is just between that of chromium in red ruby and that in green emerald. A few other gems also show this effect, in particular the rare blue garnet and some Paraiba tourmalines.

* *

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 510 Red garnet with smoky quartz found in Lechang, China, picture size 9 cm (© Rob Lavinsky)

FIGURE 511 Green demantoid, a garnet owing its colour to chromium doping, found in Tubussis, Namibia, picture size 5 cm (© Rob Lavinsky)



FIGURE 512 Synthetic Cr,Tm,Ho:YAG, a doped yttrium aluminium garnet, picture size 25 cm (© Northrop Grumman)

FIGURE 513 Alexandrite found in the Setubal river, Brazil, crystal height 1.4 cm, illuminated with daylight (left) and with incandescent light (right) (© Trinity Mineral)



FIGURE 514 Synthetic alexandrite, picture size 20 cm (© Northrop Grumman)

Perovskites are a large class of cubic crystals used in jewelry and in tunable lasers. Their general composition is XYO_3, XYF_3 or $XYCl_3$.

FIGURE 515 Perovskite found in Hillesheim, Germany, picture width 3 mm (© Stephan Wolfsried)

to be added

FIGURE 516 Synthetic perovskite, picture size c... cm (© Aa Bb)

* *

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Diamond is a metastable variety of graphite, thus pure carbon. Theory says that graphite is the stable form; practice says that diamond is still more expensive. In contrast to graphite, diamond has face-centred cubic structure, is a large band gap semiconductor and typically has octahedral shape. Diamond burns at 1070 K; in the absence of oxygen it converts to graphite at around 1950 K. Diamond can be formed in magmatic and in metamorphic rocks. Diamonds can be synthesized in reasonable quality, though gemstones of large size and highest quality are not yet possible. Diamond can be coloured and be doped to achieve electrical conductivity in a variety of ways. Diamond is mainly used in jewelry, for hardness measurements and as abrasive.

FIGURE 517 Natural diamond from Saha republic, Russia, picture size 4 cm (© Rob Lavinsky)

to be added

FIGURE 518 Synthetic diamond, picture size c... cm (© Aa Bb)

to be added

FIGURE 519 Ophtalmic diamond knife, picture size c... cm (© Aa Bb)

* *

Silicon, Si, is not found in nature in pure form; all crystals are synthetic. The structure is face-centred cubic, thus diamond-like. It is moderately brittle, and can be cut in thin wafers which can be further thinned by grinding or chemical etching, even down to a thickness of 10 µm. Being a semiconductor, the band structure determines its black colour, its metallic shine and its brittleness. Silicon is widely used for silicon chips and electronic semiconductors. Today, human-sized silicon crystals can be grown free of dislocations and other line defects.

to be added

FIGURE 520 Silicon crystal, picture size c... cm (© Aa Bb)

to be added

FIGURE 521 Silicon growing machine, picture size c... cm (© Aa Bb)

* *

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Teeth are the structures that allowed animals to be so successful in populating the Earth. They are composed of several materials; the outer layer, the *enamel*, is 97% hydroxylapatite, mixed with a small percentage of two proteins groups, the amelogenins and the enamelins. The growth of teeth is still not fully understood; neither the molecular level nor the shape-forming mechanisms are completely clarified. Hydroxylapatite is soluble in acids; addition of fluorine ions changes the hydroxylapatite to fluorapatite and greatly reduces the solubility. This is the reason for the use of fluorine in tooth paste.

Hydroxylapatite (or hydroxyapatite) has the chemical formula $Ca_{10}(PO_4)_6(OH)_2$, possesses hexagonal crystal structure, is hard (more than steel) but relatively brittle. It occurs as mineral in sedimentary rocks (see Figure 522), in bones, renal stones, bladders tones, bile stones, atheromatic plaque, cartilage arthritis and teeth. Hydroxylapatite is mined as a phosphorus ore for the chemical industry, is used in genetics to separate single and double-stranded DNA, and is used to coat implants in bones.

FIGURE 522 Hydroxylapatite found in Snarum, Norway, picture size 5 cm (© Rob Lavinsky)

FIGURE 523 The main and the reserve teeth on the jaw bone of a shark, all covered in hydroxylapatite, picture size 15 cm (© Peter Doe)

* *

Pure metals, such as gold, silver and even copper, are found in nature, usually in magmatic rocks. But only a few metallic compounds form crystals, such as pyrite. Monocrystalline pure metal crystals are all synthetic. Monocrystalline metals, for example iron, aluminium, gold or copper, are extremely soft and ductile. Either bending them repeatedly – a process called cold working – adding impurities, or forming alloys makes them hard and strong. Stainless steel, a carbon-rich iron alloy, is an example that uses all three processes.

* *

There are about 4000 known mineral types. On the other hand, there are ten times as many obsolete mineral names, namely around 40 000. An official list can be found in various places on the internet, including www.mindat.org or www.minieralienatlas.de. To explore the world of crystal shapes, see the www.smorf.nl website. Around new 40 minerals are discovered each year. Searching for minerals and collecting them is a fascinating pastime.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 524 Pyrite, found in Navajún, Spain, picture width 5.7 cm (© Rob Lavinsky)

FIGURE 525 Silver from Colquechaca, Bolivia, picture width 2.5 cm (© Rob Lavinsky)

to be added

FIGURE 526 Copper single crystal, picture size c... cm (© Aa Bb)

How can one look through matter?

Quantum theory showed us that all obstacles have only finite potential heights. That leads to a question: Is it possible to look through matter? For example, can we see what is hidden inside a mountain? To be able to do this, we need a signal which fulfils two conditions: it must be able to *penetrate* the mountain, and it must be scattered in a *material-dependent* way. Table 98 gives an overview of the possibilities.

We see that many signals are able to penetrate a mountain. However, only sound or radio waves provide the possibility to distinguish different materials, or to distinguish solids from liquids and from air. In addition, any useful method requires a large number of signal sources and of signal receptors, and thus a large amount of cash. Will there ever be a simple method allowing to look into mountains as precisely as X-rays allow to study human bodies? For example, will it ever be possible to map the interior of the pyramids?

Challenge 1497 s A motion expert like the reader should be able to give a definite answer.

One of the high points of twentieth century physics was the development of the best method so far to look into matter with dimensions of about a metre or less: magnetic

Page 1222 resonance imaging. We will discuss it later on.

The other modern imaging technique, ultrasound imaging, is getting more and more criticized. It is much used for prenatal diagnostics of embryos. However, studies have found that ultrasound produces extremely high levels of audible sound to the baby, especially when the ultrasound is switched on or off, and that babies react negatively to this loud noise.

What is necessary to make matter invisible?

You might have already imagined what adventures would be possible if you could be invisible for a while. Some years ago, a team of Dutch scientists found a material that

Ref. 959 can be switched from mirror mode to transparent mode using an electrical signal. This seems a first step to realize the dream to become invisible at will.

In 2006, researchers made the headlines in the popular press by claiming that they could build a cloak of invisibility. A blatant lie.

Nature shows us how to be invisible. An object is invisible if it has no surface, no absorption and small size. In short, invisible objects are either small clouds or composed of them. Most atoms and molecules are examples. Homogeneous non-absorbing gases

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 98 Signals penetrating mountains and other matter

Signal	Penetration depth in stone	Achieved resolution	Material dependence	Use
Matter				
Diffusion of water or liquid chemicals	*c.* 5 km	*c.* 100 m	medium	mapping hydrosystems
Diffusion of gases	*c.* 5 km	*c.* 100 m	medium	studying vacuum systems
Electromagnetism				
Infrasound and earthquakes	100 000 km	100 km	high	mapping of Earth crust and mantle
Sound, explosions, seismic waves	0.1 – 10 m	*c.* $\lambda/100$	high	oil and ore search, structure mapping in rocks, searching for underwater treasures in sunken ship with sub-bottom-profilers
Ultrasound		1 mm	high	medical imaging, acoustic microscopy
Static magnetic field variation			medium	cable search, cable fault localization, search for structures and metal inside soil, rocks and seabed
Electrical currents				soil and rock investigations, search for tooth decay
Electromagnetic sounding, 0.2 – 5 Hz				soil and rock investigations in deep water and on land
Radio waves	10 m	30 m to 1 mm	small	soil radar (up to 10 MW), magnetic imaging, research into solar interior
Ultra-wide band radio	10 cm	1 mm	sufficient	searching for wires and tubes in walls, breast cancer detection
Mm and THz waves	below 1 mm	1 mm		see through clothes, envelopes and teeth Ref. 961
Infrared	*c.* 1 m	0.1 m	medium	mapping of soil over 100 m
Visible light	*c.* 1 cm	0.1 µm	medium	imaging of many sorts
X-rays	a few metre	5 µm	high	medicine, material analysis, airports
Muons created by cosmic radiation	up to *c.* 300 m	0.1 m	small	finding caves in pyramids, imaging interior of trucks
Weak interactions				
Neutrino beams	light years	zero	very weak	studies of Sun
Strong interactions				
Cosmic radiation	1 m to 1 km			
Radioactivity	1 mm to 1 m			airport security checks
Gravitation				
Variation of g		50 m	low	oil and ore search

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

also realize these conditions. That is the reason that air is (usually) invisible. When air is not homogeneous, it can be visible, e.g. above hot surfaces.

In contrast to gases, solids or liquids do have surfaces. Surfaces are usually visible, even if the body is transparent, because the refractive index changes there. For example, quartz can be made so transparent that one can look through 1 000 km of it; pure quartz is thus more transparent than usual air. Still, objects made of pure quartz are visible to the eye due to their refractive index. Quartz can be invisible only when submerged in liquids with the same refractive index.

A frequent lie – used to get funding – is that objects can be made invisible by covering them with metamaterials. The impossibility has been already shown earlier on.

Page 756

In other words, to become invisible, we must transform ourselves into a diffuse cloud of non-absorbing atoms. On the way to become invisible, we would lose all memory and all genes, in short, we would lose all our individuality. But an individual cannot be made of gas. An individual is defined through its boundary. There is no way that we can be invisible; a reversible way to perform the feat is also impossible. In summary, quantum theory shows that only the dead can be invisible.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The causes of colour

Quantum theory explains all colours in nature. Here is a summary of the various mechanisms one observes.*

TABLE 99 Causes of colour

Colour type	Example	Details
Class I: Colours due to simple excitations		
	**1. Incandescence**	
	Carbon arc lamp, hot steel, lightbulb wire, most stars, magma, lava, hot melts	colours are due to continuous spectrum emitted by all hot matter; colour sequence, given by Wien's rule, is black, red, orange, yellow, white, blue-white (molten lead and silver © Graela)
	Wood fire, candle	wood and wax flames are yellow due to incandescence if carbon-rich and oxygen-poor
	White fireworks, flashlamp, sparklers	due to metals burning to oxide at high temperature, such as magnesium, zinc, iron, aluminium or zirconium (sparkler © Sarah Domingos)
	2. Atomic gas excitations	
	Red neon lamp, blue argon lamp, UV mercury lamp, yellow sodium street lamps, most gas lasers, metal vapour lasers, some fluorescence	colours are due to transitions between atomic energy levels (gas discharges © Pslawinski)
	Aurora, triboluminescence in scotch tape, crystalloluminescence in strontium bromate	in air, blue and red colours are due to atomic and molecular energy levels of nitrogen, whereas green, yellow, orange colours are due to oxygen (aurora © Jan Curtis)
	Lightning, arcs, sparks, coloured fireworks, most coloured flames, some electroluminescence	colour lines are due to energy levels of highly excited atoms (flames of K, Cu, Cs, B, Ca © Philip Evans)

* See also the fascinating book by Kurt Nassau, *The Physics and Chemistry of Color – the fifteen causes of color*, J. Wiley & Sons, 1983, and the excellent webexhibits.org/causesofcolour website.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 99 Causes of colour (continued)

Colour type	Example	Details
	3. Vibrations and rotations of molecules	
	Bluish water, blue ice when clear, violet iodine, red-brown bromine, yellow-green chlorine, red flames from CN or blue-green flames from CH, some gas lasers	colours are due to quantized levels of rotation and vibrations in molecules (blue iceberg © Marc Shandro)
Class II: Colours due to ligand field effects		
	**4. Transition metal compounds**	
	Green malachite $Cu_2CO_3(OH)_2$, blue cobalt oxide, blue azurite $Cu_3(CO_3)_2(OH)_2$, red to brown hematite Fe_2O_3, green MnO, white $Mn(OH)_2$, brown manganite, chrome green Cr_2O_3, green praesodymium, pink europium and yellow samarium compounds, piezochromic and thermochromic $Cr_2O_3 - Al_2O_3$ UV and electron phosphors, scintillation, some fluorescence, some lasers	colours are due to electronic states of the ions; phosphors are used in cathodes tubes for TV/computer displays and on fluorescent lamp tubes (green malachite on yellow kasolite, a uranium mineral, picture width 5 mm, found in Kolwezi, Zaire/Congo, © Stephan Wolfsried, television shadow mask photo © Planemad)
	5. Transition metal impurities	
	Ruby, emerald, alexandrite, perovskites, corresponding lasers	electronic states of transition metal ions are excited by light and thus absorb specific wavelengths (ruby on calcite from Mogok, Myanmar, picture width 3 cm, © Rob Lavinsky)

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 99 Causes of colour (continued)

Colour type	Example	Details
Class III: Colours due to molecular orbitals		
	6. Organic compounds	
	Red haemoglobin in blood, green chlorophyll in plants, yellow or orange carotenes in carrots, flowers and yellow autumn leaves, red or purple anthocyanins in berries, flowers and red autumn leaves, blue indigo, red lycopene in tomatoes, red meat from iron-containing myoglobin, brown glucosamine in crust of baked food, brown tannins, black eumelanin in human skin, hair and eye, iron-rich variation pheomelanin in redheads, black melanin also in cut apples and bananas as well as in movable sacks in chameleons, brown-black asphalt, some fluorescence, chemiluminescence, phosphorescence, halochromism, electrochromism and thermochromism, dye lasers	colours are due to conjugated π-bonds, i.e. to alternating single and double bonds in molecules; floral pigments are almost all anthocyanins, betalains or carotenes; used in colourants for foods and cosmetics, in textile dyes, in electrochromic displays, in inks for colour printers, in photosensitizers (narcissus © Thomas Lüthi)
	Glow-worms, deap-sea fish, bacteria, funghi	bioluminescence is due to excited molecules, generally called *luciferines* (angler fish, length 4.5 cm, © Steve Haddock)

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 99 Causes of colour (continued)

Colour type	Example	Details
	**7. Inorganic charge transfer**	
	Blue sapphire, blue lapis lazuli, green amazonite, brown-black magnetite Fe_3O_4 and most other iron minerals (colouring basalt black, beer bottles brown, quartz sand yellow, and many other rocks with brown or red tones), black graphite, purple permanganate, orange potassium dichromate, yellow molybdates, red hematite Fe_2O_3, black graphite, some fluorescence	light induces change of position of an electron from one atom to another; for example, in blue sapphire the transition is between Ti and Fe impurities; many paint pigments use charge transfer colours; fluorescent analytical reagents are used in molecular medicine and biology (magnetite found in Laach, Germany, picture width 10 mm, © Stephan Wolfsried)
Class IV: Colours due to energy band effects		
	8. Metallic bands	
	Gold (green in transmission), pyrite, iron, brass, alloys, silver, copper, ruby glass	colours in reflection and in transmission are due to transitions of electrons between overlapping bands (saxophone © Selmer)
	9. Pure semiconductor bands	
	Silicon, GaAs, black galena PbS, red cinnabar HgS, cadmium yellow CdS, black CdSe, red CdS_xSe_{1-x}, white ZnO, orange vermillion HgS, colourless diamond, black to gold piezochromic SmS	colour due to electron transitions between separate bands; colour series is black, red, orange, yellow, white/colourless; some used as pigments
	10. Doped semiconductor bands	
	Blue, yellow, green and black diamond; LEDs; semiconductor lasers; solar cells; ZnS and $Zn_xCd_{1-x}S$ based and other phosphors	colours are due to transitions between dopants and semiconductor bands (e.g. blue diamond: boron accepters, black diamond: nitrogen donors) (quantum dots © Andrey Rogach)

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 99 Causes of colour (continued)

Colour type	Example	Details
	11. Colour centres	
	Amethyst, smoky quartz, fluorite, green diamonds, blue, yellow and brown topaz, brown salt, purple colour of irradiated glass containing Mn^{2+}, lyoluminescence, some fluorescence, F-centre lasers	colours due to colour centres, i.e. to electrons or to holes bound at crystal vacancies; colour centres are usually are created by radiation (amethyst © Rob Lavinsky)
	Some light-dependent sunglasses	the photochrmoic colouring is due to colour centres formed by the UV light of the Sun
Class V: Colours due to physical and geometrical optics		
	12. Dispersive refraction and polarization	
	Cut diamond, cut zirconia, halos and sun dogs formed by ice crystals in the air	spectral decomposition (sparkle or 'fire' of gemstones) is due to dispersion in crystals (zirconia photo © Gregory Phillips)
	Rainbow	colours of primary and secondary bow are due to dispersion in water droplets
	Green flash	dispersion in the atmosphere shifts the sun colours
	13. Scattering	
	Blue sky, blue colouring of distant mountains, red sunset; colour intensification by pollution; blue quartz	blue light is scattered more than red light by Rayleigh scattering, when scatterers (molecules, dust) are smaller than the wavelength of light (Tokyo sunset © Altus Plunkett, blue quartz © David Lynch)

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 99 Causes of colour (continued)

Colour type	Example	Details
	White colour of hair, milk, beer foam, clouds, fog, cigarette smoke coming out of lungs, snow, whipped cream, shampoo, stars in gemstones	the white colour is due to wavelength-independent Mie scattering, i.e. scattering at particles larger than the wavelength of light (snow man © Andreas Kostner)
	Blue human skin colour in cold weather, blue and green eyes in humans, blue monkey skin, blue turkey necks, most blue fish, blue reptiles, blue cigarette smoke	Tyndall blue colours are due to scattering on small particles in front of a dark background (blue poison frog *Dendrobates azureus* © Lee Hancock)
	Ruby glass	the red colour of Murano glass is due to scattering by tiny colloidal gold particles included in the glass in combination with the metallic band structure of gold (ruby glass © murano-glass-shop.it)
	Nonlinearities, Raman effect, potassium dihydrogen phosphate (KDP)	frequency-shifting scattering, second harmonic generation and other nonlinearities of certain materials change the colour of light impinging with high intensities (800 nm to 400 nm frequency doubling ring laser © Jeff Sherman)
	14. Interference (without diffraction)	
	Nacre, oil films, soap bubbles, coatings on camera lenses, eyes of cats in the dark, wings of flies and dragonflies, fish scales, some snakes, pearls	thin film interference produces a standard colour sequence that allows precise thickness determination (abalone shell © Anne Elliot)
	Polarization colours of thin layers of birefringent crystals or thicker layers of stressed polymers	due to interference, as shown by the dependence on layer thickness

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 99 Causes of colour (continued)

Colour type	Example	Details
	Supernumerary rainbows (see page 726)	due to interference, as shown by the dependence on drop size
	Iridescent beetles, butterflies and bird feathers, iridescent colours on banknotes and on cars	due to scattering at small structures or at nanoparticles, as shown by the angular dependence of the colour (mallard duck © Simon Griffith)
15. Diffraction (with interference)		
	Opal	colours are due to the tiny spheres included in the water inside the opal; colours can change if the opal dries out (polished Brazilian opal © Opalsnopals)
	Aureole, glory, corona	colours are due to diffraction at the tiny mist droplets (aeroplane condensation cloud iridescence © Franz Kerschbaum)
	Diffraction gratings, CDs, vinyl records, some beetles and snakes	colours are due to diffraction and interference at tiny, regular pits (CD illuminated by flashlamp © Alfons Reichert)
	Cholesteric liquid crystals, certain beetles	colours are due to diffraction and interference in internal material layers
	photonic crystals	a modern research topic
Class VI: Colours due to eye limitations		
Fechner colours, as on lite.bu.edu/vision/applets/Color/Benham/Benham.html	Benham's top	colours are due to different speed response of different photoreceptors
Internal colour production when eyes are stimulated	Phosphenes	occur through pressure (rubbing, sneeze), or with electric or magnetic fields
Polarization colours	Haidinger's brush	see page 730
Colour illusions, as on www.psy.ritsumei.ac.jp/~akitaoka/color9e.html	Appearing and disappearing colours	effects are due to combinations of brain processing and eye limitations

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 99 Causes of colour (continued)

Colour type	Example	Details
False colour output, as described on page 764	Red light can be seen as green	observable with adaptive optics, if red light is focused on a green-sensitive cone
Colour-blind or 'daltonic' person, see page 771, with reduced colour spectrum	Protan, deutan or tritan	each type limits colour perception in a different way

The above table tries to include all colours that appear in everyday life. (Can you find one that is missing?) Some issues are still topic of research. For example, until recently it was unclear why exactly asphalt is black. The exact structure of the chemical compounds, the *asphaltenes*, that produce the very dark brown colour was unknown. Recent research has settled this question.

Challenge 1498 s

Ref. 977

Colours fascinate. Fascination also means business; indeed, a large part of the chemical industry is dedicated to synthesizing colourants for paints, clothes, food and cosmetics. Also evolution uses the fascination of colours for its own business: propagating life. The specialists in this domain are the flowering plants. The chemistry of colour production in plants is extremely involved and at least as interesting as the production of colours in factories. Practically all flower colourants, from white, yellow, orange, red to blue, are from three chemical classes: the carotenoids, the anthocyanins (flavonoids) and the betalains. These colourants are stored in petals inside dedicated containers, the *vacuoles*. There are many good review articles giving more details.

Ref. 975

Even though colours are common in plants and animals, most higher animals do not produce many colourants themselves. For example, humans produce only one colourant: *melanin*. (*Hemoglobin*, which colours blood red, is not a dedicated colourant, but transports the oxygen from the lungs through the body. Also the pink *myoglobin* in the muscles is not a dedicated colourant.) Many higher animals, such as birds, need to *eat* the colourants that are so characteristic for their appearance. The yellow colour of legs of pigeons is an example. It has been shown that the connection between colour and nutrition is regularly used by potential mates to judge from the body colours whether a proposing partner is sufficiently healthy, and thus sufficiently sexy.

Ref. 976

How does matter behave at the lowest temperatures?

The low-temperature behaviour of matter has numerous experimental and theoretical aspects. The first issue is whether matter is always solid at low temperatures. The answer is no. All phases exist at low temperatures, as shown in Table 100.

Concerning the electric properties of matter at lowest temperatures, the present status is that matter is either insulating or superconducting. Finally, one can ask about the magnetic properties of matter at low temperatures. We know already that matter can not be paramagnetic at lowest temperatures. It seems that matter is either ferromagnetic, diamagnetic or antiferromagnetic at lowest temperatures.

More about superfluidity and superconductivity will be told below.

Page 1176

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 100 Matter at lowest temperatures

PHASE	TYPE	LOW TEMPERATURE BEHAVIOUR	EXAMPLE
Solid	conductor	superconductivity	lead, MgB_2 (40 K)
		antiferromagnet	chromium, MnO
		ferromagnet	iron
	insulator	diamagnet	
Liquid	bosonic	Bose–Einstein condensation, i.e., superfluidity	^{4}He
	fermionic	pairing, then BEC, i.e., superfluidity	^{3}He
Gas	bosonic	Bose–Einstein condensation	^{87}Rb, ^{7}Li, ^{23}Na, H, ^{4}He, ^{41}K
	fermionic	pairing, then Bose–Einstein condensation	^{40}K, ^{6}Li

CURIOSITIES AND FUN CHALLENGES ABOUT MATERIALS SCIENCE

What is the maximum height of a mountain? This question is of course of interest to all climbers. Many effects limit the height. The most important is the fact that under heavy pressure, solids become liquid. For example, on Earth this happens at about 27 km. This is quite a bit more than the highest mountain known, which is the volcano Mauna Kea in Hawaii, whose top is about 9.45 km above the base. On Mars gravity is weaker, so that mountains can be higher. Indeed the highest mountain on Mars, Olympus mons, is 80 km high. Can you find a few other effects limiting mountain height?

Ref. 962
Challenge 1499 ny
Challenge 1500 s

* *

Do you want to become rich? Just invent something that can be produced in the factory, is cheap and can substitute duck feathers in bed covers, sleeping bags or in badminton shuttlecocks. Another industrial challenge is to find an artificial substitute for latex, and a third one is to find a substitute for a material that is rapidly disappearing due to pollution: cork.

Challenge 1501 r

* *

What is the difference between solids, liquids and gases?

Challenge 1502 ny

* *

What is the difference between the makers of bronze age knifes and the builders of the Eiffel tower? Only their control of dislocation distributions.

* *

Quantum theory shows that tight walls do not exist. Every material is penetrable. Why?

Challenge 1503 s

* *

Quantum theory shows that even if tight walls would exist, the lid of such a box can never be tightly shut. Can you provide the argument?

Challenge 1504 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

To what type of colour, in table on the causes of colour, does Cerenkov radiation belong? Bremsstrahlung? What type of colour is not listed?

Challenge 1505 ny

* *

Quantum theory predicts that heat transport at a given temperature is quantized. Can you guess the unit of thermal conductance?

Challenge 1506 ny

* *

Robert Full has shown that van der Waals forces are responsible for the way that geckos walk on walls and ceilings. The gecko, a small reptile with a mass of about 100 g, uses an elaborate structure on its feet to perform the trick. Each foot has 500 000 hairs each split in up to 1000 small spatulae, and each spatula uses the van der Waals force (or alternatively, capillary forces) to stick to the surface. As a result, the gecko can walk on vertical glass walls or even on glass ceilings; the sticking force can be as high as 100 N per foot.

Ref. 963

The same mechanism is used by jumping spiders (*Salticidae*). For example, *Evarcha arcuata* have hairs at their feet which are covered by hundred of thousands of setules. Again, the van der Waals force in each setule helps the spider to stick on surfaces.

Ref. 964

Researchers have copied these mechanisms for the first time in 2003, using microlithography on polyimide, and hope to make durable sticky materials in the future.

* *

Millimetre waves or terahertz waves are emitted by all bodies at room temperature. Modern camera systems allow to image them. In this way, it is possible to see through clothes. This ability could be used in future to detect hidden weapons in airports. But the development of a practical and affordable detector which can be handled as easily as a binocular is still under way. The waves can also be used to see through paper, thus making it unnecessary to open letters in order to read them. Secret services are exploiting this technique. A third application of terahertz waves might be in medical diagnostic, for example for the search of tooth decay. Terahertz waves are almost without side effects, and thus superior to X-rays. The lack of low-priced quality sources is still an obstacle to their application.

* *

Does the melting point of water depend on the magnetic field? This surprising claim was made in 2004 by Inaba Hideaki and colleagues. They found a change of 0.9 mK/T. It is known that the refractive index and the near infrared spectrum of water is affected by magnetic fields. Indeed, not everything about water might be known yet.

Ref. 965

* *

Plasmas, or ionized gases, are useful for many applications. Not only can they be used for heating or cooking and generated by chemical means (such plasmas are variously called fire or flames) but they can also be generated electrically and used for lighting or deposition of materials. Electrically generated plasmas are even being studied for the disinfection of dental cavities.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 527 The concentration of CO_2 and the change of average atmospheric temperature in the past 0.8 million years (© Dieter Lüthi)

* *

It is known that the concentration of CO_2 in the atmosphere between 1800 and 2005 has increased from 280 to 380 parts per million, as shown in Figure 527. (How would you measure this?) It is known without doubt that this increase is due to human burning of fossil fuels, and not to natural sources such as the oceans or volcanoes. There are three arguments. First of all, there was a parallel decline of the $^{14}C/^{12}C$ ratio. Second, there was a parallel decline of the $^{13}C/^{12}C$ ratio. Finally, there was a parallel decline of the oxygen concentration. All three measurements independently imply that the CO_2 increase is due to the burning of fuels, which are low in ^{14}C and in ^{13}C, and at the same time decrease the oxygen ratio. Natural sources do not have these three effects. Since CO_2 is a major greenhouse gas, the data implies that humans are also responsible for a large part of the temperature increase during the same period. Global warming exists and is mainly due to humans.

Ref. 966
Challenge 1507 s

* *

Making crystals can make one rich. The first man who did so, the Frenchman Auguste Verneuil (1856–1913), sold rubies grown in his laboratory for many years without telling anybody. Many companies now produce synthetic gems.

Synthetic diamonds have now displaced natural diamonds in almost all applications. In the last years, methods to produce large, white, jewel-quality diamonds of ten carats and more are being developed. These advances will lead to a big change in all the domains that depend on these stones, such as the production of the special surgical knives used

Ref. 967

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009


Lorentz deflection of probe current (if due to positive carriers, as in certain semiconductors)
magnetic field B
probe of thickness d
wire with probe current I (opposite to electron flow)
resulting edge charges lead to a Hall voltage V

FIGURE 528 The Hall effect

in eye lens operation.

* *

The technologies to produce *perfect* crystals, without grain boundaries or dislocations, are an important part of modern industry. Perfectly regular crystals are at the basis of the integrated circuits used in electronic appliances, are central to many laser and telecommunication systems and are used to produce synthetic jewels.

* *

Challenge 1508 ny How can a small plant pierce through tarmac?

* *

The Lorentz force leads to an interesting effect inside materials. If a current flows along a conducting strip that is in a (non-parallel) magnetic field, a voltage builds up between two edges of the conductor, because the charge carriers are deflected in their flow. This effect is called the (classical) *Hall effect* after the US-American physicist Edwin Hall (1855–1938), who discovered it in 1879, during his PhD. The effect, shown in Figure 528, is regularly used, in so-called *Hall probes*, to measure magnetic fields; the effect is also used to read data from magnetic storage media or to measure electric currents (of the order of 1 A or more) in a wire without cutting it. Typical Hall probes have sizes of around 1 cm down to 1 µm and less. The Hall voltage V turns out to be given by

$$V = \frac{IB}{ned} \,, \tag{691}$$

where n is the electron number density, e the electron charge, and d is the thickness of the probe, as shown in Figure 528. Deducing the equation is a secondary school exercise. The Hall effect is a material effect, and the material parameter n determines the Hall voltage. The sign of the voltage also tells whether the material has positive or negative charge carriers; indeed, for metal strips the voltage polarity is opposite to the one shown in the figure.

Challenge 1509 e

Challenge 1510 e

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 529 Single atom sheets, mapped by atomic force microscopy, of $NbSe_2$ (a) and of graphite or graphene (b), a single atom sheet of MoS_2 imaged by optical microscopy (d), and a single atom sheet of $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_x$ on a holey carbon film imaged by scanning electron microscopy (c) (from Ref. 971, © 2005 National Academy of Sciences)

Many variations of the Hall effect have been studied. For example, the *quantum* Hall
Page 1178 effect will be explored below.

In 1998, Geert Rikken and his coworkers found that in certain materials photons can
Ref. 968 also be deflected by a magnetic field; this is the *photonic Hall effect*.

In 2005, again Geert Rikken and his coworkers found a material, a terbium gallium garnet, in which a flow of phonons in a magnetic field leads to temperature difference on
Ref. 969 the two sides. They called this the *phonon Hall effect*.

* *

Do magnetic fields influence the crystallization of calcium carbonate in water? This issue
Ref. 970 is topic of intense debates. It might be, or it might not be, that magnetic fields change the crystallization seeds from calcite to aragonite, thus influencing whether water tubes are covered on the inside with carbonates or not. The industrial consequences of reduction in *scaling*, as this process is called, would be enormous. But the issue is still open, as are convincing data sets.

* *

Ref. 971 It has recently become possible to make the thinnest possible sheets of graphite and other materials (such as BN, MoS_2, $NbSe_2$, $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_x$): these crystal sheets are precisely one atom thick! The production of *graphene* – that is the name of a monoatomic graphite layer – is extremely complicated: you need graphite from a pencil and a roll of adhesive tape. That is probably why it was necessary to wait until 2004 for the development of the technique. (In fact, the stability of monoatomic sheets was questioned for many years before that. Some issues in physics cannot be decided with paper and pencil; sometimes you need adhesive tape as well.) Graphene and the other so-called *two-dimensional crys-*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

tals (this is, of course, a tabloid-style exaggeration) are studied for their electronic and mechanical properties; in future, they might even have applications in high-performance batteries.

* *

Gold absorbs light. Therefore it is used, in expensive books, to colour the edges of pages. Apart from protecting the book from dust, it also prevents that sunlight lets the pages turn yellow near the edges.

* *

Like trees, crystals can have growth rings. Smoke quartz is known for these so-called *phantoms*, but also fluorite and calcite.

QUANTUM TECHNOLOGY

> I were better to be eaten to death with a rust than to be scoured to nothing with perpetual motion.
>
> William Shakespeare (1564–1616) *King Henry IV*.

Quantum effects do not appear only in microscopic systems. Several quantum effects are important in modern life; transistors, lasers, superconductivity and a few other effects and systems have shaped modern life in many ways.

Motion without friction – superconductivity and superfluidity

We are used to thinking that friction is inevitable. We even learned that friction was an inevitable result of the particle structure of matter. It should come to the surprise of every physicist that motion without friction is possible.

In 1911 Gilles Holst and Heike Kamerlingh Onnes discovered that at low temperatures, electric currents can flow with no resistance, i.e., with no friction, through lead. The observation is called *superconductivity*. In the century after that, many metals, alloys and ceramics have been found to show the same behaviour.

The condition for the observation of motion without friction is that quantum effects play an essential role. That is the reason for the requirement of low temperature in such experiments. Nevertheless, it took over 50 years to reach a full understanding of the effect. This happened in 1957, when Bardeen, Cooper and Schrieffer published their results. Ref. 984 At low temperatures, electron behaviour is dominated by an attractive interaction that makes them form pairs – today called *Cooper pairs* – that are effective bosons. And bosons can all be in the same state, thus effectively moving without friction.

For superconductivity, the attractive interaction between electrons is due to the deformation of the lattice. Two electrons attract each other in the same way as two masses attract each other due to deformation of the space-time mattress. However, in the case of solids, the deformations are quantized. With this approach, Bardeen, Cooper and Schrieffer explained the lack of electric resistance of superconducting materials, their complete

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 530 Nuclear magnetic resonance shows that vortices in superfluid ^{3}He-B are quantized.

diamagnetism ($\mu_r = 0$), the existence of an energy gap, the second-order transition to normal conductivity at a specific temperature, and the dependence of this temperature on the mass of the isotopes. Last but not least, they received the Nobel Prize in 1972.*

Another type of motion without friction is *superfluidity*. Already in 1937, Pyotr Kapitsa had predicted that normal helium (^{4}He), below a transition observed at the temperature of 2.17 K, would be a superfluid. In this domain, the fluid moves without friction through tubes. (In fact, the fluid remains a mixture of a superfluid component and a normal component.) Helium is even able, after an initial kick, to flow over obstacles, such as glass walls, or to flow out of bottles. ^{4}He is a boson, so no pairing is necessary for it to flow without friction. This research earned Kapitsa a Nobel Prize in 1978.

The explanation of superconductivity also helped for fermionic superfluidity. In 1972, Richardson, Lee, and Osheroff found that even ^{3}He is superfluid, if temperatures are lowered below 2.7 mK. ^{3}He is a fermion, and requires pairing to become superfluid. In fact, below 2.2 mK, ^{3}He is even superfluid in two different ways; one speaks of phase A and phase B.**

In the case of ^{3}He, the theoreticians had been faster than the experimentalists. The theory for superconductivity through pairing had been adapted to superfluids already in 1958 – before any data were available – by Bohr, Mottelson and Pines. This theory was then adapted and expanded by Anthony Leggett.*** The attractive interaction between ^{3}He atoms, the basic mechanism that leads to superfluidity, turns out to be the spin-spin interaction.

In superfluids, like in ordinary fluids, one can distinguish between laminar and turbulent flow. The transition between the two regimes is mediated by the behaviour of vortices. But in superfluids, vortices have properties that do not appear in normal fluids. In the superfluid ^{3}He-B phase, vortices are *quantized*: vortices only exist in integer multiples of the elementary circulation $h/2m_{^3\mathrm{He}}$. Present research is studying how these vortices behave and how they induce the transition form laminar to turbulent flows.

Ref. 978

* For John Bardeen (1908–1991), this was his second, after he had got the first Nobel Prize in 1956, shared with William Shockley and Walter Brattain, for the discovery of the transistor. The first Nobel Prize was a problem for Bardeen, as he needed time to work on superconductivity. In an example to many, he reduced the tam-tam around himself to a minimum, so that he could work as much as possible on the problem of superconductivity. By the way, Bardeen is topped by Frederick Sanger and by Marie Curie. Sanger first won a Nobel Prize in Chemistry in 1958 by himself and then won a second one shared with Walter Gilbert in 1980; Marie Curie first won one with her husband and a second one by herself, though in two different fields.

** They received the Nobel Prize in 1996 for this discovery.

*** Aage Bohr, son of Niels Bohr, and Ben Mottelson received the Nobel Prize in 1975, Anthony Leggett in 2003.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

In recent years, studying the behaviour of *gases* at lowest temperatures has become very popular. When the temperature is so low that the de Broglie wavelength is comparable to the atom-atom distance, bosonic gases form a Bose–Einstein condensate. The first one were realized in 1995 by several groups; the group around Eric Cornell and Carl Wieman used ^{87}Rb, Rand Hulet and his group used ^{7}Li and Wolfgang Ketterle and his group used ^{23}Na. For fermionic gases, the first degenerate gas, ^{40}K, was observed in 1999 by the group around Deborah Jin. In 2004, the same group observed the first gaseous Fermi condensate, after the potassium atoms paired up.

The fractional quantum Hall effect

The fractional quantum Hall effect is one of the most intriguing discoveries of materials science. The effect concerns the flow of electrons in a two-dimensional surface. In 1982, Ref. 980 Robert Laughlin predicted that in this system one should be able to observe objects with Ref. 979 electrical charge $e/3$. This strange and fascinating prediction was indeed verified in 1997.

The story begins with the discovery by Klaus von Klitzing of the quantum Hall effect. Ref. 983 In 1980, Klitzing and his collaborators found that in two-dimensional systems at low temperatures – about 1 K – the electrical conductance S is quantized in multiples of the quantum of conductance

$$S = n \frac{e^2}{\hbar} \,. \tag{692}$$

The explanation is straightforward: it is the quantum analogue of the classical Hall effect, which describes how conductance varies with applied magnetic field. The corresponding resistance values are

$$R = \frac{1}{n} \frac{\hbar}{e^2} = 25\,812,807557(18)\,\Omega/n \,. \tag{693}$$

The values are independent of material, temperature, or magnetic field. They are constants of nature. Von Klitzing received the Nobel Prize for physics for the discovery, because the effect was unexpected, allows a highly precise measurement of the fine structure constant, and also allows one to build detectors for the smallest voltage variations measurable so far. Their discovery started a large wave of subsequent research.

Two years later, it was found that in extremely strong magnetic fields and at extremely Ref. 981 low temperatures, the conductance could vary in steps *one third* that size. Shortly afterwards, even stranger numerical fractions were also found. In fact, all fractions of the form $m/(2m+1)$ or of the form $(m+1)/(2m+1)$, m being an integer, are possible. This is the *fractional quantum Hall effect*. In a landmark paper, Robert Laughlin explained all these Ref. 980 results by assuming that the electron gas could form collective states showing quasiparticle excitations with a charge $e/3$. This was confirmed 15 years later and earned him a Nobel price as well. We have seen in several occasions that quantization is best discovered through noise measurements; also in this case, the clearest confirmation came from electrical current noise measurements.

Subsequent experiments confirmed Laughlin's deduction. He had predicted the appearance of a new form of a *composite* quasi-particle, built of electrons and of one or several magnetic flux quanta. If an electron bonds with an *even* number of quanta, the composite is a fermion, and leads to Klitzing's *integral* quantum Hall effect. If the electron

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

bonds with an *odd* number of quanta, the composite is a boson, and the *fractional* quantum Hall effect appears. The experimental and theoretical details of these quasi-particles might well be the most complex and fascinating aspects of solid state physics, but exploring them would lead us too far from the aim of our adventure.

In 2007, a new chapter in the story was opened by Andre Geim and his own and a second team, when they discovered a new type of quantum Hall effect at room temperature. They used graphene, i.e., single-atom layers of graphite, and found a relativistic analogue of the quantum Hall effect. This effect was even more unexpected than the previous ones, is equally interesting, and can be performed on a table top. The groups are good candidates for a trip to Stockholm.

Ref. 982
Page 1175

What do we learn from these results? Systems in two dimensions have states which follow different rules than systems in three dimensions. The fractional charges in superconductors have no relation to quarks. Quarks, the constituents of protons and neutrons, have charges $e/3$ and $2e/3$. Might the quarks have something to do with superconductivity? At this point we need to stand the suspense, as no answer is possible; we come back to this issue in the last part of this adventure.

TABLE 101 A selection of lamps and lasers

Lamp type, application	Wavelength	Brightness or power	Cost	Lifetime
Incandescent lamps				
Tungsten wire light bulbs, halogen lamps, for illumination	300 to 800 nm	5 to 25 lm/W	0.1 cent/lm	700 h
Gas discharge lamps				
Oil lamps, candles, for illumination	white	up to 500 lm	1 cent/lm	5 h
Neon lamps, for advertizing	red			up to 30 kh
Mercury lamps, for illumination	UV plus spectrum	45 to 110 lm/W	0.05 cent/lm	3000 to 24 000 h
Metal halogenide lamps (ScI_3 or 'xenon light', NaI, DyI_3, HoI_3, TmI_5) for car headlights and illumination	white	110 lm/W	1 cent/lm	up to 20 kh
Sodium low pressure lamps for street illumination	589 nm yellow	200 lm/W	0.2 cent/lm	up to 18 kh
Sodium high pressure lamps for street illumination	broad yellow	120 lm/W	0.2 cent/lm	up to 24 kh
Xenon arc lamps, for cinemas	white	30 to 150 lm/W, up to 15 kW		100 to 2500 h
Recombination lamps				

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 101 A selection of lamps and lasers (continued)

Lamp type, application	Wavelength	Brightness or power	Cost	Lifetime
Foxfire in forests, e.g. due to *Armillaria mellea* and other bioluminescent fungi in rotting wood	green	just visible		years
Firefly, to attract mates	green-yellow			*c.* 10 h
Large deep sea squid, *Taningia danae*, producing light flashes, to confuse prey	red			years
Deep-sea fish, such as *angler fish*, to attract prey or find mates	white			years
Light emitting diodes, for measurement, illumination and communication	red, green, blue, UV	up to 100 lm/W	10 cent/lm	15k to 100 kh
Synchroton radiation sources				
Electron synchroton source	X-rays to radio waves	pulsed	many MEuro	
Ideal white lamp or laser	visible	*c.* 300 lm/W	n.a.	n.a.
Ideal coloured lamp or laser	green	683 lm/W	n.a.	n.a.
Gas lasers				
He-Ne laser (obsolete), for school experiments	632.8 nm	550 lm/W	2000 cent/lm	300 h
Argon laser, for pumping and laser shows	several blue and green lines	up to 100 W	10 kEuro	
Krypton laser, for pumping and laser shows	several blue, green, red lines	50 W		
Xenon laser	many lines in the IR, visible and near UV	20 W		
Nitrogen (or 'air') laser, for pumping of other lasers, for hobby	337.1 nm	pulsed up to 1 MW	down to a few hundred Euro	limited by metal electrode lifetime
Water vapour laser, for research	many lines between 7 and 220 µm, often 118 µm	CW 0.5 W, pulsed much higher	a few kEuro	

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 101 A selection of lamps and lasers (continued)

Lamp type, application	Wavelength	Brightness or power	Cost	Lifetime
CO_2 laser, for cutting, welding, glass welding and surgery	10.6 µm	CW up to 100 kW, pulsed up to 10 TW		1500 h
Excimer laser, for lithography in silicon chip manufacturing, eye surgery, pumping, psoriasis treatment, laser deposition	193 nm (ArF), 248 nm (KrF), 308 nm (XeCl), 353 nm (XeF)	100 W		
Metal vapour lasers (Cu, Cd, Se, Ca, Ag, Au, Mn, Tl, In, Hg)				
Copper vapour laser, for pumping, photography, dermatology, laser cutting, hobby constructions and explorative research	248 nm, 511 nm and 578 nm	pulses up to 5 MW		
Cadmium vapour laser, for printing, typesetting and recognition of forged US dollar notes	325 nm and 442 nm	up to 200 mW	12 kEuro	10 kh
Gold vapour laser, for explorative research, dermatology	627 nm	pulses up to 1 MW	from a few hundred Euro upwards	
Chemical gas lasers				
HF, DF and oxygen-iodine laser, used as weapons, pumped by chemical reactions	1.3 to 4.2 µm	up to MW in CW mode	over 10 MEuro	unknown
Liquid Dye lasers				
Rhodamine, stilbene, coumarin etc. lasers, for spectroscopy and medical uses	tunable, range depends on dye in 300 to 1100 nm range	up to 10 W	10 kEuro	dye-dependent
Beer, vodka, whiskey and many other liquids work as laser material	IR, visible			
Solid state lasers				
Ruby laser (obsolete), for holography and tattoo removal	694 nm		1 kEuro	
Nd:YAG (neodym-YAG) laser, for material processing, surgery, pumping, rangefinding, velocimetry	1064 nm	CW 10 kW, pulsed 300 MW	50 to 500 kEuro	1000 h
Er:YAG laser, for dermatology	2940 nm			

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 101 A selection of lamps and lasers (continued)

Lamp type, application	Wavelength	Brightness or power	Cost	Lifetime
Ti:sapphire laser, for ultrashort pulses for spectroscopy, LIDAR, and research	650 to 1200 nm	CW 1 W, pulsed 300 TW	from 5 kEuro upwards	
Alexandrite laser, for laser machining, dermatology, LIDAR	700 to 840 nm			
Cr:LiSAF laser		pulsed 10 TW, down to 30 fs		
Cr:YAG laser	1.35 to 1.6 μm	pulsed, down to 100 fs		
Cr:Forsterite laser, optical tomography	1200 to 1300 nm	pulsed, below 100 fs		
Erbium doped glass laser, used in optical communications (undersea cables) and optical amplifiers	1.53 to 1.56 μm			years
Perovskite laser, such as Co:$KZnF_3$, for research	NIR tunable, 1650 to 2070 nm	100 mW	2 kEuro	
F-centre laser, for spectroscopy (NaCl:OH-, KI:Li, LiF)	tuning ranges between 1.2 and 6 μm	100 mW	20 kEuro	
Semiconductor lasers				
GaN laser diode, for optical recording	400 to 500 nm	10 mW	a few Euro	a few 100 h
AlGaAs laser diode, for optical recording, pointers, data communication, laser fences, bar code readers (normal or vertical cavity)	620 to 900 nm	up to 1 W	below 1 Euro to 100 Euro	*c.* 10 000 h
InGaAsP laser diode, for fiberoptic communication, laser pumping, material processing, medial uses (normal and vertical cavity or VCSEL)	1 to 2.5 μm	up to 100 W	below 1 Euro up to a few k Euro	up to 20 000 h
Lead salt (PbS/PbSe) laser diode, for spectroscopy and gas detection	3 to 25 μm	0.1 W	a few 100 Euro	
Quantum cascade laser, for research and spectroscopy	2.7 to 350 μm	CW achieved		
Hybrid silicon lasers, for research	IR	nW	0.1 MEuro	
Free electron lasers				

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 531 A semiconductor laser (red), a diode pumped, frequency doubled Nd:YAG laser (green) and an argon laser (blue) (© ..., ..., ...)

TABLE 101 A selection of lamps and lasers (continued)

Lamp type, application	Wavelength	Brightness or power	Cost	Lifetime
Used for material science	5 nm to 1 mm	CW 20 kW, pulsed in GW range	10 MEuro	years
Nuclear-reaction pumped lasers				
Have uses only in science fiction and for getting money from gullible military				

Lasers and other spin-one vector boson launchers

Photons are vector bosons; a lamp is thus a vector boson launcher. All lamps fall into one of three classes. Incandescent lamps use emission from a hot solid, gas discharge lamps use excitation of atoms, ions or molecules through collision, and solid state lamps generate (cold) light through recombination of charges in semiconductors.

Ref. 1001

Most solid state lamps are light emitting diodes. The large progress in brightness of light emitting diodes could lead to a drastic reduction in future energy consumption, if their cost is lowered sufficiently. Many engineers are working on this task. Since the cost is a good estimate for the energy needed for production, can you estimate which lamp is

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1511 s the most friendly to the environment?

Nobody thought much about lamps, until Albert Einstein and a few other great physicists came along, such as Theodore Maiman and Hermann Haken. Many other researchers later received Nobel Prizes by building on their work. In 1916, Einstein showed that there are two types of sources of light – or of electromagnetic radiation in general – both of which actually 'create' light. He showed that every lamp whose brightness is turned up high enough will change behaviour when a certain intensity threshold is passed. The main mechanism of light emission then changes from spontaneous emission to *stimulated emission*. Nowadays such a special lamp is called a *laser*. (The letters 'se' in laser are an abbreviation of 'stimulated emission'.) After a passionate worldwide research race, in 1960 Maiman was the first to build a laser emitting visible light. (So-called *masers* emitting microwaves were already known for several decades.) In summary, Einstein and the other physicists showed that lasers are lamps which are sufficiently turned up. Lasers consist of some light producing and amplifying material together with a mechanism to pump energy into it. The material can be a gas, a liquid or a solid; the pumping process can use electrical current or light. Usually, the material is put between two mirrors, in order to improve the efficiency of the light production. Common lasers are semiconductor lasers (essentially strongly pumped LEDs or light emitting diodes), He–Ne lasers (strongly pumped neon lamps), liquid lasers (essentially strongly pumped fire flies) and ruby lasers (strongly pumped luminescent crystals).

Lasers produce radiation in the range from microwaves and extreme ultraviolet. They have the special property of emitting *coherent* light, usually in a collimated beam. Therefore lasers achieve much higher light intensities than lamps, allowing their use as tools. In modern lasers, the coherence length, i.e., the length over which interference can be observed, can be thousands of kilometres. Such high quality light is used e.g. in gravitational wave detectors.

People have become pretty good at building lasers. Lasers are used to cut metal sheets up to 10 cm thickness, others are used instead of knives in surgery, others increase surface hardness of metals or clean stones from car exhaust pollution. Other lasers drill holes in teeth, measure distances, image biological tissue or grab living cells. Most materials can be used to make lasers, including water, beer and vodka.

Some materials amplify light so much that end mirrors are not necessary. This is the case for nitrogen lasers, in which nitrogen, or simply air, is used to produce a UV beam. Even a laser made of a single atom (and two mirrors) has been built; in this example, Ref. 1010 only eleven photons on average were moving between the two mirrors. Quite a small lamp. Also lasers emitting light in two dimensions have been built. They produce a light plane instead of a light beam.

Lasers have endless applications. Lasers read out data from compact discs (CDs), are used in the production of silicon integrated circuits, and transport telephone signals; we Page 297 already encountered lasers that work as loudspeakers. The biggest advances in recent years came from the applications of femtosecond laser pulses. Femtosecond pulses generate high-temperature plasmas in the materials they propagate, even in air. Such short pulses can be used to cut material without heating it, for example to cut bones in heart operations. Femtosecond lasers have been used to make high resolution hologram of human heads within a single flash. Recently such lasers have been used to guide lightning Ref. 1002 along a predetermined path and seem promising candidates for laser ligtning rods. A

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

curious application is to store information in fingernails (up to 5 Mbit for a few months) using such lasers, in a way not unlike that used in recordable compact discs (CD-R). Ref. 1011

Can two photons interfere?

In 1930, Dirac made the famous statement already mentioned above: Page 1008 Ref. 1003

> Each photon interferes only with itself. Interference between two different photons never occurs.

Often this statement is misinterpreted as implying that two separate photon *sources* cannot interfere. It is almost unbelievable how this false interpretation has spread through the literature. Everybody can check that this statement is incorrect with a radio: two distant radio stations transmitting on the same frequency lead to beats in amplitude, i.e., to *wave interference*. (This should not to be confused with the more common *radio interference*, with usually is simply a superposition of intensities.) Radio transmitters are coherent sources of photons, and any radio receiver shows that two such sources can indeed interfere. Ref. 1004

In 1949, interference of two different sources has been demonstrated with microwave beams. Numerous experiments with two lasers and even with two thermal light sources have shown light interference from the fifties onwards. In 1963, Magyar and Mandel used two ruby lasers emitting light pulses and a rapid shutter camera to produce spatial interference fringes. Ref. 1004

However, all these experimental results do not contradict the statement by Dirac. Indeed, two photons cannot interfere for several reasons.

— Interference is a result of space-time propagation of waves; photons appear only when the energy–momentum picture is used, mainly when interaction with matter takes place. The description of space-time propagation and the particle picture are mutually exclusive – this is one aspect of the complementary principle. Why does Dirac seem to mix the two in his statement? Dirac employs the term 'photon' in a very general sense, as quantized state of the electromagnetic field. When two coherent beams are superposed, the quantized entities, the photons, cannot be ascribed to either of the sources. Interference results from superposition of two coherent states, not of two particles.
— Interference is only possible if one cannot know where the detected photon comes from. The quantum mechanical description of the field in a situation of interference never allows to ascribe photons of the superposed field to one of the sources. In other words, if you can say from which source a detected photon comes from, you *cannot* observe interference.
— Interference between two beams requires a fixed phase between them, i.e., an uncertain particle number; in other words, interference is only possible if the photon number for each of the two beams is unknown.

A better choice of words is to say that interference is always between two (indistinguishable) states, or if one prefers, between two possible (indistinguishable) histories, but never between two particles. In summary, two different electromagnetic beams can

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 532 An electron hologram

interfere, but not two different photons.

Can two electron beams interfere?

Do coherent electron sources exist? Yes, as it is possible to make holograms with electron beams.* However, electron coherence is only transversal, not longitudinal. Transversal coherence is given by the possible size of wavefronts with fixed phase. The limit of this size is given by the interactions such a state has with its environment; if the interactions are weak, matter wave packets of several metres of size can be produced, e.g. in particle colliders, where energies are high and interaction with matter is low.

Actually, the term transversal coherence is a fake. The ability to interfere with oneself is not the definition of coherence. Transversal coherence only expresses that the source size is small. Both small lamps (and lasers) can show interference when the beam is split and recombined; this is not a proof of coherence. Similarly, monochromaticity is not a proof for coherence either.

A state is called *coherent* if it possesses a well-defined phase throughout a given domain of space or time. The size of that region or of that time interval defines the degree of coherence. This definition yields coherence lengths of the order of the source size for small 'incoherent' sources. Nevertheless, the size of an interference pattern, or the distance d between its maxima, can be much larger than the coherence length l or the source size s.

In summary, even though an electron can interfere with itself, it cannot interfere with a second one. Uncertain electron numbers are needed to see a macroscopic interference pattern. That is impossible, as electrons (at usual energies) carry a conserved charge.

– CS – sections on transistors and superconductivity to be added – CS –

Challenges, dreams and fun curiosities about quantum technology

Nowadays, we carry many electronic devices in our jacket or trousers. Almost all use batteries. In the future, there is a high chance that some of these devices will extract energy from the human body. There are several options. One can extract thermal energy with thermoelements, or one can extract vibrational energy with piezoelectric, electrostatic or

Ref. 1006 * In 2002, the first holograms have been produced that made use of neutron beams.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 533 Imaging isolated electrons: single electrons surrounded by bubbles that explode in liquid helium under negative pressure produce white spots (mpg film © Humphrey Maris)

electromagnetic transducers. The challenge is to make these elements small and cheap. It will be interesting to find out which technology will arrive to the market first.

* *

In 2007, Humphrey Maris and his student Wei Guo performed an astonishing experiment: they filmed single electrons with a video camera. Well, the truth is a bit more complicated, but it is not a lie to summarize it in this way.

Ref. 985

Maris is an expert on superfluid helium. Since many years he knew that free electrons in superfluid helium repel helium atoms, and can move, surrounded by a small vacuum bubble, about 2 nm across, through the fluid. He also discovered that under negative pressure, these bubbles can grow and finally explode. When they explode, they are able to scatter light. With his student Wei Guo, he then injected electrons into superfluid helium through a tungsten needle under negative voltage, produced negative pressure by focussing waves from two piezoelectric transducers in the bulk of the helium, and shone light through the helium. When the pressure became negative enough they saw the explosions of the bubbles. Figure 533 shows the video. If the experiment is confirmed, it is one of the highlights of experimental physics in the last decade.

* *

Challenge 1512 d Is it possible to make A4-size, thin and flexible colour displays for an affordable price?

* *

Challenge 1513 r Will there ever be desktop laser engravers for 1000 euro?

* *

Challenge 1514 r Will there ever be room-temperature superconductivity?

* *

Challenge 1515 s Will there ever be teleportation of everyday objects?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

One process that quantum physics does not allow is telephathy. An unnamed space agency found this out during the Apollo 14 mission, when, during the flight to the moon, cosmonaut Edgar Mitchell tested telepathy as communication means. Unsurprisingly, he found that it was useless. It is unclear why the unnamed space agency spent so much money for a useless experiment – an experiment that could have been performed, at a cost of a phone call, also down here on earth.

Ref. 986

* *

Challenge 1516 d Will there ever be applied quantum cryptology?

* *

Challenge 1517 d Will there ever be printable polymer electronic circuits, instead of lithographically patterned silicon electronics as is common now?

* *

Challenge 1518 r Will there ever be radio-controlled flying toys in the size of insects?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 42

QUANTUM ELECTRODYNAMICS – THE ORIGIN OF VIRTUAL REALITY

The central concept that quantum theory introduces in the description of nature is the idea of *virtual particles*. Virtual particles are short-lived particles; they owe their existence exclusively to the quantum of action. Because of the quantum of action, they do not need to follow the energy-mass relation that special relativity requires of normal, real particles. Virtual particles can move faster than light and can move backward in time. Despite these strange properties, they have many observable effects.

Ships, mirrors and the Casimir effect

When two parallel ships roll in a big swell, *without* even the slightest wind blowing, they will attract each other. This effect was well known up to the nineteenth century, when many places still lacked harbours. As Sipko Boersma tells, shipping manuals advised captains to let the ships be pulled apart using a well-manned rowing boat.

Ref. 989

Waves induce oscillations of ships because a ship absorbs energy from the waves. When oscillating, the ship also emits waves. This happens mainly towards the two sides of the ship. As a result, for a single ship, the wave emission has no net effect on its position. Now imagine that two parallel ships oscillate in a long swell, with a wavelength much larger than the distance between the ships. Due to the long wavelength, the two ships will oscillate in phase. The ships will thus not be able to absorb energy from each other. As a result, the energy they radiate towards the outside will push them towards each other.

The effect is not difficult to calculate. The energy of a rolling ship is

$$E = mgh\,\alpha^2/2 \tag{694}$$

where α is the roll angle amplitude, m the mass of the ship and $g = 9,8\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$ the acceleration due to gravity. The *metacentric height* h is the main parameter characterizing a ship, especially a sailing ship; it tells with what torque the ship returns to the vertical when inclined by an angle α. Typically, one has h =1.5 m.

When a ship is inclined, it will return to the vertical by a damped oscillation. A damped oscillation is characterized by a period T and a quality factor Q. The *quality factor* is the number of oscillations the system takes to reduce its amplitude by a factor $e = 2.718$. If the quality factor Q of an oscillating ship and its oscillation period T are

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

given, the radiated power W is

$$W = 2\pi \frac{E}{QT} \,. \tag{695}$$

We saw above that radiation force (radiation pressure times area) is W/c, where c is the wave propagation velocity. For water waves, we have the famous relation

$$c = \frac{gT}{2\pi} \,. \tag{696}$$

Assuming that for two nearby ships each one completely absorbs the power emitted from the other, we find that the two ships are attracted towards each other following

$$ma = m2\pi^2 \frac{h\alpha^2}{QT^2} \,. \tag{697}$$

Inserting typical values such as $Q = 2.5$, $T = 10\,\mathrm{s}$, $\alpha = 0.14\,\mathrm{rad}$ and a ship mass of 700 tons, we get about 1.9 kN. Long swells thus make ships attract each other. The intensity of the attraction is comparatively small and can indeed be overcome with a rowing boat. On the other hand, even the slightest wind will damp the oscillation amplitude and have other effects that will avoid the observation of the attraction.

Sound waves or noise in air can have the same effect. It is sufficient to suspend two metal plates in air and surround them by loudspeakers. The sound will induce attraction (or repulsion) of the plates, depending on whether the sound wavelength cannot (or can) be taken up by the other plate.

Ref. 990

In 1948, the Dutch physicist Hendrik Casimir made one of the most spectacular predictions of quantum theory: he predicted a similar effect for metal plates in vacuum. Casimir, who worked at the Dutch Electronics company Philips, wanted to understand why it was so difficult to build television tubes. Television screens are made by deposing small neutral particles on glass, but Casimir observed that the particles somehow attracted each other. Casimir got interested in understanding how neutral particles interact. During these theoretical studies he discovered that two neutral mirrors (or metal plates) would attract each other even in complete vacuum. This is the famous *Casimir effect*. Casimir also determined the attraction strength between a sphere and a plate, and between two spheres. In fact, all conducting bodies attract each other in vacuum, with a force depending on their geometry.

In all these situations, the role of the sea is taken by the zero-point fluctuations of the electromagnetic field, the role of the ships by the mirrors. Casimir understood that the space between two parallel mirrors, due to the geometrical constraints, had different zero-point fluctuations than the free vacuum. Like two ships, the result would be the attraction of the mirrors.

Casimir predicted that the attraction for two mirrors of mass m and surface A is given by

$$\frac{ma}{A} = \frac{\pi^3}{120} \frac{\hbar c}{d^4} \,. \tag{698}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The effect is a pure quantum effect; in classical electrodynamics, two neutral bodies do not attract. The effect is small; it takes some dexterity to detect it. The first experimental confirmation was by Derjaguin, Abrikosova and Lifshitz in 1956; the second experimental confirmation was by Marcus Sparnaay, Casimir's colleague at Philips, in 1958. Two beautiful high-precision measurements of the Casimir effect were performed in 1997 by Lamoreaux and in 1998 by Mohideen and Roy; they confirmed Casimir's prediction with a precision of 5 % and 1 % respectively. (Note that at very small distances, the dependence is not $1/d^4$, but $1/d^3$.)

Ref. 991 Ref. 992 Ref. 993 Ref. 994

In a cavity, spontaneous emission is suppressed, if it is smaller than the wavelength of the emitted light! This effect has also been observed. It confirms the old saying that spontaneous emission is emission stimulated by the zero point fluctuations.

The Casimir effect thus confirms the existence of the zero-point fluctuations of the electromagnetic field. It confirms that quantum theory is valid also for electromagnetism.

The Casimir effect between two spheres is proportional to $1/r^7$ and thus is much weaker than between two parallel plates. Despite this strange dependence, the fascination of the Casimir effect led many amateur scientists to speculate that a mechanism similar to the Casimir effect might explain gravitational attraction. Can you give at least three arguments why this is impossible, even if the effect had the correct distance dependence?

Challenge 1519 s

Like the case of sound, the Casimir effect can also produce repulsion instead of attraction. It is sufficient that one of the two materials be perfectly permeable, the other a perfect conductor. Such combinations repel each other, as Timothy Boyer discovered in 1974.

Ref. 995

The Casimir effect bears another surprise: between two metal plates, the speed of light changes and can be larger than c. Can you imagine what exactly is meant by 'speed of light' in this context?

Ref. 996 Challenge 1520 s

In 2006, the Casimir effect provided another surprise. The ship story just presented is beautiful, interesting and helps understanding the effect; but it seems that the story is based on a misunderstanding. Alas, the interpretation of the old naval text given by Sipko Boersma seems to be wishful thinking. There might be such an effect for ships, but it has never been observed nor put into writing by seamen, as Fabrizio Pinto has pointed out after carefully researching naval sources.

The Lamb shift

In the 1947, the measurements of the spectrum of hydrogen had yielded another effect due to virtual particles. Willis Lamb (1913–) found that the $2S_{1/2}$ energy level in atomic hydrogen lies slightly above the $2P_{1/2}$ level. This is in contrast to the calculation performed above, where the two levels are predicted to have the same energy. In reality, they have an energy difference of 1057.864 MHz or 4.3 μeV. This discovery had important consequences for the description of quantum theory and yielded Lamb a share of the 1955 Nobel Prize in Physics.

Page 1046

The reason for the level difference is an unnoticed approximation performed in the simple relativistic calculation of the hydrogen levels. There are two equivalent ways to explain it. One is to say that the calculation neglects the coupling terms between the Dirac equation and the Maxwell equations. This explanation lead to the first calculations

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

of the Lamb shift, around the year 1950. The other explanation is to say that the calculation *neglects virtual particles*. In particular, the calculation neglects the virtual photons emitted and absorbed during the motion of the electron around the nucleus. This is the explanation in line with the modern vocabulary of quantum electrodynamics. QED is the perturbative approach to solve the coupled Dirac and Maxwell equations.

The QED Lagrangian

– CS – section on the QED Lagrangian to be added – CS –

Interactions and virtual particles

The electromagnetic interaction is exchange of virtual photons. So how can the interaction be attractive? At first sight, any exchange of virtual photons should drive the electrons from each other. However, this is not correct. The momentum of virtual photons does not have to be in the direction of its energy flow; it can also be in opposite direction.* Obviously, this is only possible within the limits provided by the indeterminacy principle.

Can one count virtual photons? No.

Vacuum energy

The strangest result of quantum field theory is the energy density of the vacuum.

– CS – More to be written – CS –

Moving mirrors

Mirrors also work when they or the light source is in motion; in contrast, walls do not produce echoes for all sound sources or for all wall speeds. For example, experiments show that walls do not produce echoes if the wall or the sound source moves faster than sound. On the other hand, mirrors always produce an image, whatever the involved speeds. These observations show that the speed of light is the *same* for all observers. Can you detail the argument?

Challenge 1521 s

Mirrors also differ from tennis rackets. (Rackets are a kind of portable walls, to continue the previous analogy.) We have seen that mirrors cannot be used to change the speed of the light they hit, in contrast to what tennis rackets can do with balls. This observation shows that the speed of light is a *limit* velocity. In short, the simple existence of mirrors is sufficient to derive special relativity.

But there are more interesting things to be learned from mirrors. We only have to ask whether mirrors work when they undergo *accelerated* motion. This issue yields a surprising result.

* One of the most beautiful booklets on quantum electrodynamics which makes this point remains the text by Richard Feynman, *QED: the Strange Theory of Light and Matter*, Penguin Books, 1990.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

In the 1970s, quite a number of researchers found that there is no vacuum for accelerated observers. This effect is called *Fulling–Davies–Unruh effect* or sometimes the *dynamical Casimir effect*. As a consequence, a mirror in accelerated motion reflects the fluctuations it encounters and reflects them. In short, *an accelerated mirror emits light*. Unfortunately, the intensity is so weak that it has not been measured up to now. We will explore the issue in more detail below. Can you explain why accelerated mirrors emit light, but not matter?

Page 1207
Challenge 1522 s

Photons hitting photons

When virtual particles are taken into account, light beams can 'bang' onto each other. This result is in full contrast to classical electrodynamics. Indeed, QED shows that the appearance of virtual electron-positron pairs allow photons to hit each other. And such pairs are found in any light beam.

However, the cross-section for photons banging onto each other is small. In fact, the bang is extremely weak. When two light beams cross, most photons will pass undisturbed. The cross-section A is approximately

$$A \approx \frac{973}{10\,125\pi}\alpha^4\left(\frac{\hbar}{m_e c}\right)^2\left(\frac{\hbar\omega}{m_e c^2}\right)^6 \tag{699}$$

for the everyday case that the energy $\hbar\omega$ of the photon is much smaller than the rest energy $m_e c^2$ of the electron. This value is about 18 orders of magnitude smaller than what was measurable in 1999; the future will show whether the effect can be observed for visible light. However, for high energy photons these effects are observed daily in particle accelerators. In these cases one observes not only interaction through virtual electron–antielectron pairs, but also through virtual muon–antimuon pairs, virtual quark–antiquark pairs, and much more.

Everybody who consumes science fiction knows that matter and antimatter annihilate and transform into pure light. In more detail, a matter particle and an antimatter particle annihilate into two or more photons. More interestingly, quantum theory predicts that the opposite process is also possible: photons hitting photons can produce matter!

Ref. 997

In 1997, this was also confirmed experimentally. At the Stanford particle accelerator, photons from a high energy laser pulse were bounced off very fast electrons. In this way, the reflected photons acquired a large energy, when seen in the inertial frame of the experimenter. The original pulse, of 527 nm or 2.4 eV green light, had a peak power density of $10^{22}\,\mathrm{W/m^2}$, about the highest achievable so far. That is a photon density of $10^{34}\,/\mathrm{m^3}$ and an electric field of $10^{12}\,\mathrm{V/m}$, both of which were record values at the time. When this laser pulse was reflected off a 46.6 GeV electron beam, the returning photons had an energy of 29.2 GeV and thus had become intense gamma rays. These gamma rays then collided with other, still incoming green photons and produced electron–positron pairs by the reaction

Challenge 1523 e

$$\gamma_{29.2} + n\,\gamma_{\mathrm{green}} \to \mathrm{e}^+ + \mathrm{e}^- \tag{700}$$

for which both final particles were detected by special apparatuses. The experiment thus showed that light can hit light in nature, and above all, that doing so can produce matter.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

This is the nearest one can get to the science fiction idea of light swords or of laser swords banging onto each other.

Is the vacuum a bath?

If the vacuum is a sea of virtual photons and particle–antiparticle pairs, vacuum could be suspected to act as a bath. In general, the answer is negative. Quantum field theory works because the vacuum is *not* a bath for single particles. However, there is always an exception. For dissipative systems made of many particles, such as electrical conductors, the vacuum *can* act as a viscous fluid. Irregularly shaped, neutral, but conducting bodies can emit photons when accelerated, thus damping such type of motion. This is due to the Fulling–Davies–Unruh effect, also called the *dynamical Casimir effect*, as described above. The damping depends on the shape and thus also on the direction of the body's motion.

Ref. 998

Page 287

In 1998, Gour and Sriramkumar even predicted that Brownian motion should also appear for an imperfect, i.e., partly absorbing mirror placed in vacuum. The fluctuations of the vacuum should produce a mean square displacement

Ref. 999

$$\langle d^2 \rangle = \hbar/mt \tag{701}$$

increasing linearly with time; however, the extremely small displacements produced this way seem out of experimental reach so far. But the result is not a surprise. Are you able to give another, less complicated explanation for it?

Challenge 1524 ny

Renormalization – why is an electron so light?

– CS – section on renormalization to be added – CS –

Sometimes it is claimed that the infinities appearing in quantum electrodynamics in the intermediate steps of the calculation show that the theory is incomplete or wrong. However, this type of statement would imply that classical physics is also incomplete or wrong, on the ground that in the definition of the velocity v with space x and time t, namely

$$v = \frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t} = \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \frac{\Delta x}{\Delta t} = \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \Delta x \frac{1}{\Delta t} \,, \tag{702}$$

one gets an infinity as intermediate step. Indeed, $\mathrm{d}t$ being vanishingly small, one could argue that one is dividing by zero. Both arguments show the difficulty to accept that the result of a limit process can be a finite quantity even if infinite quantities appear in it. The parallel with the definition of the velocity is closer than it seems; both 'infinities' stem from the assumption that space-time is continuous, i.e., infinitely divisible. The infinities necessary in limit processes for the definition of differentiation, of integration or for the renormalization scheme appear only when space-time is approximated as a complete set, or as physicists say, as a 'continuous' set.

On the other hand, the conviction that the appearance of an infinity might be a sign of incompleteness of a theory was an interesting development in physics. It shows how

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 534 What is the maximum possible value of h/l?

uncomfortable many physicists had become with the use of infinity in our description of nature. Notably, this was the case for Dirac himself, who, after having laid in his youth the basis of quantum electrodynamics, has tried for the rest of his life to find a way, without success, to change the theory so that infinities are avoided.*

Ref. 1000

Renormalization is a procedure that follows from the requirement that continuous space-time and gauge theories must work together. In particular, it follows form the requirement that the particle concept is consistent, i.e., that perturbation expansions are possible.

Curiosities and fun challenges of quantum electrodynamics

Motion is an interesting topic, and when a curious person asks a question about it, most of the time quantum electrodynamics is needed for the answer. Together with gravity, quantum electrodynamics explains almost all of our everyday experience, including numerous surprises. Let us have a look at some of them.

* *

There is a famous riddle asking how far the last card (or the last brick) of a stack can hang over the edge of a table. Of course, only gravity, no glue or any other means is allowed to keep the cards on the table. After you solved the riddle, can you give the solution in case that the quantum of action is taken into account?

Challenge 1525 s

* *

Quantum electrodynamics explains why there are only a *finite* number of different atom types. In fact, it takes only two lines to prove that pair production of electron–antielectron pairs make it impossible that a nucleus has more than about 137 protons. Can you show this? The effect at the basis of this limit, the polarization of the vacuum, also plays a role in much larger systems, such as charged black holes, as we will see shortly.

Ref. 1007

Challenge 1526 s

Page 1211

* *

* Not long after his death, his wish has been fulfilled, although in a different manner that he envisaged. The final part of this mountain ascent will show the way out of the issue.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Taking 91 of the 92 electrons off an uranium atom allows researchers to check whether the innermost electron still is described by QED. The electric field near the uranium nucleus, 1 EV/m is near the threshold for spontaneous pair production. The field is the highest constant field producible in the laboratory, and an ideal testing ground for precision QED experiments. The effect of virtual photons is to produce a Lamb shift; even in these extremely high fields, the value fits with the predictions. Ref. 1008

* *

Is there a critical magnetic field in nature, like there is a critical electric field, limited by spontaneous pair production? Challenge 1527 ny

* *

In classical physics, the field energy of a point-like charged particle, and hence its mass, was predicted to be infinite. QED effectively *smears out* the charge of the electron over its Compton wavelength, so that in the end the field energy contributes only a small correction to its total mass. Can you confirm this? Page 781 Challenge 1528 ny

* *

Microscopic evolution can be pretty slow. Light, especially when emitted by single atoms, is always emitted by some metastable state. Usually, the decay times, being induced by the vacuum fluctuations, are much shorter than a microsecond. However, there are metastable atomic states with a lifetime of ten years: for example, an ytterbium ion in the $^2F_{7/2}$ state achieves this value, because the emission of light requires an octupole transition, in which the angular momentum changes by $3\hbar$; this is an extremely unlikely process. Ref. 1009

In radiocative decay, the slowness record is held by ^{209}Bi, with over 10^{19} years of half-life. Page 1348

* *

Microscopic evolution can be pretty fast. Can you imagine how to deduce or to measure the speed of electrons inside atoms? And inside metals? Challenge 1529 s

* *

Take a horseshoe. The distance between the two ends is not fixed, since otherwise their position and velocity would be known at the same time, contradicting the indeterminacy relation. Of course, this reasoning is also valid for any other solid object. In short, both quantum mechanics and special relativity show that rigid bodies do not exist, albeit for different reasons.

* *

Have you ever admired a quartz crystal or some other crystalline material? The beautiful shape and atomic arrangement has formed spontaneously, as a result of the motion of atoms under high temperature and pressure, during the time that the material was deep under the Earth's surface. The details of crystal formation are complex and interesting.

For example, are regular crystal lattices *energetically* optimal? This simple question leads to a wealth of problems. We might start with the much simpler question whether a

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 535 On tungsten tips, rhenium atoms, visible at the centre of the images, do not form dimers (left) but do form trimers (right) (© Hans-Werner Fink, APS, AIP from Ref. 1014)

Challenge 1530 s

regular dense packing of spheres is the most *dense* possible. Its density is $\pi/\sqrt{18}$, i.e., a bit over 74 %. Even though this was conjectured to be the maximum possible value already

Ref. 1012

in 1609 by Johannes Kepler, the statement was proven only in 1998 by Tom Hales. The proof is difficult because in small volumes it is possible to pack spheres up to almost 78 %. To show that over large volumes the lower value is correct is a tricky business.

Next, does a regular crystal of solid spheres, in which the spheres do *not* touch, have the lowest possible entropy? This simple problem has been the subject of research only in the 1990s. Interestingly, *for low temperatures*, regular sphere arrangements indeed show the largest possible entropy. At low temperatures, spheres in a crystal can oscillate around their average position and be thus more disordered than if they were in a liquid; in the liquid state the spheres would block each other's motion and would not allow to show disorder at all.

This many similar results deduced from the research into these so-called *entropic forces* show that the transition from solid to liquid is – at least in part – simply a geometrical effect. For the same reason, one gets the surprising result that even slightly

Ref. 1013

repulsing spheres (or atoms) can form crystals and melt at higher temperatures. These are beautiful examples of how classical thinking can explain certain material properties, using from quantum theory only the particle model of matter.

But the energetic side of crystal formation provides other interesting questions. Quantum theory shows that it is possible that *two* atoms repel each other, while *three* attract each other. This beautiful effect was discovered and explained by Hans-Werner Fink in

Ref. 1014

1984. He studied rhenium atoms on tungsten surfaces and showed, as observed, that they cannot form dimers – two atoms moving closeby – but readily form trimers. This is an example contradicting classical physics; the effect is impossible if one pictures atoms as immutable spheres, but becomes possible when one remembers that the electron clouds around the atoms rearrange depending on their environment.

For an exact study of crystal energy, the interactions between all atoms have to be included. The simplest question is to determine whether a regular array of alternatively charged spheres has lower energy than some irregular collection. Already such simple

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 536 Some snow flakes (© Furukawa Yoshinori)

questions are still topic of research; the answer is still open.

Another question is the mechanism of face formation in crystals. Can you confirm Challenge 1531 s that crystal faces are those planes with the *slowest* growth speed, because all fast growing planes are eliminated? The finer details of the process form a complete research field in Ref. 1015 itself.

However, not always the slowest growing planes win out. Figure 536 shows some well-known exceptions. Explaining such shapes is possible today, and Furukawa Yoshinori is Ref. 1016 one of the experts in the field, heading a dedicated research team. Indeed, there remains the question of symmetry: why are crystals often symmetric, such as snowflakes, instead of asymmetric? This issue is a topic of self-organization, as mentioned already in the Page 302 section of classical physics. It turns out that the symmetry is an automatic result of the way molecular systems grow under the combined influence of diffusion and nonlinear processes. The details are still a topic of research.

* *

A similar breadth of physical and mathematical problems are encountered in the study Ref. 1017 of liquids and polymers. The ordering of polymer chains, the bubbling of hot water, the motion of heated liquids and the whirls in liquid jets show complex behaviour that can be explained with simple models. Turbulence and self-organization will be a fascinating research field for many years to come.

* *

The ways people handle single atoms with electromagnetic fields provide many beautiful examples of modern applied technologies. Nowadays it is possible to levitate, to trap, to Page 260 excite, to photograph, to deexcite and to move single atoms just by shining light onto Ref. 210 them. In 1997, the Nobel Prize in Physics has been awarded to the originators of the field.

* *

In 1997, a Czech group built a quantum version of the Foucault pendulum, using the Ref. 1018 superfluidity of helium. In this beautiful piece of research, they cooled a small ring of fluid helium below the temperature of 0.28 K, below which the helium moves without friction. In such situations it thus can behave like a Foucault pendulum. With a clever arrangement, it was possible to measure the rotation of the helium in the ring using phonon signals, and to show the rotation of the Earth.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

If an electrical wire is sufficiently narrow, its electrical conductance is quantized in steps of $2e^2/\hbar$. The wider the wire, the more such steps are added to its conductance. Can you Challenge 1532 s explain the effect? By the way, quantized conductance has also been observed for light Ref. 1019 and for phonons.

* *

An example of modern research is the study of hollow atoms, i.e., atoms missing a number of inner electrons. They have been discovered in 1990 by J.P. Briand and his group. They appear when a completely ionized atom, i.e., one without any electrons, is brought in contact with a metal. The acquired electrons then orbit on the outside, leaving the inner shells empty, in stark contrast with usual atoms. Such hollow atoms can also be Ref. 1020 formed by intense laser irradiation.

* *

In the past, the description of motion with formulae was taken rather seriously. Before computers appeared, only those examples of motion were studied which could be described with simple formulae. It turned out that Galilean mechanics cannot solve the three-body problem, special relativity cannot solve the two-body problem, general relativity the one-body problem and quantum field theory the zero-body problem. It took some time to the community of physicists to appreciate that understanding motion does not depend on the description by formulae, but on the description by clear equations based on space and time.

* *

The Casimir effect, as well as other experiments, imply that there is a specific and *finite* energy density that can be ascribed to the vacuum. Does this mean that we can apply the Challenge 1533 d Banach-Tarski effect to pieces of vacuum?

* *

Challenge 1534 s Can you explain why mud is not clear?

* *

Challenge 1535 ny Matter is hard, radiation is soft. Are you able to summarise why?

* *

Photons not travelling parallel to each other attract each other through gravitation and thus deflect each other. Could two such photons form a bound state, a sort of atom of light, in which they would circle each other, provided there were enough empty space Challenge 1536 s for this to happen?

* *

Challenge 1537 s Can the universe ever have been smaller than its own Compton wavelength?

In fact, quantum electrodynamics, or QED, provides a vast number of curiosities and every year there is at least one interesting new discovery. We now conclude the theme with a more general approach.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

How can one move on perfect ice? – The ultimate physics test

In our quest, we have encountered motion of many sorts. Therefore, the following test – not to be taken too seriously – is the ultimate physics test, allowing to check your understanding and to compare it with that of others.

Imagine that you are on a perfectly frictionless surface and that you want to move to its border. How many methods can you find to achieve this? Any method, so tiny its effect may be, is allowed.

Classical physics provided quite a number of methods. We saw that for rotating ourselves, we just need to turn our arm above the head. For translation motion, throwing a shoe or inhaling vertically and exhaling horizontally are the simplest possibilities. Can
Challenge 1538 s you list at least six additional methods, maybe some making use of the location of the surface on Earth? What would you do in space?

Electrodynamics and thermodynamics taught us that in vacuum, heating one side of the body more than the other will work as motor; the imbalance of heat radiation will push you, albeit rather slowly. Are you able to find at least four other methods from these
Challenge 1539 s two domains?

General relativity showed that turning one arm will emit gravitational radiation un-
Challenge 1540 s symmetrically, leading to motion as well. Can you find at least two better methods?

Quantum theory offers a wealth of methods. Of course, quantum mechanics shows that we actually are always moving, since the indeterminacy relation makes rest an impossibility. However, the average motion can be zero even if the spread increases with time. Are you able to find at least four methods of moving on perfect ice due to quantum
Challenge 1541 s effects?

Materials science, geophysics, atmospheric physics and astrophysics also provide ways
Challenge 1542 s to move, such as cosmic rays or solar neutrinos. Can you find four additional methods?

Self-organization, chaos theory and biophysics also provide ways to move, when the inner workings of the human body are taken into account. Can you find at least two
Challenge 1543 s methods?

Assuming that you read already the section following the present one, on the effects of semiclassical *quantum gravity*, here is an additional puzzle: is it possible to move by
Challenge 1544 s accelerating a pocket mirror, using the emitted Unruh radiation? Can you find at least two other methods to move yourself using quantum gravity effects? Can you find one from string theory?

If you want points for the test, the marking is simple. For students, every working method gives one point. Eight points is ok, twelve points is good, sixteen points is very good, and twenty points or more is excellent.For graduated physicists, the point is given only when a back-of-the-envelope estimate for the ensuing momentum or acceleration is provided.

A summary of quantum electrodynamics

The shortest possible summary of quantum electrodynamics is the following: *matter is made of charged particles which interact through photon exchange in the way described by Figure 537*.

No additional information is necessary. In a bit more detail, quantum electrodynamics starts with elementary *particles*, characterized by their mass, their spin and their charge,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 537 QED as perturbation theory in space-time

and with the *vacuum*, essentially a sea of virtual particle–antiparticle pairs. *Interactions* between charged particles are described as the exchange of virtual photons, and *decay* is described as the interaction with the virtual photons of the vacuum.

All physical results of QED can be calculated by using the single diagram of Figure 537. It contains the Lagrangian and the Hamiltonian of QED, as well as a method to calculate results for actual systems. As QED is a perturbative theory, the diagram directly describes the first order effects and its composites describe effects of higher order. QED is a perturbative theory.

QED describes all everyday properties of matter and radiation. It describes the *divisibility* down to the smallest constituents, the *isolability* from the environment and the *impenetrability* of matter. It also describes the *penetrability* of radiation. All these properties are due to electromagnetic interactions of constituents and follow from Figure 537. Matter is divisible because the interactions are of finite strength, matter is also divisible because the interactions are of finite range, and matter is impenetrable because interactions among the constituents increase in intensity when they approach each other, in particular because matter constituents are fermions. Radiation is divisible into photons, and is penetrable because photons are bosons and first order photon-photon interactions do not exist.

Both matter and radiation are made of elementary constituents. These elementary constituents, whether bosons or fermions, are indivisible, isolable, indistinguishable, and point-like.

To describe observations, it is necessary to use quantum electrodynamics in all those situations for which the characteristic dimensions d are of the order of the Compton wavelength

$$d \approx \lambda_C = \frac{h}{m\,c}\,. \tag{703}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

In situations where the dimensions are of the order of the de Broglie wavelength, or equivalently, where the action is of the order of the Planck value, simple quantum mechanics is sufficient:

$$d \approx \lambda_{\mathrm{dB}} = \frac{h}{m\,v} \,. \tag{704}$$

For larger dimensions, classical physics will do.

Together with gravity, quantum electrodynamics explains almost all observations of motion on Earth; QED unifies the description of matter and radiation in daily life. All objects and all images are described by it, including their properties, their shape, their transformations and their other changes. This includes self-organization and chemical or biological processes. In other words, QED gives us full grasp of the effects and the variety of motion due to electromagnetism.

Open questions in QED

Even though QED describes motion without any discrepancy from experiment, that does not mean that we understand every detail of every example of electric motion. For example, nobody has described the motion of an animal with QED yet.* In fact, there is beautiful and fascinating work going on in many branches of electromagnetism.

Atmospheric physics still provides many puzzles and regularly delivers new, previ- Ref. 1022 ously unknown phenomena. For example, the detailed mechanisms at the origin of aurorae are still controversial; and the recent unexplained discoveries of discharges *above* Ref. 1023 clouds should not make one forget that even the precise mechanism of charge separation *inside* clouds, which leads to lightning, is not completely clarified. In fact, all examples of electrification, such as the charging of amber through rubbing, the experiment which gave electricity its name, are still poorly understood.

Materials science in all its breadth, including the study of solids, fluids, and plasmas, as well as biology and medicine, still provides many topics of research. In particular, the twenty-first century will undoubtedly be the century of the life sciences.

The study of the interaction of atoms with intense light is an example of present research in atomic physics. Strong lasers can strip atoms of many of their electrons; for such phenomena, there are not yet precise descriptions, since they do not comply to the weak field approximations usually assumed in physical experiments. In strong fields, new Ref. 1025 effects take place, such as the so-called Coulomb explosion.

But also the skies have their mysteries. In the topic of cosmic rays, it is still not clear Ref. 1024 how rays with energies of 10^{22} eV are produced outside the galaxy. Researchers are intensely trying to locate the electromagnetic fields necessary for their acceleration and to understand their origin and mechanisms.

In the theory of quantum electrodynamics, discoveries are expected by all those who Ref. 1026 study it in sufficient detail. For example, Dirk Kreimer has discovered that higher order interaction diagrams built using the fundamental diagram of Figure 537 contain relations to the theory of knots. This research topic will provide even more interesting results in the near future.

* On the other hand, there is beautiful work going on how humans move their limbs; it seems that humans Ref. 1021 move by combining a small set of fundamental motions.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Relations to knot theory appear because QED is a *perturbative* description, with the vast richness of its nonperturbative effects still hidden. Studies of QED at high energies, where perturbation is *not* a good approximation and where particle numbers are not conserved, promise a wealth of new insights. We will return to the topic later on.

High energies provide many more questions. So far, the description of motion was based on the idea that measurable quantities can be multiplied and added. This always happens at one space-time point. In mathematical jargon, observables form a *local* algebra. Thus the structure of an algebra contains, implies and follows from the idea that local properties *lead* to local properties. We will discover later on that this basic assumption is wrong at high energies.

Many other open issues of more practical nature have not been mentioned. Indeed, by far the largest numbers of physicists get paid for some form of applied QED. However, our quest is the description of the *fundamentals* of motion. So far, we have not achieved it. For example, we still need to understand motion in the realm of atomic nuclei. But before we do that, we take a first glimpse of the strange issues appearing when gravity and quantum theory meet.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 43

QUANTUM MECHANICS WITH GRAVITATION – THE FIRST APPROACH

Gravitation is a weak effect. Every seaman knows it: storms are the worst part of his life, not gravity. Despite its weakness, including gravity into quantum mechanics yields a list of important issues.

Does gravity act on quantum systems? Yes. In the chapter on general relativity we already mentioned that light frequency changes with height. Thus gravity has a simple and measurable effect on photons.

In 2004 it became possible to repeat Galileo's leaning tower experiment with atoms instead of steel balls. Single atoms do fall like stones. In particular, atoms of different mass fall with the same acceleration, within the experimental precision of one part in 6 million.

Ref. 1027

The phase of wave functions

Gravity also has an effect on wave functions: it changes their *phase*. Can you imagine why? The effect was first confirmed in 1975 with the help of neutron interferometers, where neutron beams are brought to interference after having climbed some height h at two different locations. The experiment is shown schematically in Figure 538; the predicted phase difference is

Challenge 1545 ny

$$\delta\varphi = \frac{mghl}{\hbar v} \,, \tag{705}$$

where l is the horizontal distance between the two climbs and v and m are the speed and mass of the neutrons. These beautifully simple experiments have confirmed the formula within experimental errors.

Ref. 1028

In the 1990s, similar experiments have even been performed with complete atoms. These interferometers are so sensitive that local gravity g can be measured with a precision of more than eight significant digits.

Ref. 1030

Playing table tennis with neutrons

The gravitational potential also has directly measurable effects on quantum particles. Classically, a table tennis ball (without spin) follows parabolic paths when bouncing over a table tennis table. How does a quantum particle behave in the same setting? The experiment was first performed in 2002.

Ref. 1031

In the gravitational field, the energy levels of the neutron are quantized. This leads to probability density that changes with height in discrete steps, as shown in Figure 539.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 538 The weakness of gravitation

FIGURE 539 Table tennis and neutrons

— More to be added —

The best experimental procedure is to produce an intense beam of neutral particles, because neutral particles are not affected by stray electromagnetic fields. Neutrons are ideal, as they are produced in large quantities by nuclear reactors. Using a few clever tricks, the experimenters managed to slow down neutrons to the incredibly small value of 8 m/s, comparable to a table tennis ball. They then directed the neutrons onto a neutron mirror, the analogue of the table tennis table, and observed the neutrons jumping back up.

Why is the experiment so difficult? The lowest energy level for neutrons due to gravity is $2.3 \cdot 10^{-31}$ J, or 1.4 peV. To get an impression of it smallness, we can compare it to the value of $2.2 \cdot 10^{-18}$ J or 13.6 eV for the lowest state in the hydrogen atom. Nevertheless, the team managed to measure the first few discrete levels. The results confirmed the prediction of the Schrödinger equation to the achievable measurement precision.

In short, neutrons in gravity, atoms in gravity and photons in gravity show now surprises. The Dirac equation with gravity can thus be used, for example, to describe the processes inside trees.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The gravitational Bohr atom

A short calculation shows that an electron circling a proton due to gravity alone, without electrostatic attraction, would do so at a gravitational Bohr radius of

Challenge 1546 ny

$$r_{\text{gr.B.}} = \frac{\hbar^2}{G\, m_e^2\, m_p} = 1.1 \cdot 10^{29}\,\text{m} \tag{706}$$

which is about a thousand times the distance to the cosmic horizon. In fact, even in the normal hydrogen atom there is not a *single way* to measure gravitational effects. (Are you able to confirm this?)

Challenge 1547 ny

But why is gravity so weak? Or equivalently, why are the universe and normal atoms so much smaller than a gravitational Bohr atom? At the present point of our quest these questions cannot be answered. Worse, the weakness of gravity even means that with high probability, future experiments will provide little additional data helping to decide among competing answers. The only help is careful thought.

We might conclude from all this that gravity does not require a quantum description. Indeed, we stumbled onto quantum effects because classical electrodynamics implies, in stark contrast with reality, that atoms decay in about 0.1 ns. Classically, an orbiting electron would emit radiation until it falls into the nucleus. Quantum theory is thus necessary to explain the existence of matter.

When the same stability calculation is performed for the emission of gravitational radiation by orbiting electrons, one finds a decay time of around 10^{37} s. (True?) This extremely large value, trillions of times longer than the age of the universe, is a result of the low emission of gravitational radiation by rotating masses. Therefore, the existence of atoms does not require a quantum theory of gravity.

Challenge 1548 ny

Page 530

Indeed, quantum gravity is unnecessary in every single domain of everyday life. However, we will see later on that quantum gravity is necessary in domains which are more remote, but also more fascinating.

Page 1396

Gravitation and limits to disorder

> Die Energie der Welt ist constant.
> Die Entropie der Welt strebt einem Maximum zu.*
>
> Rudolph Clausius

We have already encountered the famous statement by Clausius, the father of the term 'entropy'. We have seen that the Boltzmann constant $k/2$ is the smallest entropy found in nature.

Page 598

What is the influence of gravitation on entropy, and thermodynamics in general? For a long time, nobody was interested in this question. In parallel, for many decades nobody asked whether there also exists a theoretical *maximum* for entropy. The situations changed dramatically in 1973, when Jacob Bekenstein discovered that the two issues are related.

Bekenstein was investigating the consequences gravity has for quantum physics. He

Ref. 1032

* 'The energy of the universe is constant. Its entropy tends towards a maximum.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

found that the entropy of an object of energy E and size L is bound by

$$S \leqslant EL\frac{k\pi}{\hbar c} \tag{707}$$

for all physical systems. In particular, he deduced that (nonrotating) black holes saturate
Challenge 1549 s the bound, with an entropy given by

$$S = \frac{kc^3}{G\hbar}\frac{A}{4} = \frac{kG}{\hbar c}4\pi M^2 \tag{708}$$

where A is now the area of the *horizon* of the black hole. It is given by $A = 4\pi R^2 = 4\pi(2GM/c^2)^2$. In particular, the result implies that every black hole has an entropy. Black holes are thus disordered systems described by thermostatics. *Black holes are the most disordered systems known.**

As an interesting note, the maximum entropy also gives a memory limit for memory
Challenge 1550 s chips. Can you find out how?

What are the different microstates leading to this macroscopic entropy? It took many years to convince physicists that the microstates are due to the various possible states of the black hole horizon itself, and that they are due to the diffeomorphism invariance
Ref. 1034 at this boundary. As Gerard 't Hooft explains, the entropy expression implies that the number of degrees of freedom of a black hole is about (but not exactly) one per Planck
Challenge 1551 s area of the horizon.

If black holes have entropy, they must have a temperature. What does this temperature mean? In fact, nobody believed this conclusion until two unrelated developments confirmed it within a short time. All these results were waiting to be discovered since the 1930s, even though, incredibly, nobody had thought about them for over 40 years.

Measuring acceleration with a thermometer – Fulling–Davies–Unruh radiation

Independently, Stephen Fulling in 1973, Paul Davies in 1975 and William Unruh in 1976
Ref. 1035 made the same theoretical discovery while studying quantum theory: if an inertial observer observes that he is surrounded by vacuum, a second observer *accelerated* with respect to the first does not: he observes black body radiation. The radiation has a spectrum corresponding to the temperature

$$T = a\frac{\hbar}{2\pi kc} \,. \tag{709}$$

* The precise discussion that black holes are the most disordered systems in nature is quite subtle. The
Ref. 1033 issue is summarized by Bousso. Bousso claims that the area appearing in the maximum entropy formula cannot be taken naively as the area at a given time, and gives four arguments why this should be not allowed. However, all four arguments are wrong in some way, in particular because they assume that lengths smaller than the Planck length or larger than the universe's size can be measured. Ironically, he brushes aside some of the arguments himself later in the paper, and then deduces an improved formula, which is exactly the same as the one he criticizes first, just with a different interpretation of the area A. Later in his careers, Bousso revised his conclusions; he now supports the maximum entropy bound. In short, the expression of black hole entropy is indeed the maximum entropy for a physical system with surface A.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The result means that there is no vacuum on Earth, because any observer on its surface can maintain that he is accelerated with $9.8\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$, thus leading to $T = 40\,\mathrm{zK}$! We can thus measure gravity, at least in principle, using a thermometer. However, even for the largest practical accelerations the temperature values are so small that it is questionable whether the effect will ever be confirmed experimentally. But if it will, it will be a great experiment. Ref. 1036

When this effect was predicted, people explored all possible aspects of the argument. For example, also an observer in rotational motion detects radiation following expression (709). But that was not all. It was found that the acceleration of a *mirror* leads to radiation *emission*! Mirrors are thus harder to accelerate than other bodies of the same mass.

When the acceleration is high enough, also *matter* particles can be emitted and detected. If a particle counter is accelerated sufficiently strongly across the vacuum, it will start counting particles! We see that the difference between vacuum and matter becomes fuzzy at large accelerations.

Black holes aren't black

In 1973 and 1974, Jacob Bekenstein, and independently, the English physicist Stephen Hawking, famous for the courage with which he fights a disease which forces him into the wheelchair, surprised the world of general relativity with a fundamental theoretical discovery. They found that if a virtual particle–antiparticle pair appeared in the vacuum near the horizon, there is a finite chance that one particle escapes as a real particle, while the virtual antiparticle is captured by the black hole. The virtual antiparticle is thus of negative energy, and reduces the mass of the black hole. The mechanism applies both to fermions and bosons. From far away this effect looks like the emission of a particle. A detailed investigation showed that the effect is most pronounced for photon emission. In short, Bekenstein and Hawking showed that black holes radiate as black bodies.

Black hole radiation confirms both the result on black hole entropy by Bekenstein and the effect for observers accelerated in vacuum found by Fulling, Davies and Unruh. When all this became clear, a beautiful Gedanken experiment was published by William Unruh and Robert Wald, showing that the whole result could have been deduced already 50 years earlier! Ref. 1037

Shameful as this delay of the discovery is for the community of theoretical physicists, the story itself remains beautiful. It starts in the early 1970s, when Robert Geroch studied the issue shown in Figure 540. Imagine a mirror box full of heat radiation, thus full of light. The mass of the box is assumed to be negligible, such as a box made of thin aluminium paper. We lower the box, with all its contained radiation, from a space station towards a black hole. On the space station, lowering the weight of the heat radiation allows to generate energy. Obviously, when the box reaches the black hole horizon, the heat radiation is red-shifted to infinite wavelength. At that point, the full amount of energy originally contained in the heat radiation has been provided to the space station. We can now do the following: we can open the box on the horizon, let drop out whatever is still inside, and wind the empty and massless box back up again. As a result, we have completely converted heat radiation into mechanical energy. Nothing else has changed: the black hole has the same mass as beforehand.

But this result contradicts the second principle of thermodynamics! Geroch con-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 540 A *Gedanken experiment* allowing to deduce the existence of black hole radiation

cluded that something must be wrong. We must have forgotten an effect which makes this process impossible.

In the 1980s, Unruh and Wald showed that black hole radiation is precisely the forgotten effect that puts everything right. Because of black hole radiation, the box feels buoyancy, so that it cannot be lowered down to the horizon. It floats somewhat above it, so that the heat radiation inside the box has not yet *zero* energy when it falls out of the opened box. As a result, the black hole does increase in mass and thus in entropy. In summary, when the empty box is pulled up again, the final situation is thus the following: only part of the energy of the heat radiation has been converted into mechanical energy, part of the energy went into the increase of mass and thus of entropy of the black hole. The second principle of thermodynamics is saved.

Well, it is only saved if the heat radiation has precisely the right energy density at the horizon and above. Let us have a look. The centre of the box can only be lowered up to a hovering distance d above the horizon, where the acceleration due to gravity is $g = c^2/4GM$. The energy E gained by lowering the box is

$$E = mc^2 - mg\frac{d}{2} = mc^2\left(1 - \frac{dc^2}{8GM}\right) \tag{710}$$

The efficiency of the process is $\eta = E/mc^2$. To be consistent with the second law of thermodynamics, this efficiency must obey

$$\eta = \frac{E}{mc^2} = 1 - \frac{T_{\mathrm{BH}}}{T}e \tag{711}$$

We thus find a black hole temperature T_{BH} given by the hovering distance d. That hovering distance d is roughly given by the size of the box. The box size in turn must be

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 102 The principles of thermodynamics and those of horizon mechanics

Principle	Thermodynamics	Horizons
Zeroth principle	the temperature T is constant in a body at equilibrium	the surface gravity a is constant on the horizon
First principle	energy is conserved: $\mathrm{d}E = T\mathrm{d}S - p\mathrm{d}V + \mu\mathrm{d}N$	energy is conserved: $\mathrm{d}(mc^2) = \frac{ac^2}{8\pi G}\mathrm{d}A + \Omega\mathrm{d}J + \Phi\mathrm{d}q$
Second principle	entropy never decreases: $\mathrm{d}S \geqslant 0$	surface area never decreases: $\mathrm{d}A \geqslant 0$
Third principle	$T = 0$ cannot be achieved	$a = 0$ cannot be achieved

at least the wavelength of the thermal radiation; in first approximation, Wien's relation gives $d \approx \hbar c/kT$. A precise calculation, first performed by Hawking, gives the result

$$T_{\mathrm{BH}} = \frac{\hbar c^3}{8\pi kGM} = \frac{\hbar c}{4\pi k}\frac{1}{R} = \frac{\hbar}{2\pi kc}\, g_{\mathrm{surf}} \quad \text{with} \quad g_{\mathrm{surf}} = \frac{c^4}{4GM} \tag{712}$$

where R and M are the radius and the mass of the black hole. It is either called the black-hole temperature or Bekenstein-Hawking temperature. As an example, a black hole with the mass of the Sun would have the rather small temperature of 62 nK, whereas a smaller black hole with the mass of a mountain, say 10^{12} kg, would have a temperature of 123 GK. That would make quite a good oven. All known black hole candidates have masses in the range from a few to a few million solar masses. The radiation is thus extremely weak, the reason being that the emitted wavelength is of the order of the black hole radius, as you might want to check. The radiation emitted by black holes is often also called *Bekenstein-Hawking radiation*.

Challenge 1552 ny

Ref. 1038

Black hole radiation is thus so weak that we can speak of an academic effect. It leads to a luminosity that increases with decreasing mass or size as

Challenge 1553 ny

$$L \sim \frac{1}{M^2} \sim \frac{1}{R^2} \quad \text{or} \quad L = nA\sigma T^4 = n\frac{c^6\hbar}{G^2M^2}\frac{\pi^2}{15\cdot 2^7} \tag{713}$$

where σ is the Stefan–Boltzmann or *black body radiation constant*, n is the number of particle degrees of freedom that can be radiated; if only photons are radiated, we have $n = 2$. (For example, if neutrinos were massless, they would be emitted more frequently than photons.)

Page 793

Ref. 1039

Black holes thus shine, and the more the smaller they are. This is a genuine *quantum* effect, since classically, black holes, as the name says, cannot emit any light. Even though the effect is academically weak, it will be of importance later on. In actual systems, many other effects around black holes increase the luminosity far above this value; indeed, black holes are usually brighter than normal stars, due to the radiation emitted by the matter falling into them. But that is another story. Here we are only treating isolated black holes, surrounded only by vacuum.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Due to the emitted radiation, black holes gradually lose mass. Therefore their theoretical lifetime is *finite*. A calculation shows that it is given by

Challenge 1554 ny

$$t = M^3 \frac{20\,480\,\pi G^2}{\hbar c^4} \approx M^3\ 3.4 \cdot 10^{-16}\ \mathrm{s/kg^3} \tag{714}$$

as function of their initial mass M. For example, a black hole with mass of 1 g would have a lifetime of $3.4 \cdot 10^{-25}$ s, whereas a black hole of the mass of the Sun, $2.0 \cdot 10^{30}$ kg, would have a lifetime of about 10^{68} years. Obviously, these numbers are purely academic. In any case, *black holes evaporate*. However, this extremely slow process for usual black holes determines their lifetime only if no other, faster process comes into play. We will present a few such processes shortly. Hawking radiation is the weakest of all known effects. It is not masked by stronger effects only if the black hole is non-rotating, electrically neutral and with no matter falling into it from the surroundings.

So far, none of these quantum gravity effects has been confirmed experimentally, as the values are much too small to be detected. However, the deduction of a Hawking temperature has been beautifully confirmed by a theoretical discovery of Unruh, who found that there are configurations of fluids in which sound waves cannot escape, so-called '*silent holes*'. Consequently, these silent holes radiate sound waves with a temperature satisfying the same formula as real black holes. A second type of analogue system, namely *optical black holes*, are also being investigated.

Ref. 1040

Ref. 1042

Gamma ray bursts

In 1975, a much more dramatic radiation effect than black hole radiation was predicted for *charged* black holes by Damour and Ruffini. Charged black holes have a much shorter lifetime than just presented, because during their formation a second process takes place. In a region surrounding them the electric field is larger than the so-called vacuum polarization value, so that large numbers of electron-positron pairs are produced, which then almost all annihilate. This process effectively reduces the charge of the black hole to a value for which the field is below critical everywhere, while emitting large amounts of high energy light. It turns out that the mass is reduced by up to 30 % in a time of the order of seconds. That is quite shorter than 10^{68} years. This process thus produces an extremely intense *gamma ray burst*.

Ref. 1043

Such gamma ray bursts had been discovered in the late 1960s by military satellites which were trying to spot nuclear explosions around the world through their gamma ray emission. The satellites found about two such bursts per day, coming from all over the sky. Another satellite, the Compton satellite, confirmed that they were extragalactic in origin, and that their duration varied between a sixtieth of a second and about a thousand seconds. In 1996, the Italian-Dutch BeppoSAX satellite started mapping and measuring gamma ray bursts systematically. It discovered that they were followed by an *afterglow* in the X-ray domain of many hours, sometimes of days. In 1997 afterglow was discovered also in the optical domain. The satellite also allowed to find the corresponding X-ray, optical and radio sources for each burst. These measurements in turn allowed to determine the distance of the burst sources; red-shifts between 0.0085 and 4.5 were measured. In 1999 it also became possible to detect *optical* bursts corresponding to the

Ref. 1044

Ref. 1045

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 541 The location and energy of the 2704 gamma ray bursts observed in the sky between 1991 and 2000 by the BATSE experiment on board of the Compton Gamma Ray Observatory, a large satellite deployed by the space shuttle after over 20 years of planning and construction (NASA)

gamma ray ones.*

All this data together show that the gamma ray bursts have energies ranging from 10^{40} W to 10^{45} W. The larger value is about one hundredth of the brightness all stars of the whole visible universe taken together! Put differently, it is the same amount of energy that is released when converting several solar masses into radiation within a few seconds. In fact, the measured luminosity is near the theoretical maximum luminosity a body can have. This limit is given by

Challenge 1555 s

$$L < L_{\mathrm{Pl}} = \frac{c^5}{4G} = 0.9 \cdot 10^{52}\,\mathrm{W}\,, \tag{715}$$

as you might want to check yourself. In short, the sources of gamma ray bursts are the biggest bombs found in the universe. In fact, more detailed investigations of experimental data confirm that gamma ray bursts are 'primal screams' of black holes in formation.

Challenge 1556 e

Ref. 1045

With all this new data, Ruffini took up his 1975 model again in 1997 and with his collaborators showed that the gamma ray bursts generated by the annihilation of electron-positrons pairs created by vacuum polarization, in the region they called the *dyadosphere*, have a luminosity and a duration exactly as measured, if a black hole of about a few up to 30 solar masses is assumed. Charged black holes therefore reduce their charge and mass through the vacuum polarization and electron positron pair creation process. (The process reduces the mass because it is one of the few processes which is *reversible*; in contrast, most other attempts to reduce charge on a black hole, e.g. by throwing in a particle with the opposite charge, increase the mass of the black hole and are thus irreversible.) The left over remnant then can lose energy in various ways and also turns out to be responsible for the afterglow discovered by the BeppoSAX satellite. Among others, Ruffini's team speculates that the remnants are the sources for the high energy cosmic rays, whose origin had not been localized so far. All these exciting studies are still ongoing.

Ref. 1046

Recent studies distinguish two classes of gamma ray bursts. Short gamma ray bursts,

* For more about this fascinating topic, see the www.aip.de/~jcg/grb.html website by Jochen Greiner.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

with a duration between a millisecond and two seconds, differ significantly in energy and spectrum from long gamma ray bursts, with an average length of ten seconds, a higher energy content and a softer energy spectrum. It is often speculated that short bursts are due to merging neutron stars or merging black holes, whereas long bursts are emitted, as just explained, when a black hole is formed in a supernova or hypernova explosion. It also seems that gamma ray bursts are not of spherical symmetry, but that the emission takes place in a collimated beam. This puts the energy estimates given above somewhat into question. The details of the formation process are still subject to intense exploration.

Ref. 1048

Other processes leading to emission of radiation from black holes are also possible. Examples are matter falling into the black hole and heating up, matter being ejected from rotating black holes through the Penrose process, or charged particles falling into a black hole. These mechanisms are at the origin of *quasars*, the extremely bright quasi-stellar sources found all over the sky. They are assumed to be black holes surrounded by matter, in the development stage following gamma ray bursters. The details of what happens in quasars, the enormous voltages (up to 10^{20} V) and magnetic fields generated, as well as their effects on the surrounding matter are still object of intense research in astrophysics.

Page 611

Material properties of black holes

Once the concept of entropy of a black hole was established, people started to think about black holes like about any other material object. For example, black holes have a matter density, which can be defined by relating their mass to a fictitious volume defined by $4\pi R^3/3$. This density is given by

$$\rho = \frac{1}{M^2}\,\frac{3c^6}{32\pi G^3} \tag{716}$$

and can be quite low for large black holes. For the highest black holes known, with 1000 million solar masses or more, the density is of the order of the density of air. Nevertheless, even in this case, the density is the highest possible in nature for that mass.

Challenge 1557 e

By the way, the gravitational acceleration at the horizon is still appreciable, as it is given by

$$g_{\text{surf}} = \frac{1}{M}\,\frac{c^4}{4G} = \frac{c^2}{2R} \tag{717}$$

which is still 15 km/s^2 for an air density black hole.

Challenge 1558 ny

Obviously, the black hole temperature is related to the entropy S by its usual definition

$$\frac{1}{T} = \left.\frac{\partial S}{\partial E}\right|_{\rho} = \left.\frac{\partial S}{\partial (Mc^2)}\right|_{\rho} \tag{718}$$

All other thermal properties can be deduced by the standard relations from thermostatics.

In particular, it looks as if black holes are the matter states with the largest possible entropy. Can you confirm this statement?

Challenge 1559 ny

It also turns out that black holes have a *negative* heat capacity: when heat is added, they

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

cool down. In other words, black holes cannot achieve equilibrium with a bath. This is not a real surprise, since *any* gravitationally bound material system has negative specific heat. Indeed, it takes only a bit of thinking to see that any gas or matter system collapsing under gravity follows $dE/dR > 0$ and $dS/dR > 0$. That means that while collapsing, the energy and the entropy of the system shrink. (Can you find out where they go?) Since temperature is defined as $1/T = dS/dE$, temperature is always positive; from the temperature increase $dT/dR < 0$ during collapse one deduces that the specific heat dE/dT is negative.

Challenge 1560 ny
Challenge 1561 s
Ref. 1049

Black holes, like any object, oscillate when slightly perturbed. These vibrations have also been studied; their frequency is proportional to the mass of the black hole.

Ref. 1050

Nonrotating black holes have no magnetic field, as was established already in the 1960s by Russian physicists. On the other hand, black holes have something akin to a finite electrical conductivity and a finite viscosity. Some of these properties can be understood if the horizon is described as a membrane, even though this model is not always applicable. In any case, one can study and describe macroscopic black holes like any other macroscopic material body. The topic is not closed.

Ref. 1039
Ref. 1047

How do black holes evaporate?

When a nonrotating and uncharged black hole loses mass by radiating Hawking radiation, eventually its mass reaches values approaching the Planck mass, namely a few micrograms. Expression (714) for the lifetime, applied to a black hole of Planck mass, yields a value of over sixty thousand Planck times. A surprising large value. What happens in those last instants of evaporation?

A black hole approaching the Planck mass at some time will get smaller than its own Compton wavelength; that means that it behaves like an elementary particle, and in particular, that quantum effects have to be taken into account. It is still unknown how these final evaporation steps take place, whether the mass continues to diminish smoothly or in steps (e.g. with mass values decreasing as $\sqrt{n}$ when n approaches zero), how its internal structure changes, whether a stationary black hole starts to rotate (as the author predicts), how the emitted radiation deviates from black body radiation. There is still enough to study. However, one important issue *has* been settled.

The information paradox of black holes

When the thermal radiation of black holes was discovered, one question was hotly debated for many years. The matter forming a black hole can contain lots of information; e.g., imagine the black hole formed by a large number of books collapsing onto each other. On the other hand, a black hole radiates thermally until it evaporates. Since thermal radiation carries no information, it seems that information somehow disappears, or equivalently, that entropy increases.

An incredible number of papers have been written about this problem, some even claiming that this example shows that physics as we know it is incorrect and needs to be changed. As usual, to settle the issue, we need to look at it with precision, laying all prejudice aside. Three intermediate questions can help us finding the answer.

— What happens when a book is thrown into the Sun? When and how is the information radiated away?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

— How precise is the sentence that black hole radiate *thermal* radiation? Could there be a slight deviation?
— Could the deviation be measured? In what way would black holes radiate information?

Challenge 1562 e You might want to make up your own mind before reading on.

Let us walk through a short summary. When a book or any other highly complex – or low entropy – object is thrown into the Sun, the information contained is radiated away. The information is contained in some slight deviations from black hole radiation, namely in slight correlations between the emitted radiation emitted over the burning time of the Sun. A short calculation, comparing the entropy of a room temperature book and the information contained in it, shows that these effects are extremely small and difficult to measure.

Ref. 1051 A clear exposition of the topic was given by Don Page. He calculated what information would be measured in the radiation if the system of black hole and radiation *together* would be in a *pure* state, i.e., a state containing specific information. The result is simple. Even if a system is large – consisting of many degrees of freedom – and in pure state, any smaller *sub*system nevertheless looks almost perfectly thermal. More specifically, if a total system has a Hilbert space dimension $N = nm$, where n and $m \leqslant n$ are the dimensions of two subsystems, and if the total system is in a pure state, the subsystem m Challenge 1563 ny would have an entropy S_m given by

$$S_m = \frac{1-m}{2n} + \sum_{k=n+1}^{mn} \frac{1}{k} \tag{719}$$

which is approximately given by

$$S_m = \ln m - \frac{m}{2n} \quad \text{for} \quad m \gg 1\,. \tag{720}$$

To discuss the result, let us think of n and m as counting degrees of freedom, instead of Hilbert space dimensions. The first term in equation (720) is the usual entropy of a mixed state. The second term is a small deviation and describes the amount of specific information contained in the original pure state; inserting numbers, one finds that it is extremely small compared to the first. In other words, the subsystem m is almost indistinguishable from a mixed state; it looks like a thermal system even though it is not.

A calculation shows that the second, small term on the right of equation (720) is indeed sufficient to radiate away, during the lifetime of the black hole, any information contained in it. Page then goes on to show that the second term is so small that not only it is lost in measurements; it is also lost in the usual, perturbative calculations for physical systems.

The question whether any radiated information could be measured can now be answered directly. As Don Page showed, even measuring half of the system only gives about Ref. 1052 1/2 bit of that information. It is necessary to measure the complete system to measure all the contained information. In summary, at a given instant, the amount of information radiated by a black hole is negligible when compared with the total black hole radiation, and is practically impossible to detect by measurements or even by usual calculations.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

More paradoxes

A black hole is a macroscopic object, similar to a star. Like all objects, it can interact with its environment. It has the special property to swallow everything that falls into them. This immediately leads us to ask if we can use this property to cheat around the usual everyday 'laws' of nature. Some attempts have been studied in the section on general relativity and above; here we explore a few additional ones.

Page 613

* *

Apart from the questions of entropy, we can look for methods to cheat around conservation of energy, angular momentum, or charge. Every Gedanken experiment comes to the same conclusions. No cheats are possible; in addition, the maximum number of degrees of freedom in a region is proportional to the surface area of the region, and *not* to its volume. This intriguing result will keep us busy for quite some time.

Challenge 1564 ny

* *

A black hole transforms matter into antimatter with a certain efficiency. Thus one might look for departures from particle number conservation. Are you able to find an example?

Challenge 1565 ny

* *

Black holes deflect light. Is the effect polarization dependent? Gravity itself makes no difference of polarization; however, if virtual particle effects of QED are included, the story might change. First calculations seem to show that such an effect exists, so that gravitation might produce rainbows. Stay tuned.

Ref. 1056

* *

If lightweight boxes made of mirrors can float in radiation, one gets a strange consequence: such a box might self-accelerate in free space. In a sense, an accelerated box could float on the Fulling–Davies–Unruh radiation it creates by its own acceleration.

Are you able to show the following: one reason why this is impossible is a small but significant difference between gravity and acceleration, namely the absence of tidal effects. (Other reasons, such as the lack of perfect mirrors, also make the effect impossible.)

Challenge 1566 ny

* *

In 2003, Michael Kuchiev has made the spectacular prediction that matter and radiation with a wavelength *larger* than the diameter of a black hole is partly reflected when it hits a black hole. The longer the wavelength, the more efficient the reflection would be. For stellar or even bigger black holes, only photons or gravitons are predicted to be reflected. Black holes are thus not complete trash cans. Is the effect real? The discussion is still ongoing.

Ref. 1057

Curiosities about quantum theory and gravity

Due to the influence of gravity on phases of wave functions, some people who do not believe in bath induced decoherence have even studied the influence of gravity on the decoherence process of usual quantum systems in flat space-time. Predictably, the calculated results do not reproduce experiments.

Ref. 1029

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

Despite its weakness, gravitation provides many puzzles. Most famous are a number of curious coincidences that can be found when quantum mechanics and gravitation are combined. They are usually called 'large number hypotheses' because they usually involve large dimensionless numbers. A pretty, but less well known version connects the Planck length, the cosmic horizon, and the number of baryons:

Ref. 1053

$$(N_b)^3 \approx \left(\frac{R_0}{l_{Pl}}\right)^4 = \left(\frac{t_0}{t_{Pl}}\right)^4 \approx 10^{244} \tag{721}$$

in which $N_b = 10^{81}$ and $t_0 = 1.2 \cdot 10^{10}$ a were used. There is no known reason why the number of baryons and the horizon size R_0 should be related in this way. This coincidence is equivalent to the one originally stated by Dirac,* namely

$$m_p^3 \approx \frac{\hbar^2}{Gct_0} \,. \tag{723}$$

where m_p is the proton mass. This approximate equality seems to suggest that certain microscopic properties, namely the mass of the proton, is connected to some general properties of the universe as a whole. This has lead to numerous speculations, especially since the time dependence of the two sides differs. Some people even speculate whether relations (721) or (723) express some long-sought relation between local and global topological properties of nature. Up to this day, the only correct statement seems to be that they are *coincidences* connected to the time at which we happen to live, and that they should not be taken too seriously.

Ref. 1055

Quantum mechanics of gravitation

Let us take a conceptual step at this stage. So far, we looked at quantum theory *with* gravitation; now we have a glimpse at quantum theory *of* gravitation.

If we bring to our mind the similarity between the electromagnetic field and the gravitational 'field,' our next step should be to find the quantum description of the gravitational field. However, despite attempts by many brilliant minds for almost a century, this approach was not successful. Indeed, modern approaches take another direction, as will be explained later on. Let us see what was achieved and why the results are not sufficient.

Ref. 1054 Page 1437

* The equivalence can be deduced using $Gn_b m_p = 1/t_0^2$, which, as Weinberg explains, is required by several cosmological models. Indeed, this can be rewritten simply as

$$m_0^2/R_0^2 \approx m_{Pl}^2/R_{Pl}^2 = c^4/G^2 \,. \tag{722}$$

Together with the definition of the baryon density $n_b = N_b/R_0^3$ one gets Dirac's large number hypothesis, substituting protons for pions. Note that the Planck time and length are defined as $\sqrt{\hbar G/c^5}$ and $\sqrt{\hbar G/c^3}$ and are the natural units of length and time. We will study them in detail in the last part of the mountain ascent.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Do gravitons exist?

Quantum theory says that everything that moves is made of particles. What kind of particles are gravitational waves made of? If the gravitational field is to be treated quantum mechanically like the electromagnetic field, its waves should be quantized. Most properties of these quanta can be derived in a straightforward way.

The $1/r^2$ dependence of universal gravity, like that of electricity, implies that the quanta of the gravitational field have *vanishing* mass and move at light speed. The independence of gravity from electromagnetic effects implies a *vanishing* electric charge.

We observe that gravity is always attractive and never repulsive. This means that the field quanta have *integer* and *even* spin. Vanishing spin is ruled out, since it implies no coupling to energy. To comply with the property that 'all energy has gravity', spin $S = 2$ is needed. In fact, it can be shown that *only* the exchange of a massless spin 2 particle leads, in the classical limit, to general relativity.

Ref. 1059

The coupling strength of gravity, corresponding to the fine structure constant of electromagnetism, is given either by

$$\alpha_{G1} = \frac{G}{\hbar c} = 2.2 \cdot 10^{-15}\,\mathrm{kg}^{-2} \quad \text{or by} \quad \alpha_{G2} = \frac{Gmm}{\hbar c} = \left(\frac{m}{m_{Pl}}\right)^2 = \left(\frac{E}{E_{Pl}}\right)^2 \tag{724}$$

However, the first expression is not a pure number; the second expression is, but depends on the mass one inserts. These difficulties reflect the fact that gravity is not properly speaking an interaction, as became clear in the section on general relativity. It is often argued that m should be taken as the value corresponding to the energy of the system in question. For everyday life, typical energies are 1 eV, leading to a value $\alpha_{G2} \approx 1/10^{56}$. Gravity is indeed weak compared to electromagnetism, for which $\alpha_{em} = 1/137.04$.

If all this is correct, *virtual* field quanta would also have to exist, to explain static gravitational fields.

However, up to this day, the so-called *graviton* has not yet been detected, and there is in fact little hope that it ever will. On the experimental side, nobody knows yet how to build a graviton detector. Just try!

Challenge 1567 s

On the theoretical side, the problems with the coupling constant probably make it impossible to construct a *renormalizable* theory of gravity; the lack of renormalization means the impossibility to define a perturbation expansion, and thus to define particles, including the graviton. It might thus be that relations such as $E = \hbar\omega$ or $p = \hbar/2\pi\lambda$ are not applicable to gravitational waves. In short, it may be that the particle concept has to be changed before applying quantum theory to gravity. The issue is still open at this point.

Space-time foam

The indeterminacy relation for momentum and position also applies to the gravitational field. As a result, it leads to an expression for the indeterminacy of the metric tensor g in a region of size L, which is given by

$$\Delta g \approx 2\frac{{l_{Pl}}^2}{L^2}\,, \tag{725}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1568 ny where $l_{\mathrm{Pl}} = \sqrt{\hbar G/c^3}$ is the Planck length. Can you deduce the result? Quantum theory thus shows that like the momentum or the position of a particle, also the metric tensor g is a *fuzzy* observable.

But that is not all. Quantum theory is based on the principle that actions below $\hbar/2$ cannot be observed. This implies that the observable values for the metric g in a region of size L are bound by

$$g \geqslant \frac{2\hbar G}{c^3}\frac{1}{L^2} \,. \tag{726}$$

Can you confirm this? The result has far-reaching consequences. A minimum value for the metric depending inversely on the region size implies that it is impossible to say what happens to the shape of space-time at extremely small dimensions. In other words, at extremely high energies, the concept of space-time itself becomes fuzzy. John Wheeler introduced the term *space-time foam* to describe this situation. The term makes clear that space-time is not continuous nor a manifold in those domains. But this was the basis on which we built our description of nature so far! We are forced to deduce that our description of nature is built on sand. This issue will form the start of the third part Page 1398 of our mountain ascent.

Decoherence of space-time

General relativity taught us that the gravitational field and space-time are the same. If the gravitational field evolves like a quantum system, we may ask why no superpositions of different macroscopic space-times are observed.

Ref. 1058 The discussion is simplified for the simplest case of all, namely the superposition, in a vacuum region of size l, of a homogeneous gravitational field with value g and one with Page 1077 value g'. As in the case of a superposition of macroscopic distinct wave functions, such a superposition *decays*. In particular, it decays when particles cross the volume. A short Challenge 1569 ny calculation yields a decay time given by

$$t_{\mathrm{d}} = \left(\frac{2kT}{\pi m}\right)^{3/2}\frac{nl^4}{(g-g')^2} \,, \tag{727}$$

where n is the particle number density, kT their kinetic energy and m their mass. Inserting typical numbers, we find that the variations in gravitational field strength are Challenge 1570 ny *extremely* small. In fact, the numbers are so small that we can deduce that the gravitational field is the *first* variable which behaves classically in the history of the universe. Quantum gravity effects for space-time will thus be extremely hard to detect.

In short, matter not only tells space-time how to curve, it also tells it to behave with class.

Quantum theory as the enemy of science fiction

How does quantum theory change our ideas of space-time? The end of the twentieth century has brought several unexpected but strong results in semiclassical quantum gravity.

Ref. 1060 In 1995 Ford and Roman found that worm holes, which are imaginable in general rel-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

ativity, cannot exist if quantum effects are taken into account. They showed that macroscopic worm holes require unrealistically large negative energies. (For microscopic worm holes the issue is still unclear.)

Ref. 1062 In 1996 Kay, Radzikowski and Wald showed that closed time-like curves do not exist in semiclassical quantum gravity; there are thus no time machines in nature.

Ref. 1061 In 1997 Pfenning and Ford showed that warp drive situations, which are also imaginable in general relativity, cannot exist if quantum effects are taken into account. Such situations require unrealistically large negative energies.

In short, the inclusion of quantum effects destroys all those fantasies which were started by general relativity.

No vacuum means no particles

Gravity has an important consequence for quantum theory. To count and define particles, Page 1055 quantum theory needs a defined vacuum state. However, the vacuum state cannot be defined when the curvature radius of space-time, instead of being larger than the Compton wavelength, becomes comparable to it. In such highly curved space-times, particles cannot be defined. The reason is the impossibility to distinguish the environment from the particle in these situations: in the presence of strong curvatures, the vacuum is full of spontaneously generated matter, as black holes show. Now we just saw that at small dimensions, space-time fluctuates wildly; in other words, space-time is highly curved at small dimensions or high energies. In other words, strictly speaking particles cannot be defined; the particle concept is only a low energy approximation! We will explore this strange conclusion in more detail in the final part of our mountain ascent.

Summary on quantum theory and gravity

Everyday gravitational fields can be included in quantum theory. However, the inclusion of strong gravitational fields into quantum theory leads to problems with the particle concept.

On the other hand, the inclusion of quantum effects into general relativity leads to space-time foam, space-time superpositions, and probably of gravitons. The inclusion also forbids the existence of wormholes, time-like curves and negative energy regions. Problems with the concept of space-time arises at high curvatures.

Since the combination of quantum theory and gravitation leads to problems with both the particle concept and the space-time concept, we are forced putting into question the foundations of our description of nature so far.

In fact, up to now we hid a simple fact: quantum theory and general relativity *contradict* each other. This contradiction was the real reason that we stepped back to special relativity before we started exploring quantum theory. By stepping back we avoided many problems, because quantum theory does not contradict *special* relativity. However, quantum theory does contradict *general* relativity. The issues are dramatic, changing everything from the basis of classical physics to the results of quantum theory. There will be surprising consequences for the nature of space-time, of particles and for motion itself. But before we study these issues, however, we complete the theme of the present, quantum part of the mountain ascent, namely exploring the essence of matter and interactions.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 44

THE STRUCTURE OF THE NUCLEUS – THE DENSEST CLOUDS

Nuclear physics was born in 1896 in France, but is now a small activity. ot many researchers are working on the topic now. The field produced ot more than one daughter, experimental high energy physics, which was born around 1930. But since 1985, also these activities are in strong decline, with the exception of the latest CERN experiment. Despite the short time of activity, the history is impressive; the two fields uncovered why stars shine, how powerful bombs work, how cosmic evolution produced the atoms we are made of and how medical doctors can dramatically improve their healing rate.

Ref. 1063

> Nuclear physics is just low-density astrophysics.
> Anonymous

A physical wonder – magnetic resonance imaging

Arguably, the most spectacular tool that physical research has produced in the twentieth century was magnetic resonance imaging, or MRI for short. This technique allows to image human bodies with a high resolution and with (almost) no damage, in strong contrast to X-ray imaging. Though the machines are still expensive – costing up to several million euro – there is hope that they will become cheaper in the future. Such a machine, shown in Figure 542, consists essentially of a large magnetic coil, a radio transmitter and a computer. Some results of putting part of a person into the coil are shown in Figure 543.

In these machines, a radio transmitter emits radio waves that are absorbed because hydrogen nuclei are small spinning magnets. The magnets can be parallel or antiparallel to the magnetic field produced by the coil. The transition energy E is absorbed from a radio wave whose frequency ω is tuned to the magnetic field B. The energy absorbed by a single hydrogen nucleus is given by

$$E = \hbar\omega = \hbar\gamma B \tag{728}$$

The material constant $\gamma/2\pi$ has a value of 42.6 MHz/T for hydrogen nuclei; it results from the non-vanishing spin of the proton. This is a quantum effect, as shown by the appearance of the quantum of action $\hbar$. Using some cleverly applied magnetic fields, typically with a strength between 0.3 and 7 T for commercial and up to 21 T for experimental machines, the machines are able to measure the absorption for each volume element separately. Interestingly, the precise absorption level depends on the chemical compound the nucleus is built into. Thus the absorption value will depend on the chemical environ-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 542 A commercial MRI machine (© Royal Philips Electronics)



FIGURE 543 Sagittal images of the head and the spine (used with permission from Joseph P. Hornak, *The Basics of MRI*, www.cis.rit.edu/htbooks/mri, Copyright 2003)

ment. When the intensity of the absorption is plotted as grey scale, an image is formed that retraces the different chemical composition. Two examples are shown in Figure 543. Using additional tricks, modern machines can picture blood flow in the heart or air flow in lungs; they can even make films of the heart beat. Other techniques show how the location of sugar metabolism in the brain depends on what you are thinking about.*

Ref. 1064 Also what many are thinking about all the time has been imaged: the first scan of people making love has been taken by Willibrord Weijmar Schultz and his group in

* The website www.cis.rit.edu/htbooks/mri by Joseph P. Hornak gives an excellent introduction to magnetic resonance imaging, both in English and Russian, including the physical basis, the working of the machines, and numerous beautiful pictures. The method of studying nuclei by putting them at the same time into

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 544 Henri Becquerel (1852–1908)

1999.IndexWeijmar Schultz, Willibrord It is shown in Figure 545.

Each magnetic resonance image thus proves that atoms have spinning nuclei. Like for any other object, nuclei have size, shape, colour, composition and interactions. Let us explore them.

The size of nuclei

The magnetic resonance signal shows that hydrogen nuclei are quite sensitive to magnetic fields. The g-factor of protons, defined using the magnetic moment μ, their mass and charge as $g = \mu 4m/e\hbar$, is about 5.6. Using expression (626) that relates the g-factor and the radius of a composite object, we deduce that the radius of the proton is about 0.9 fm; this value is confirmed by experiment. Protons are thus much smaller than hydrogen atoms, the smallest of atoms, whose radius is about 30 pm. In turn, the proton is the smallest of all nuclei; the largest nuclei have radii 7 times the proton value.

Page 1038

The small size of nuclei is no news. It is known since the beginning of the twentieth century. The story starts on the first of March in 1896, when Henri Becquerel* discovered a puzzling phenomenon: minerals of uranium potassium sulphate blacken photographic plates. Becquerel had heard that the material is strongly fluorescent; he conjectured that fluorescence might have some connection to the X-rays discovered by Conrad Röngten the year before. His conjecture was wrong; nevertheless it led him to an important new discovery. Investigating the reason for the effect of uranium on photographic plates, Becquerel found that these minerals emit an undiscovered type of radiation, different from anything known at that time; in addition, the radiation is emitted by any substance containing uranium. In 1898, Bémont named the property of these minerals *radioactivity*.

Radioactive rays are also emitted from many elements other than uranium. The radiation can be 'seen': it can be detected by the tiny flashes of light that are emitted when the rays hit a scintillation screen. The light flashes are tiny even at a distance of several metre from the source; thus the rays must be emitted from point-like sources. Radioactivity has to be emitted from single atoms. Thus radioactivity confirmed unambiguously

magnetic and radio fields is also called *nuclear magnetic resonance*.

* Henri Becquerel (b. 1852 Paris, d. 1908 Le Croisic), important French physicist; his primary topic was the study of radioactivity. He was the thesis adviser of Marie Curie, the wife of Pierre Curie, and was central to bringing her to fame. The SI unit for radioactivity is named after him. For his discovery of radioactivity he received the 1903 Nobel Prize for physics; he shared it with the Curies.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 545 The origin of human life (© Willibrord Weijmar Schultz)

that atoms do exist. In fact, radioactivity even allows to count them, as we will find out shortly.

The intensity of radioactivity cannot be influenced by magnetic or electric fields; it does not depend on temperature or light irradiation. In short, radioactivity does not depend on electromagnetism and is not related to it. Also the high energy of the emitted radiation cannot be explained by electromagnetic effects. Radioactivity must thus be due to another, new type of force. In fact, it took 30 years and a dozen of Nobel Prizes to fully understand the details. It turns out that several types of radioactivity exist; the types behave differently when they fly through a magnetic field or when they encounter matter. They are listed in Table 103. All have been studied in great detail, with the aim to understand the nature of the emitted entity and its interaction with matter.

In 1909, radioactivity inspired the 37 year old physicist Ernest Rutherford,* who had won the Nobel Prize just the year before, to another of his brilliant experiments. He asked his collaborator Hans Geiger to take an emitter of alpha radiation – a type of radioactivity which Rutherford had identified and named 10 years earlier – and to point the radiation at a thin metal foil. The quest was to find out where the alpha rays would end up. The research group followed the path of the particles by using scintillation screens; later on they used an invention by Charles Wilson: the cloud chamber. A *cloud chamber*, like its

* Ernest Rutherford (1871–1937), important New Zealand physicist. He emigrated to Britain and became professor at the University of Manchester. He coined the terms alpha particle, beta particle, proton and neutron. A gifted experimentalist, he discovered that radioactivity transmutes the elements, explained the nature of alpha rays, discovered the nucleus, measured its size and performed the first nuclear reactions. Ironically, in 1908 he received the Nobel price for chemistry, much to the amusement of himself and of the world-wide physics community; this was necessary as it was impossible to give enough physics prizes to the numerous discoverers of the time. He founded a successful research school of nuclear physics and many famous physicists spent some time at his institute. Ever an experimentalist, Rutherford deeply disliked quantum theory, even though it was and is the only possible explanation for his discoveries.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 103 The main types of radioactivity and rays emitted by matter

Type	Particle	Example	Range	Danger	Shield	Use
α rays 3 to 10 MeV	helium nuclei	^{235}U, ^{238}U, ^{238}Pu, ^{238}Pu, ^{241}Am	a few cm in air	when eaten, inhaled, touched	any material, e.g. paper	thickness measurement
β rays 0 to 5 MeV	electrons and	^{14}C, ^{40}K, ^{3}H, ^{101}Tc	< 1 mm in metal	serious	metals	cancer treatment
	antineutrinos		light years	none	none	research
β^+ rays	positrons and	^{40}K, ^{11}C, ^{11}C, ^{13}N, ^{15}O	less than β	medium	any material	tomography
	neutrinos		light years	none	none	research
γ rays	high energy photons	^{110}Ag	several m in air	high	thick lead	preservation of herbs, disinfection
n reactions *c.* 1 MeV	neutrons	^{252}Cf, Po-Li (α,n), ^{38}Cl-Be (γ,n)	many m in air	high	0.3 m of paraffin	nuclear power, quantum gravity experiments
n emission typ. 40 MeV	neutrons	^{9}He, ^{24}N, ^{254}Cf	many m in air	high	0.3 m of paraffin	research experiments
p emission typ. 20 MeV	protons	^{5}Be, ^{161}Re	like α rays	small	solids	
spontaneous fission typ. 100 MeV	nuclei	^{232}Cm, ^{263}Rf	like α rays	small	solids	detection of new elements

successor, the bubble chamber, produces white traces along the path of charged particles; the mechanism is the same as the one than leads to the white lines in the sky when an aeroplane flies by.

The radiation detectors gave a strange result: most alpha particles pass through the metal foil undisturbed, whereas a few are reflected. In addition, those few which are reflected are not reflected by the surface, but in the inside of the foil. (Can you imagine how they showed this?) Rutherford deduced from this scattering experiment that first of all, atoms are mainly transparent. Only transparency explains why most alpha particles pass the foil without disturbance, even though it was over 2000 atoms thick. But some particles were scattered by large angles or even reflected. Rutherford showed that the reflections must be due to a single scattering point. By counting the particles that were reflected (about 1 in 20000 for his 0.4 μm gold foil), Rutherford was also able to deduce

Challenge 1571 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 546 Marie Curie (1867–1934)

the size of the reflecting entity and to estimate its mass. He found that it contains almost all of the mass of the atom in a diameter of around 1 fm. He thus named it the *nucleus*. Using the knowledge that atoms contain electrons, Rutherford then deduced from this experiment that atoms consist of an electron cloud that determines the size of atoms – of the order of 0.1 nm – and of a tiny but heavy nucleus at the centre. If an atom had the size of a basketball, its nucleus would have the size of a dust particle, yet contain 99.9 % of the basketball's mass. Atoms resemble thus candy floss around a heavy dust particle. Even though the candy floss – the electron cloud – around the nucleus is extremely thin and light, it is strong enough to avoid that two atoms interpenetrate; thus it keeps the neighbouring nuclei at constant distance. For the tiny and massive alpha particles however, the candy floss is essentially empty space, so that they simply fly through the electron clouds until they exit on the other side or hit a nucleus.

The density of the nucleus is impressive: about $5.5 \cdot 10^{17}\,\mathrm{kg/m^3}$. At that density, the mass of the Earth would fit in a sphere of 137 m radius and a grain of sand would have a mass larger than the largest existing oil tanker. (True?) Now we know that oil tankers are complex structures. What then is the structure of a nucleus?

Challenge 1572 e

> I now know how an atom looks like!
> Ernest Rutherford

Nuclei are composed

The magnetic resonance images also show that nuclei are composed. Images can be taken also using heavier nuclei instead of hydrogen, such as certain fluorine or oxygen nuclei. The g-factors of these nuclei also depart from the value 2 characteristic of point particles; the more massive they are, the bigger the departure. Such objects have a finite size; indeed, the size of nuclei can be measured directly and confirm the values predicted by the g-factor. Both the values of the g-factor and the non-vanishing sizes show that nuclei are composed.

Page 1037

Interestingly, the idea that nuclei are composed is older than the concept of nucleus itself. Already in 1815, after the first mass measurements of atoms by John Dalton and others, researchers noted that the mass of the various chemical elements seem to be almost perfect multiples of the weight of the hydrogen atom. William Prout then formulated the hypothesis that all elements are composed of hydrogen. When the nucleus was discov-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

ered, knowing that it contains almost all mass of the atom, it was therefore first thought that all nuclei are made of hydrogen nuclei. Being at the origin of the list of constituents, the hydrogen nucleus was named *proton*, from the greek term for 'first' and reminding the name of Prout at the same time. Protons carry a positive unit of electric charge, just the opposite of that of electrons, but are almost 2000 times as heavy.

However, the charge and the mass numbers of the other nuclei do not match. On average, a nucleus that has n times the charge of a proton, has a mass that is about 2.6 n times than of the proton. Additional experiments then confirmed an idea formulated by Werner Heisenberg: all nuclei heavier than hydrogen nuclei are made of positively charged protons and neutral *neutrons*. Neutrons are particles a tiny bit more massive than protons (the difference is less than a part in 700), but without any electrical charge. Since the mass is almost the same, the mass of nuclei – and thus that of atoms – is still an (almost perfect) integer multiple of the proton mass. But since neutrons are neutral, the mass and the charge number of nuclei differ. Being neutral, neutrons do not leave tracks in clouds chambers and are more difficult to detect. For this reason, they were discovered much later than other subatomic particles.

Today it is possible to keep single neutrons suspended between suitably shaped coils, with the aid of teflon 'windows'. Such traps were proposed in 1951 by Wolfgang Paul. They work because neutrons, though they have no charge, do have a small magnetic moment. (By the way, this implies that neutrons are composed of charged particles.) With a suitable arrangement of magnetic fields, neutrons can be kept in place, in other words, they can be levitated. Obviously, a trap only makes sense if the trapped particle can be observed. In case of neutrons, this is achieved by the radio waves absorbed when the magnetic moment switches direction with respect to an applied magnetic field. The result of these experiments is simple: the lifetime of free neutrons is around 888(1) s. Nevertheless, inside most nuclei we are made of, neutrons do not decay, as the result does not lead to a state of lower energy. (Why not?)

Challenge 1573 s

Magnetic resonance images also show that some elements have different types of atoms. These elements have atoms that with the same number of protons, but with different numbers of neutrons. One says that these elements have several isotopes.* This also explains why some elements radiate with a mixture of different decay times. Though chemically they are (almost) indistinguishable, isotopes can differ strongly in their nuclear properties. Some elements, such as tin, caesium, or polonium, have over thirty isotopes each. Together, the about 100 known elements have over 2000 *nuclides*.**

The motion of protons and neutrons inside nuclei allows to understand the spin and the magnetic moment of nuclei. Since nuclei are so extremely dense despite containing numerous positively charged protons, there must be a force that keeps everything together against the electrostatic repulsion. We saw that the force is not influenced by electromagnetic or gravitational fields; it must be something different. The force must be short range; otherwise nuclei would not decay by emitting high energy alpha rays. The new force is called the strong nuclear interaction. We shall study it in detail shortly.

* The name is derived from the Greek words for 'same' and 'spot', as the atoms are on the same spot in the periodic table of the elements.

** Nuclides is the standard expression for a nucleus with a given number of neutrons and protons.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 547 All known nuclides with their lifetimes (above) and main decay modes (below), data from www.nndc.bnl.gov/nudat2)

Nuclei can move alone – cosmic rays

In everyday life, nuclei are mostly found inside atoms. But in some situations, they move all by themselves. The first to discover an example was Rutherford, who had shown that alpha particles are helium nuclei. Like all nuclei, alpha particles are small, so that they are quite useful as projectiles.

Then, in 1912, Viktor Heß* made a completely unexpected discovery. Heß was in-

* Viktor Franz Heß, (1883–1964), Austrian nuclear physicist, received the Nobel Prize for physics in 1936 for his discovery of cosmic radiation. Heß was one of the pioneers of research into radioactivity. Heß' discovery also explained why the atmosphere is always somewhat charged, a result important for the formation and behaviour of clouds. Twenty years after the discovery of cosmic radiation, in 1932 Carl Anderson discovered the first antiparticle, the positron, in cosmic radiation; in 1937 Seth Neddermeyer and Carl Anderson discovered the muon; in 1947 a team led by Cecil Powell discovered the pion; in 1951, the Λ^0 and the kaon K^0 are discovered. All discoveries used cosmic rays and most of these discoveries led to Nobel Prizes.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 548 Viktor Heß (1883–1964)



FIGURE 549 An electroscope (or electrometer) (© Harald Chmela) and its charged (middle) and uncharged state (right)

Page 675

trigued by electroscopes (also called electrometers). These are the simplest possible detectors of electric charge. They mainly consist of two hanging, thin metal foils, such as two strips of aluminium foil taken from a chocolate bar. When the electroscope is charged, the strips repel each other and move apart, as shown in Figure 549. (You can build one easily yourself by covering an empty glass with some transparent cellophane foil and suspending a paper clip and the aluminium strips from the foil.) An electroscope thus measures electrical charge. Like many before him, Heß noted that even for a completely isolated electroscope, the charge disappears after a while. He asked: why? By careful study he eliminated one explanation after the other, he and others were left with only one possibility: that the discharge could be due to charged rays, such as those of the recently discovered radioactivity. He thus prepared a sensitive electrometer and took it with him on a balloon flight.

Challenge 1574 e

As expected, the balloon flight showed that the discharge effect diminished with height, due to the larger distance from the radioactive substances on the Earth's surface. But above about 1000 m of height, the discharge effect increased again, and the higher he flew, the stronger it became. Risking his health and life, he continued upwards to more than 5000 m; there the discharge effect was several times stronger than on the surface of the Earth. This result is exactly what is expected from a radiation coming from outer space and absorbed by the atmosphere. In one of his most important flights, performed during an (almost total) solar eclipse, Heß showed that most of the 'height radiation' did not come from the Sun, but from further away. He – and Millikan – thus called the radiation *cosmic rays*. During the last few centuries, many people have drunk from a glass

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 104 The main types of cosmic radiation

PARTICLE	ENERGY	ORIGIN	DETECTOR	SHIELD
At high altitude, the primary particles:				
Protons (90 %)	10^9 to 10^{22} eV	stars, supernovae, extragalactic, unknown	scintillator	in mines
Alpha rays (9 %)	typ. $5 \cdot 10^6$ eV	stars, galaxy	ZnS, counters	1 mm of any material
Other nuclei, such as Le, Be, B, Fe (1 %)	10^9 to 10^{19} eV	stars, novae	1 mm of any material	counters, films
Neutrinos	MeV, GeV	Sun, stars	chlorine, gallium, water	none
Electrons (0.1 %)	10^6 to $> 10^{12}$ eV	supernova remnants		
Gammas (10^{-6})	1 eV to 50 TeV	stars, pulsars, galactic, extragalactic	semiconductor detectors	in mines
At sea level, secondary particles are produced in the atmosphere:				
Muons	3 GeV, $150/\mathrm{m^2 s}$	protons hit atmosphere, produce pions which decay into muons	drift chamber, bubble chamber, scintillation detector	15 m of water or 2.5 m of soil
Oxygen, radiocarbon and other nuclei	varies	e.g., $n + {}^{16}\mathrm{O} \to \mathrm{p} + {}^{14}\mathrm{C}$	soil	
Positrons	varies		counters	soil
Neutrons	varies	reaction product when proton hits ^{16}O nucleus	counters	soil
Pions	varies	reaction product when proton hits ^{16}O nucleus	counters	soil
In addition, there are slowed down primary beam particles.				

and eaten chocolate; but only Heß combined these activities with such careful observation and deduction that he earned a Nobel Prize.*

Today, the most impressive detectors for cosmic rays are Geiger–Müller counters and spark chambers. Both share the same idea; a high voltage is applied between two metal parts kept in a thin and suitably chosen gas (a wire and a cylindrical mesh for the Geiger-Müller counter, two plates or wire meshes in the spark chambers). When a high energy ionizing particle crosses the counter, a spark is generated, which can either be observed through the generated spark (as you can do yourself in the entrance hall of the CERN

* In fact, Hess used gold foils in his electrometer.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 550 A Geiger–Müller counter with the detachable detection tube, the connection cable to the counter electronics, and, for this model, the built-in music player (© Joseph Reinhardt)

main building), or detected by the sudden current flow. Historically, the current was first amplified and sent to a loudspeaker, so that the particles can be heard by a 'click' noise. With a Geiger counter, one cannot see atoms or particles, but one can hear them. Finally, ionized atoms could be counted. Finding the right gas mixture is tricky; it is the reason that the counter has a double name. One needs a gas that extinguishes the spark after a while, to make the detector ready for the next particle. Müller was Geiger's assistant; he made the best counters by adding the right mixture of alcohol to the gas in the chamber. Nasty rumours maintained that this was discovered when another assistant tried, without success, to build counters while Müller was absent. When Müller, supposedly a heavy drinker, came back, everything worked again. However, the story is apocryphal. Today, Geiger–Müller counters are used around the world to detect radioactivity; the smallest fit in mobile phones and inside wrist watches.

The particle energy in cosmic rays spans a large range between 10^3 eV and at least 10^{20} eV; the latter is the same energy as a tennis ball after serve. Understanding the origin of cosmic rays is a science by its own. Some are galactic in origin, some are extragalactic. For most energies, supernova remnants – pulsars and the like – seem the best candidates. However, the source of the highest energy particles is still unknown.

In other words, cosmic rays are probably the only type of radiation discovered without the help of shadows. But shadows have been found later on. In a beautiful experiment performed in 1994, the shadow thrown by the Moon on high energy cosmic rays (about 10 TeV) was studied. When the position of the shadow is compared with the actual position of the Moon, a shift is found. Indeed, due to the magnetic field of the Earth, the cosmic ray Moon shadow is expected to be shifted westwards for protons and eastwards for antiprotons. The data are consistent with a ratio of antiprotons between 0 % and 30 %. By studying the shadow's position, the experiment thus showed that high energy cosmic rays are mainly positively charged and thus consist mainly of matter, and only in small part, if at all, of antimatter.

Ref. 1065

Detailed observations showed that cosmic rays arrive on the surface of the Earth as a mixture of many types of particles, as shown in Table 104. They arrive from outside the atmosphere as a mixture of which the largest fraction are protons, alpha particles,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 551 An aurora borealis, produced by charged particles in the night sky (© Jan Curtis)

iron and other nuclei. Nuclei can thus travel alone over large distances. The number of charged cosmic rays depends on their energy. At the lowest energies, charged cosmic rays hit the human body many times a second. The measurements also show that the rays arrive in irregular groups, called *showers*. The neutrino flux is many orders of magnitude higher, but does not have any effect on human bodies.

Page 1285

The distribution of the incoming direction of cosmic rays shows that many rays must be extragalactic in origin. The typical nuclei of cosmic radiation are ejected from stars and accelerated by supernova explosions. When they arrive on Earth, they interact with the atmosphere before they reach the surface of the Earth. The detailed acceleration mechanisms are still a topic of research.

Cosmic rays have several effects on everyday life. Through the charges they produce in the atmosphere, they are probably responsible for the jagged, non-straight propagation of lightning. (Lightning advances in pulses, alternating fast propagation for about 30 m with slow propagation, until they hit connect. The direction they take at the slow spots depends on the wind and the charge distribution in the atmosphere.) Cosmic rays are also important in the creation of rain drops and ice particles inside clouds, and thus indirectly in the charging of the clouds. Cosmic rays, together with ambient radioactivity, also start the Kelvin generator.

Page 671

If the Moon would not exist, we would die from cosmic rays. The Moon helps to give the Earth a high magnetic field via a dynamo effect, which then diverts most rays towards the magnetic poles. Also the upper atmosphere helps animal life to survive, by shielding life from the harmful effects of cosmic rays. Indeed, aeroplane pilots and airline employees have a strong radiation exposure that is not favourable to their health. Cosmic rays are one of several reasons that long space travel, such as a trip to mars, is not an option for humans. When cosmonauts get too much radiation exposure, the body weakens and eventually they die. Space heroes, including those of science fiction, would not survive much longer than two or three years.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 552 Two aurorae australes on Earth, seen from space (a composed image with superimposed UV intensity, and a view in the X-ray domain) and a double aurora on Saturn (all NASA)

Cosmic rays also produce beautifully coloured flashes inside the eyes of cosmonauts; they regularly enjoy these events in their trips. But cosmic rays are not only dangerous and beautiful. They are also useful. If cosmic rays would not exist at all, we would not exist either. Cosmic rays are responsible for mutations of life forms and thus are one of the causes of biological evolution. Today, this effect is even used artificially; putting cells into a radioactive environment yields new strains. Breeders regularly derive new mutants in this way.

Cosmic rays cannot be seen directly, but their cousins, the 'solar' rays, can. This is most spectacular when they arrive in high numbers. In such cases, the particles are inevitably deviated to the poles by the magnetic field of the Earth and form a so-called *aurora borealis* (at the North Pole) or an *aurora australis* (at the South pole). These slowly moving and variously coloured curtains of light belong to the most spectacular effects in the night sky. (Have a look at www.nasa.gov/mov/105423main_FUV_2005-01_v01.mov.) Visible light and X-rays are emitted at altitudes between 60 and 1000 km. Seen from space, the aurora curtains typically form a circle with a few thousand kilometres diameter around the magnetic poles.*

Cosmic rays are mainly free nuclei. With time, researchers found that nuclei appear without electron clouds also in other situations. In fact, the vast majority of nuclei in the universe have no electron clouds at all: in the inside of stars no nucleus is surrounded by bound electrons; similarly, a large part of intergalactic matter is made of protons. It is known today that most of the matter in the universe is found as protons or alpha particles inside stars and as thin gas between the galaxies. In other words, in contrast to what the Greeks said, matter is not usually made of atoms; it is mostly made of nuclei. Our everyday environment is an exception when seen on cosmic scales. In nature, atoms are rare.

By the way, nuclei are in no way forced to move; nuclei can also be stored with almost no motion. There are methods – now commonly used in research groups – to superpose electric and magnetic fields in such a way that a single nucleus can be kept floating in mid-air; we discussed this possibility in the section on levitation earlier on.

Page 782

* In the solar system, aurorae due to core magnetic fields have been observed on Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, Neptune, Earth, Io and Ganymede. Aurorae due to other mechanisms have been seen on Venus and Mars.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Nuclei decay

Not all nuclei are stable over time. The first measurement that provided a hint was the way radioactivity changes with time. The number N of atoms decreases with time. More precisely, radioactivity follows an exponential decay:

$$N(t) = N(0)e^{-t/\tau} \tag{729}$$

The parameter τ, the so-called *life time*, depends on the type of nucleus emitting the rays. It can vary from much less than a microsecond to millions of millions of years. The expression has been checked for as long as 34 multiples of the duration τ; its validity and precision is well-established by experiments. Radioactivity is the decay of unstable nuclei. Formula (729) is an approximation for large numbers of atoms, as it assumes that $N(t)$ is a continuous variable. Despite this approximation, deriving this expression
Page 1139 from quantum theory is not a simple exercise, as we saw in the section on atomic physics. Though the quantum Zeno effect can appear for small times t, for the case of radioactivity it has not been observed so far.

Most of all, the expression (729) allows to count the number of atoms in a given mass of material. Imagine to have measured the mass of radioactive material at the beginning of your experiment; you have chosen an element that has a lifetime of about a day. Then you put the material inside a scintillation box. After a few weeks the number of flashes has become so low that you can count them; using the formula you can then determine how many atoms have been in the mass to begin with. Radioactivity thus allows us to determine the number of atoms, and thus their size, in addition to the size of nuclei.

The decay (729) and the release of energy is typical of metastable systems. In 1903, Rutherford and Soddy discovered what the state of lower energy is for alpha and beta emitters. In these cases, radioactivity changes the emitting atom; it is a spontaneous transmutation of the atom. An atom emitting alpha or beta rays changes its chemical nature.
Page 295 Radioactivity confirms what statistical mechanics of gases had concluded long time before: atoms have a structure that can change. In alpha decay, the radiating nucleus emits a (doubly charged) helium nucleus. The kinetic energy is typically a handful of MeV. After the emission, the nucleus has changed to one situated two places earlier in the periodic system of the elements.

In beta decay, a neutron transforms itself into a proton, emitting an electron and an antineutrino. Also beta decay changes the chemical nature of the atom, but to the place following the original atom in the periodic table of the elements. A variation is the beta+ decay, in which a proton changes into a neutron and emits a neutrino and a positron. We
Page 1275 will study these important decay processes below.

In gamma decay, the nucleus changes from an excited to a lower energy state by emitting a high energy photon. In this case, the chemical nature is not changed. Typical energies are in the MeV range. Due to the high energy, such rays ionize the material they encounter; since they are not charged, they are not well absorbed by matter and penetrate deep into materials. Gamma radiation is thus by far the most dangerous type of (outside) radioactivity.

By the way, in every human body about nine thousand radioactive decays take place every second, mainly 4.5 kBq (0.2 mSv/a) from ^{40}K and 4 kBq from ^{14}C (0.01 mSv/a).

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1575 s Why is this not dangerous?

All radioactivity is accompanied by emission of energy. The energy emitted by an atom trough radioactive decay or reactions is regularly a million time large than that emitted by a chemical process. That is the reason for the danger of nuclear weapons. More than a decay, a radioactive process is thus an explosion.

What distinguishes those atoms that decay from those which do not? An exponential decay law implies that the probability of decay is independent of the age of the atom. Page 1053 Age or time plays no role. We also know from thermodynamics, that all atoms are exactly identical. So how is the decaying atom singled out? It took around 40 years to discover that decays are triggered by the statistical fluctuations of the vacuum, as described by quantum theory. Indeed, radioactivity is one of the clearest observations that classical physics is not sufficient to describe nature. Radioactivity, like all decays, is a pure quantum effect. Only a finite quantum of action makes it possible that a system remains unchanged until it suddenly decays. Indeed, in 1928 George Gamow explained alpha decay with the tunnelling effect. The tunnelling effect explains the relation between the lifetime and the range of the rays, as well as the measured variation of lifetimes – between 10 ns and 10^{17} years – as the consequence of the varying potentials to be overcome.

By the way, massless particles cannot decay. There is a simple reason for it: massless particles do not experience time, as their paths are 'null'. A particle that does not experience time cannot have a half-life. (Can you find another argument?) Challenge 1576 s

As a result of the chemical effects of radioactivity, the composition ratio of certain elements in minerals allows to determine the age of the mineral. Page 1244 Using radioactive decay to deduce the age of a sample is called radiometric dating. With this technique, geologists determined the age of mountains, the age of sediments and the age of the continents. They determined the time that continents moved apart, the time that mountains formed when the continents collided and the time when igneous rocks were formed. The times found in this way are consistent with the relative time scale that geologists had defined independently for centuries before the technique appeared. With the appearance of radiometric dating, all fell into place. Equally successful was the *radiocarbon method*; with it, historians determined the age of civilizations and the age of human artefacts.* Many false beliefs were shattered. In some communities the shock is still not over, even though over hundred years have passed since these results became known. Ref. 1066

With the advent of radiometric dating, for the first time it became possible to reliably date the age of rocks, to compare it with the age of meteorites and, when space travel became fashionable, with the age of the Moon. The result of the field of *radiometric dating* was beyond all estimates and expectations: the oldest rocks and the oldest meteorites studied independently using different dating methods, are 4570(10) million years old. But if the Earth is that old, why did the Earth not cool down in its core in the meantime?

Why is hell hot?

The lava seas and streams found in and around volcanoes are the origin of the images that many cultures ascribe to hell: fire and suffering. Because of the high temperature of

* In 1960, the developer of the radiocarbon dating technique, Willard Libby, received the Nobel Prize for chemistry.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 553 The lava sea in the volcano Erta Ale in Ethiopia (© Marco Fulle)

lava, hell is inevitably depicted as a hot place. A striking example is the volcano Erta Ale, shown in Figure 553. But why is lava still hot, after 4570 million years?

A straightforward calculation shows that if the Earth had been a hot sphere in the beginning, it should have cooled down and solidified already long time ago. The Earth should be a solid object, like the moon: the Earth should not contain any lava and hell would not be hot.

Challenge 1577 ny

The solution to the riddle is provided by radioactivity: the centre of the Earth contains an oven fuelled by radioactive potassium ^{40}K, radioactive uranium ^{235}U and ^{238}U and radioactive thorium ^{232}Th. The radioactivity of these elements, and to minor degree a few others, keeps the centre of the Earth glowing. More precise investigations, taking into account the decay times and material concentrations, show that this mechanism indeed explains the internal heat of the Earth. (By the way, the decay of potassium is the origin for the 1 % of argon found in the Earth's atmosphere.)

Ref. 1067

Page 1246

This brings up a challenge: why is the radioactivity of lava and of the Earth in general not dangerous to humans?

Challenge 1578 s

Nuclei can form composites

Nuclei are highly unstable when they contain more than about 280 nucleons. Higher mass values inevitably decay into smaller fragments. But when the mass is above 10^{57} nucleons, nuclear composites are stable again: such systems are then called neutron stars. This is the most extreme example of pure nuclear matter found in nature. Neutron stars are left overs of (type II) supernova explosions. They do not run any fusion reactions any more, as other stars do; in first approximation they are simply a large nucleus.

Neutron stars are made of degenerate matter. Their density of 10^{18} kg/m^3 is a few times that of a nucleus, as gravity compresses the star. This density value means that tea spoon of such a star has a mass of several 100 million tons. Neutron stars are about 10 km in diameter. They are never much smaller, as such stars are unstable. They are never much

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 554 Various nuclear shapes – fixed: spherical, oblate, prolate (left) and oscillating (right), shown realistically as clouds (above) and simplified as geometric shapes (below)

larger, because more massive neutron stars turn into black holes.

Nuclei have colours and shapes

In everyday life, the colour of objects is determined by the wavelength of light that is least absorbed, or if they shine, by the wavelength that is emitted. Also nuclei can absorb photons of suitably tuned energies and get into an excited state. In this case, the photon energy is converted into a higher energy of one or several of the nucleons whirling around inside the nucleus. Many radioactive nuclei also emit high energy photons, which then are called gamma rays, in the range of 1 keV (or 0.2 fJ) to about 20 MeV (or 3.3 pJ). The process is similar to the emission of light by electrons in atoms. From the energy, the number and the lifetime of the excited states – they range from 1 ps to 300 d – researchers can deduce how the nucleons move inside the nucleus.

The photon energies define the 'colour' of the nucleus. It can be used, like all colours, to distinguish nuclei from each other and to study their motion. In particular, the colour of the γ-rays emitted by excited nuclei can be used to determine the chemical composition of a piece of matter. Some of these transition lines are so narrow that they can been used to study the change due to the chemical environment of the nucleus, to measure their motion or to detect the gravitational Doppler effect.

The study of γ-rays also allows to determine the shape of nuclei. Many nuclei are spherical; but many are prolate or oblate ellipsoids. Ellipsoids are favoured if the reduction in average electrostatic repulsion is larger than the increase in surface energy. All nuclei – except the lightest ones such as helium, lithium and beryllium – have a constant mass density at their centre, given by about 0.17 fermions per fm^3, and a skin thickness of about 2.4 fm, where their density decreases. Nuclei are thus small clouds, as shown in

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Figure 554.

We know that molecules can be of extremely involved shape. In contrast, nuclei are mostly spheres, ellipsoids or small variations of these. The reason is the short range, or better, the fast spatial decay of nuclear interactions. To get interesting shapes like in molecules, one needs, apart from nearest neighbour interactions, also next neighbour interactions and next next neighbour interactions. The strong nuclear interaction is too short ranged to make this possible. Or does it? It might be that future studies will discover that some nuclei are of more unusual shape, such as smoothed pyramids. Some predictions have been made in this direction; however, the experiments have not been performed yet. Ref. 1068

The shape of nuclei does not have to be fixed; nuclei can also oscillate in shape. Such oscillations have been studied in great detail. The two simplest cases, the quadrupole and octupole oscillations, are shown in Figure 554. Obviously, nuclei can also rotate. Rapidly spinning nuclei, with a spin of up to $60\hbar$ and more, exist. They usually slow down step by step, emitting a photon and reducing their angular momentum at each step. Recently it was discovered that nuclei can also have bulges that rotate around a fixed core, a bit like tides rotate around the Earth. Ref. 1069

The four types of motion in the nuclear domain

Nuclei are small because the nuclear interactions are short-ranged. Due to this short range, nuclear interactions play a role only in types of motion: scattering, bound motion, decay and a combination of these three called *nuclear reactions*. The history of nuclear physics showed that the whole range of observed phenomena can be reduced to these four fundamental processes. In each motion type, the main interest is what happens at the start and at the end; the intermediate situations are less interesting. Nuclear interactions thus lack the complex types of motion which characterize everyday life. That is the reason for the shortness of this chapter.

Scattering is performed in all accelerator experiments. Such experiments repeat for nuclei what we do when we look at an object. Seeing is a scattering process, as seeing is the detection of scattered light. Scattering of X-rays was used to see atoms for the first time; scattering of high energy alpha particles was used to discover and study the nucleus, and later the scattering of electrons with even higher energy was used to discover and study the components of the proton.

Bound motion is the motion of protons and neutrons inside nuclei or the motion of quarks inside mesons and baryons. Bound motion determines shape and shape changes of compounds.

Decay is obviously the basis of radioactivity. Decay can be due to the electromagnetic, the strong or the weak nuclear interaction. Decay allows to study the conserved quantities of nuclear interactions.

Nuclear reactions are combinations of scattering, decay and possibly bound motion. Nuclear reactions are for nuclei what the touching of objects is in everyday life. Touching an object we can take it apart, break it, solder two objects together, throw it away, and much more. The same can be done with nuclei. In particular, nuclear reactions are responsible for the burning of the Sun and the other stars; they also tell the history of the nuclei inside our bodies.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Quantum theory showed that all four types of motion can be described in the same way. Each type of motion is due to the exchange of virtual particles. For example, scattering due to charge repulsion is due to exchange of virtual photons, the bound motion inside nuclei due to the strong nuclear interaction is due to exchange of virtual gluons, beta decay is due to the exchange of virtual W bosons, and neutrino reactions are due to the exchange of virtual Z bosons. The rest of this chapter explains these mechanisms in more details.

Nuclei react

Page 1056

The first man thought to have made transuranic elements, the Italian genius Enrico Fermi, received the Nobel Prize for the discovery. Shortly afterwards, Otto Hahn and his collaborators Lise Meitner and Fritz Strassmann showed that Fermi was wrong, and that his prize was based on a mistake. Fermi was allowed to keep his prize, the Nobel committee gave Hahn and Strassman the Nobel Prize as well, and to make the matter unclear to everybody and to women physicists in particular, the prize was not given to Lise Meitner. (After her death, a new element was named after her.)

When protons or neutrons were shot into nuclei, they usually remained stuck inside them, and usually lead to the transformation of an element into a heavier one. After having done this with all elements, Fermi used uranium; he found that bombarding it with neutrons, a new element appeared, and concluded that he had created a transuranic element. Alas, Hahn and his collaborators found that the element formed was well-known: it was barium, a nucleus with less than half the mass of uranium. Instead of remaining stuck as in the previous 91 elements, the neutrons had split the uranium nucleus. Hahn, Meitner and Strassmann had observed reactions such as:

$$^{235}\mathrm{U} + \mathrm{n} \to {}^{143}\mathrm{Ba} + {}^{90}\mathrm{Kr} + 3n + 170\,\mathrm{MeV}\ . \tag{730}$$

Meitner called the splitting process *nuclear fission*. A large amount of energy is liberated in fission. In addition, several neutrons are emitted; they can thus start a chain reaction. Later, and (of course) against the will of the team, the discovery would be used to make nuclear bombs.

Reactions and decays are transformations. In each transformation, already the Greek taught us to search, first of all, for conserved quantities. Besides the well-known cases of energy, momentum, electric charge and angular momentum conservation, the results of nuclear physics lead to several new conserved quantities. The behaviour is quite constrained. Quantum field theory implies that particles and antiparticles (commonly denoted by a bar) must behave in compatible ways. Both experiment and quantum field theory show for example that every reaction of the type $\mathrm{A} + \mathrm{B} \to \mathrm{C} + \mathrm{D}$ implies that the reactions $\mathrm{A} + \overline{\mathrm{C}} \to \overline{\mathrm{B}} + \mathrm{D}$ or $\overline{\mathrm{C}} + \overline{\mathrm{D}} \to \overline{\mathrm{A}} + \overline{\mathrm{B}}$ or, if energy is sufficient, $\mathrm{A} \to \mathrm{C} + \mathrm{D} + \overline{\mathrm{B}}$, are also possible. Particles thus behave like conserved mathematical entities.

Experiments show that antineutrinos differ from neutrinos. In fact, all reactions confirm that the so-called *lepton number* is conserved in nature. The lepton number L is zero for nucleons or quarks, is 1 for the electron and the neutrino, and is -1 for the positron and the antineutrino.

In addition, all reactions conserve the so-called *baryon number*. The baryon number

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

B is 1 for protons and neutrons (and 1/3 for quarks), and −1 for antiprotons and antineutrons (and thus −1/3 for antiquarks). So far, no process with baryon number violation has ever been observed. Baryon conservation is one reason for the danger of radioactivity, fission and fusion.

Bombs and nuclear reactors

Uranium fission is triggered by a neutron, liberates energy and produces several additional neutrons. It can trigger a chain reaction which can lead to an explosion or a controlled generation of heat. Once upon a time, in the middle of the twentieth century, these processes were studied by quite a number of researchers. Most of them were interested in making weapons or in using nuclear energy, despite the high toll these activities place on the economy, on human health and on the environment.

Most stories around this topic are absurd. The first nuclear weapons were built during the second world war with the smartest physicists that could be found. Everything was ready, including the most complex physical models, factories and an organization of incredible size. There was just one little problem: there was no uranium of sufficient quality. The mighty United States thus had to go around the world to shop for good uranium. They found it in the Belgian colony of Congo, in central Africa. In short, without the support of Belgium, which sold the Congolese uranium to the USA, there would have been no nuclear bomb, no early war end and no superpower status.

Congo paid a high price for this important status. It was ruled by a long chain of military dictators up to this day. But the highest price was paid by the countries that actually built nuclear weapons. Some went bankrupt, others remained underdeveloped, still other countries have amassed huge debts and have a large underprivileged population. There is no exception. The price of nuclear weapons has also been that some regions of our planet became uninhabitable, such as numerous islands, deserts and marine environments. But it could have been worse. When the most violent physicist ever, Edward Teller, made his first calculations about the hydrogen bomb, he predicted that the bomb would set the atmosphere into fire. Nobel Prize winner Hans Bethe* corrected the mistake and showed that nothing of this sort would happen. Nevertheless, the military preferred to explode the hydrogen bomb in the Bikini atoll, the most distant place from their homeland they could find. Today it is even dangerous simply to fly over that island. It was then noticed that nuclear test explosions increased ambient radioactivity in the atmosphere all over the world. Of the produced radioactive elements, ^{3}H is absorbed by humans in drinking water, ^{14}C and ^{90}Sr through food, and ^{137}Cs in both ways. In the meantime, all countries have agreed to perform their nuclear tests underground.

Ref. 1070

But even peaceful nuclear reactors are dangerous. The reason was discovered in 1934 by Frédéric Joliot and his wife Irène, the daughter of Pierre and Marie Curie: *artificial radioactivity*. The Joliot–Curies discovered that materials irradiated by alpha rays become

* Hans Bethe (b. 1906 Strasbourg, d. 2005) was one of the great physicists of the twentieth century, even though he was head of the theory department that lead to the construction of the first atomic bombs. He worked on nuclear physics and astrophysics, helped Richard Feynman in developing quantum electrodynamics, and worked on solid state physics. When he got older and wiser, he became a strong advocate of arms control; he also was essential in persuading the world to stop atmospheric nuclear test explosions and saved many humans from cancer in doing so.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 105 Some radioactivity measurements

MATERIAL	ACTIVITY IN BQ/KG
Air	$c.\,10^{-2}$
Sea water	10^{1}
Human body	$c.\,10^{2}$
Cow milk	max. 10^{3}
Pure ^{238}U metal	$c.\,10^{7}$
Highly radioactive α emitters	$> 10^{7}$
Radiocarbon: ^{14}C (β emitter)	10^{8}
Highly radioactive β and γ emitters	$> 10^{9}$
Main nuclear fallout: ^{137}Cs, ^{90}Sr (α emitter)	$2 \cdot 10^{9}$
Polonium, one of the most radioactive materials (α)	10^{24}

radioactive in turn. They found that alpha rays transformed aluminium into radioactive phosphorus:

$$^{27}_{13}\mathrm{Al} + {}^{4}_{2}\alpha \rightarrow {}^{31}_{15}\mathrm{P}\ . \tag{731}$$

In fact, almost all materials become radioactive when irradiated with alpha particles, neutrons or gamma rays. As a result, radioactivity itself can only be contained with difficulty. After a time which depends on the material and the radiation, the box that contains radioactive material has itself become radioactive.

The dangers of natural and artificial radioactivity are the reason for the high costs of nuclear reactors. After about thirty years of operation, reactors have to be dismantled. The radioactive pieces have to be stored in specially chosen, inaccessible places, and at the same time the workers' health must not be put in danger. The world over, many dismantlings are now imminent. The companies performing the job sell the service at high price. All operate in a region not far from the border to criminal activity, and since radioactivity cannot be detected by the human senses, many crossed it. In fact, an important nuclear reactor is (usually) not dangerous to humans: the Sun. We explore it shortly.

CURIOSITIES AND CHALLENGES ON RADIOACTIVITY

Not all γ-rays are due to radioactivity. In the year 2000, an Italian group discovered that thunderstorms also emit γ-rays, of energies up to 10 MeV. The mechanisms are still being investigated. Ref. 1074

* *

Chain reactions are quite common in nature. *Fire* is a chemical chain reaction, as are exploding fireworks. In both cases, material needs heat to burn; this heat is supplied by a neighbouring region that is already burning.

* *

Radioactivity can be extremely dangerous to humans. The best example is plutonium.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 106 Human exposure to radioactivity and the corresponding doses

Exposure	Dose
Daily human exposure:	
Average exposure to cosmic radiation in Europe	
at sea level	0.3 mSv/a
at a height of 3 km	1.2 mSv/a
Average (and maximum) exposure from the soil, not counting radon effects	0.4 mSv/a (2 mSv/a)
Average (and maximum) inhalation of radon	1 mSv/a (100 mSv/a)
Average exposure due to internal radionuclides	0.3 mSv/a
natural content of ^{40}K in human muscles	10^{-4} Gy and 4500 Bq
natural content of Ra in human bones	$2 \cdot 10^{-5}$ Gy and 4000 Bq
natural content of ^{14}C in humans	10^{-5} Gy
Total average (and maximum) human exposure	2 mSv/a (100 mSv/a)
Common situations:	
Dental X-ray	*c.* 10 mSv equivalent dose
Lung X-ray	*c.* 0.5 mSv equivalent dose
Short one hour flight (see www.gsf.de/epcard)	*c.* 1 µSv
Transatlantic flight	*c.* 0.04 mSv
Maximum allowed dose at work	30 mSv/a
Deadly exposures:	
Ionization	0.05 C/kg can be deadly
Dose	100 Gy=100 J/kg is deadly in 1 to 3 days
Equivalent dose	more than 3 Sv/a leads to death

Only 1 µg of this alpha emitter inside the human body are sufficient to cause lung cancer.

* *

Why is nuclear power a dangerous endeavour? The best argument is Lake Karachay near Mayak, in the Urals in Russia. In less than a decade, the nuclear plants of the region have transformed it into the most radioactive place on Earth. Walking on the shore of the lake for an hour leads to death on the shore. The radioactive material in the lake was distributed over lage areas in several catastrophic explosions in the 1950s and 1960s, leading to widespread death and illness. Several of these accidents were comparable to the Chernobyl accident of 1986. The lake is now covered in concrete.

* *

All lead is slightly radioactive, because it contains the ^{210}Pb isotope, a beta emitter. This lead isotope is produced by the uranium and thorium contained in the rock from where the lead is extracted. For sensitive experiments, such as for neutrino experiments, one

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

needs radioactivity shields. The best shield material is lead, but obviously it has to be low radioactivity lead. Since the isotope ^{210}Pb has a half-life of 22 years, one way to do it is to use old lead. In a precision neutrino experiment in the Gran Sasso in Italy, the research team uses lead mined during Roman times in order to reduce spurious signals.

* *

Not all nuclear reactors are human made. Natural reactors have been predicted in 1956 by Paul Kuroda. In 1972 the first example was found. In Oklo, in the African country of Gabon, there is a now famous geological formation where uranium is so common that two thousand million years ago a natural nuclear reactor has formed spontaneously – albeit a small one, with an estimated power generation of 100 kW. It has been burning for over 150 000 years, during the time when the uranium 235 percentage was 3% or more, as required for chain reaction. (Nowadays, the uranium 235 content on Earth is 0.7%.) The water of a nearby river was periodically heated to steam during an estimated 30 minutes; then the reactor cooled down again for an estimated 2.5 hours, since water is necessary to moderate the neutrons and sustain the chain reaction. The system has been studied in great detail, from its geological history up to the statements it makes about the constancy of the 'laws' of nature. The studies showed that 2000 million years ago the mechanisms were the same as those used today.

* *

High energy radiation is dangerous to humans. In the 1950s, when nuclear tests were still made above ground by the large armies in the world, the generals overruled the orders of the medical doctors. They positioned many soldiers nearby to watch the explosion, and worse, even ordered them to walk to the explosion site as soon as possible after the explosion. One does not need to comment on the orders of these generals. Several of these unlucky soldiers made a strange observation: during the flash of the explosion, they were able to see the bones in their own hand and arms. How can this be?

Challenge 1579 ny

* *

The SI units for radioactivity are now common; in the old days, 1 Sievert, or 1 Sv, was called 100 rem or 'Röntgen equivalent man'; the SI unit for dose, 1 Gray, defined as 1 Gy = 1 J/kg, replaces what used to be called 100 rd or Rad. The SI unit for exposition, 1 C/kg, replaces the older unit 'R öntgen', with the relation $1\,\mathrm{R} = 2.58 \cdot 10^{-4}\,\mathrm{C/kg}$.

* *

Nuclear bombs are terrible weapons. To experience their violence but also the criminal actions of many military people during the tests, have a look at the pictures of explosions. In the 1950 and 60s, nuclear tests were performed by generals who refused to listen to doctors and scientists. Generals ordered to explode these weapons in the air, making the complete atmosphere of the world radioactive, hurting all mankind in doing so; worse, they even obliged soldiers to visit the radioactive explosion site a few minutes after the explosion, thus doing their best to let their own soldiers die from cancer and leukaemia.

Ref. 1075

* *

The technique of radiometric dating has deeply impacted astronomy, geology, evolu-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

tionary biology, archaeology and history. (And it has reduced the number of violent believers.) Half-lives can usually be measured to within one or two per cent of accuracy, and they are known both experimentally and theoretically not to change over geological time scales. As a result, radiometric dating methods can be be surprisingly precise. But how does one measure half-lives of thousands of millions of years to high precision?

Ref. 1066

Challenge 1580 s

* *

The beta decay of the radioactive carbon isotope ^{14}C has a decay time of 5568 a. This isotope is continually created in the atmosphere through the influence of cosmic rays. This happens through the reaction $^{14}N + n \to p + {}^{14}C$. As a result, the concentration of radiocarbon in air is relatively constant over time. Inside living plants, the metabolism thus (unknowingly) maintains the same concentration. In dead plants, the decay sets in. The decay time of a few thousand years is particularly useful to date historic material. The method, called radiocarbon dating, has been used to determine the age of mummies, the age of prehistoric tools and the age of religious relics. The original version of the technique measured the radiocarbon content through its radioactive decay and the scintillations it produced. A quality jump was achieved when accelerator mass spectroscopy became commonplace. It was not necessary any more to wait for decays: it is now possible to determine the ^{14}C content directly. As a result, only a tiny amount of carbon, as low as 0.2 mg, is necessary for a precise dating. This technique showed that numerous religious relics are forgeries, such as a cloth in Turin, and several of their wardens turned out to be crooks.

* *

Researchers have developed an additional method to date stones using radioactivity. Whenever an alpha ray is emitted, the emitting atom gets a recoil. If the atom is part of a crystal, the crystal is damaged by the recoil. The damage can be seen under the microscope. By counting the damaged regions it is possible to date the time at which rocks have been crystallized. In this way it has been possible to determine when material from volcanic eruptions has become rock.

* *

Several methods to date wine are used, and more are in development. A few are given in Table 107.

* *

In 1958, six nuclear bombs were made to explode in the stratosphere by a vast group of criminals. A competing criminal group performed similar experiments in 1961, followed by even more explosions by both groups in 1962. (For reports and films, see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/High_altitude_nuclear_explosion.) As a result of most of these explosions, an *artificial aurora* was triggered the night following each of them. In addition, the electromagetic pulse from the blasts destroyed satellites, destroyed electronics on Earth, disturbed radio communications, injured people on the surface of the Earth, caused problems with power plants, and distributed large amounts of radioactive material over the Earth – during 14 years following the blasts. The van Allen radiation belts around the Earth were strongly affected; it is expected that the lower van Allen belt will recover from

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 107 Natural isotopes used in radiometric dating

Isotope	Decay product	Half-life	Method using it	Examples
^{147}Sm	^{143}Nd	106 Ga	samarium–neodynium method	rocks, lunar soil, meteorites
^{87}Rb	^{87}Sr	48.8 Ga	rubidium–strontium method	rocks, lunar soil, meteorites
^{187}Rh	^{187}Os	42 Ga	rhenium–osmium method	rocks, lunar soil, meteorites
^{176}Lu	^{176}Hf	38 Ga	lutetium–hafnium method	rocks, lunar soil, meteorites
^{232}Th	^{208}Pb	14 Ga	thorium–lead method, lead–lead method	rocks, lunar soil, meteorites
^{238}U	^{206}Pb	4.5 Ga	uranium–lead method, lead–lead method	rocks, lunar soil, meteorites
^{40}K	^{40}Ar	1.26 Ga	potassium–argon method, argon–argon method	rocks, lunar soil, meteorites
^{235}U	^{207}Pb	0.7 Ga	uranium–lead method, lead–lead method	rocks, lunar soil, meteorites
^{10}Be	^{10}B	1.52 Ma	cosmogenic radiometric dating	ice cores
^{26}Al	^{26}Mg	0.72 Ma	supernova debris dating	checking that nucleosynthesis still takes place in the galaxy
^{60}Fe	^{60}Ni	1.5 Ma	supernova debris dating	deep sea crust
^{36}Cl	^{36}Ar	0.3 Ma	cosmogenic radiometric dating	ice cores
^{234}U	^{230}Th	248 ka	uranium–thorium method	corals, stalactites, bones, teeth
^{230}Th	^{226}Ra	75, 4 ka		
^{14}C	^{14}N	5715 a	radiocarbon method	wood, clothing, bones, organic material, wine
^{137}Cs	^{137}B	30 a	gamma-ray counting	dating food and wine after Chernobyl nuclear accident
^{210}Pb		22 a	gamma-ray counting	dating wine
^{3}H	^{3}He	12.3 a	gamma-ray counting	dating wine

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

the blasts only in a few hundred years. Fortunately for the human race, after 1962, this activity was stopped.

* *

Selected radioactive decay times can be changed by external influence. Electron capture, as observed in beryllium-7, is one of the rare examples were the decay time can change, by up to 1.5%, depending on the chemical environment. The decay time for the same isotope has also been found to change by a fraction of a per cent under pressures of 27 GPa. On the other hand, these effects are predicted (and measured) to be negligible for nuclei of larger mass.

* *

The non-radioactive isotopes ^{2}H and ^{18}O can be used for measuring energy production in humans in an easy way. Give a person a glass of doubly labelled water to drink and collect his urine samples for a few weeks. Using a mass spectrometer one can determine his energy consumption. Why? Doubly labelled water $^{2}H_2{}^{18}O$ is processed by the body in three main ways. The oxygen isotope is expired as $C^{18}O_2$ or eliminated as $H_2{}^{18}O$; the hydrogen isotope is eliminated as $^{2}H_2O$. Measurements on the urine allow to determine carbon dioxyde production, therefore to determine how much has food been metabolized, and thus to determine energy production.

Measurements showed that high altitude climbers with 20 000 kJ/d and bicycle riders with up to 30 000 kJ/d are the most extreme sportsmen. Average humans produce 6 000 kJ/d.

Summary on nuclei

Nuclei are composed of protons and neutrons. Their radius is between one and a few femtometres and they rotate. Their rotation allows to produce magnetic resonance images. Nuclei can be spherical or ellipsoidal, they can be excited to higher energy states, and they can oscillate in shape. Nuclei can break up and can react among each other. The last property is the reason we exist, as we will show now.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 45

THE SUN, THE STARS AND THE BIRTH OF MATTER

> Lernen ist Vorfreude auf sich selbst.*
>
> Peter Sloterdijk

Nuclear physics is the most violent part of physics. But despite this bad image, nuclear physics has something to offer which is deeply fascinating: the understanding of the Sun, the stars and the early universe.

Ref. 1071

Since protons are positively charged, inside nuclei they must be bound by a force strong enough to keep them together against their electromagnetic repulsion. This is the strong nuclear interaction; it is needed to avoid that nuclei explode. The interaction is the strongest of all known ones; nevertheless, we do not experience it in everyday life, because its range is limited to distances of a few femtometres, or a few diameters of a proton. Despite this limitation, the strong interaction tells a good story about the flesh and blood we are made of.

The Sun

The Sun emits 385 YW of light. Where does this energy come from? If it came by burning coal, the Sun would stop burning after a few thousands of years. When radioactivity was discovered, researchers tested the possibility that this process was at the heart of the Sun's shining. However, even though radioactivity can produce more energy than chemical burning, the composition of the Sun – mostly hydrogen and helium – makes this impossible. The origin of the energy in the Sun was settled in 1939 by Hans Bethe: the Sun burns by hydrogen *fusion*. Fusion is the composition of a large nucleus from smaller ones. In the Sun, the fusion reaction

Ref. 1072

$$4\,{}^1\mathrm{H} \to {}^4\mathrm{He} + 2\,e^+ + 2\,\nu + 4.4\,\mathrm{pJ} \tag{732}$$

is the result of a continuous cycle of three separate nuclear reactions:

$$\begin{aligned} {}^1\mathrm{H} + {}^1\mathrm{H} &\to {}^2\mathrm{H} + e^+ + \nu \quad \text{(a weak nuclear reaction)} \\ {}^2\mathrm{H} + {}^1\mathrm{H} &\to {}^3\mathrm{He} + \gamma \quad \text{(a strong nuclear reaction)} \\ {}^3\mathrm{He} + {}^3\mathrm{He} &\to {}^4\mathrm{He} + 2\,{}^1\mathrm{H} + \gamma\,. \end{aligned} \tag{733}$$

* 'Learning is anticipated joy about yourself.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

In total, four protons are thus fused to one helium nucleus; if we include the electrons, four hydrogen atoms are fused to one helium atom with the emission of neutrinos and light with a total energy of 4.4 pJ (26.7 MeV). Most of the energy is emitted as light; around 10 % is carried away by neutrinos. The first of the three reaction of equation 733 is due to the weak nuclear interaction; this avoids that it happens too rapidly and ensures that the Sun will shine still for some time. Indeed, in the Sun, with a luminosity of 385 YW, there are thus about 10^{38} fusions per second. This allows to deduce that the Sun will last another handful of Ga (Gigayears) before it runs out of fuel.

Ref. 1073

The fusion reaction (733) takes place in the centre of the Sun. The energy carried away by the photons arrives at the Sun's surface about two hundred thousand years later; this delay is due to the repeated scattering of the photon by the constituents inside the Sun. After two-hundred thousand years, the photons take another 8.3 minutes to reach the Earth and to sustain the life of all plants and animals.

Why do the stars shine?

> Don't the stars shine beautifully? I am the only person in the world who knows why they do.
>
> Friedrich (Fritz) Houtermans

All stars shine because of fusion. When two light nuclei are fused to a heavier one, some energy is set free, as the average nucleon is bound more strongly. This energy gain is possible until the nuclei of iron ^{56}Fe are made. For nuclei beyond this nucleus, the binding energies per nucleon then decrease again; thus fusion is not energetically possible.*

The different stars observed in the sky** can be distinguished by the type of fusion nuclear reaction that dominates. Most stars, in particular young or light stars, run hydrogen fusion. In fact, there are at least two main types of hydrogen fusion: the direct hydrogen–hydrogen (p-p) cycle and the CNO cycle(s).

The hydrogen cycle was described above and can be summarized as

Page 1248

$$4\,{}^{1}\mathrm{H} \to {}^{4}\mathrm{He} + 2\,e^{+} + 2\,\nu + 4.4\,\mathrm{pJ}\,. \tag{734}$$

This simple description does not fully purvey the fascination of the process. On average, protons in the Sun's centre move with 600 km/s. Only if they hit each other precisely head-on can a nuclear reaction occur; in all other cases, the electrostatic repulsion between the protons keeps them apart. For an average proton, a head-on collision happens once every 7 thousand million years. Nevertheless, there are so many proton collisions in the Sun that every second four million tons of hydrogen are burned to helium.

Fortunately for us, the photons generated in the Sun's centre are 'slowed' down by the outer parts of the Sun. In this process, gamma photons are progressively converted to visible photons. As a result, the sunlight of today was in fact generated at the time of the Neandertalers: a typical estimate is about 200 000 years ago. In other words, the effective speed of light right at the centre of the Sun is estimated to be around 10 km/year.

Ref. 1076

* Thus fission becomes interesting as energy source for heavy nuclei.

** To find out which stars are in the sky above you at present, see the www.surveyor.in-berlin.de/himmel website.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 555 Photographs of the Sun at wavelengths of 30.4 nm (in the extreme ultraviolet, left) and around 677 nm (visible light, right, at a different date), by the SOHO mission (ESA and NASA)

If a star has heavier elements inside it, the hydrogen fusion uses these elements as catalysts. This happens through the so-called CNO cycle, which runs as

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{12}\mathrm{C} + {}^{1}\mathrm{H} &\to {}^{13}\mathrm{N} + \gamma \\ {}^{13}\mathrm{N} &\to {}^{13}\mathrm{C} + \mathrm{e}^{+} + \nu \\ {}^{13}\mathrm{C} + {}^{1}\mathrm{H} &\to {}^{14}\mathrm{N} + \gamma \\ {}^{14}\mathrm{N} + {}^{1}\mathrm{H} &\to {}^{15}\mathrm{O} + \gamma \\ {}^{15}\mathrm{O} &\to {}^{15}\mathrm{N} + \mathrm{e}^{+} + \nu \\ {}^{15}\mathrm{N} + {}^{1}\mathrm{H} &\to {}^{12}\mathrm{C} + {}^{4}\mathrm{He} \end{aligned} \tag{735}$$

The end result of the cycle is the same as that of the hydrogen cycle, both in nuclei and in energy. The CNO cycle is faster than hydrogen fusion, but requires higher temperatures, as the protons must overcome a higher energy barrier before reacting with carbon or nitrogen than when they react with another proton. (Why?) Due to the comparatively low temperature of a few tens of million kelvin inside the Sun, the CNO cycle is less important than the hydrogen cycle. (This is also the case for the other CNO cycles that exist.)

Challenge 1581 s

These studies also explain why the Sun does not collapse. The Sun is a ball of hot gas, and the high temperature of its constituents prevents their concentration into a small volume. For some stars, the radiation pressure of the emitted photons prevents collapse; for others it is the Pauli pressure; for the Sun, like for the majority of stars, it is the usual thermal motion of the gas.

The nuclear reaction rates at the interior of a star are extremely sensitive to temperature T. The carbon cycle reaction rate is proportional to between T^{13} for hot massive O stars and T^{20} for stars like the Sun. In red giants and supergiants, the triple alpha reaction rate is proportional to T^{40}; these strong dependencies imply that stars usually shine with constancy over times of thousands and millions of years, since any change in

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

temperature would be damped by a very efficient feedback mechanism. (Of course, there are exceptions: variable stars get brighter and darker with periods of a few days; the Sun shows small oscillations in the minute range; and some stars change in brightness every few years.)

How can the Sun's surface have a temperature of 6000 K, whereas the corona around it, the thin gas emanating from the Sun, reaches two million Kelvin? In the latter part of the twentieth century it was shown, using satellites, that the magnetic field of the Sun is the cause; through the violent flows in the Sun's matter, magnetic energy is transferred to the corona in those places were flux tubes form knots, above the bright spots in the left of Figure 555 or above the dark spots in the right photograph. As a result, the particles of the corona are accelerated and heat the whole corona.

When the Sun erupts, as shown in the lower left corner in Figure 555, matter is ejected far into space. When this matter reaches the Earth,* after being diluted by the journey, it affects the environment. Solar storms can deplete the higher atmosphere and can thus possibly trigger usual Earth storms. Other effects of the Sun are the formation of auroras and the loss of orientation of birds during their migration; this happens during exceptionally strong solar storms, as the magnetic field of the Earth is disturbed in these situations. The most famous effect of a solar storm was the loss of electricity in large parts of Canada in March of 1989. The flow of charged solar particles triggered large induced currents in the power lines, blew fuses and destroyed parts of the network, shutting down the power system. Millions of Canadians had no electricity, and in the most remote places it took two weeks to restore the electricity supply. Due to the coldness of the winter and a train accident resulting from the power loss, over 80 people died. In the meantime the network has been redesigned to withstand such events.

The proton cycle and the CNO cycles are not the only options. Heavier and older stars than the Sun can also shine through other fusion reactions. In particular, when hydrogen is consumed, such stars run *helium burning*:

$$3\,{}^4\mathrm{He} \to {}^{12}\mathrm{C}\,. \tag{736}$$

This fusion reaction is of low probability, since it depends on three particles being at the same point in space at the same time. In addition, small amounts of carbon disappear rapidly via the reaction $\alpha + {}^{12}\mathrm{C} \to {}^{16}\mathrm{O}$. Nevertheless, since ${}^8\mathrm{Be}$ is unstable, the reaction with 3 alpha particles is the only way for the universe to produce carbon. All these negative odds are countered only by one feature: carbon has an excited state at 7.65 MeV, which is 0.3 MeV above the sum of the alpha particle masses; the excited state resonantly enhances the low probability of the three particle reaction. Only in this way the universe is able to produce the atoms necessary for pigs, apes and people. The prediction of this resonance by Fred Hoyle is one of the few predictions in physics that used the simple experimental observation that humans exist. The story has lead to a huge outflow of metaphysical speculations, most of which are unworthy of being even mentioned.

Page 868

* It might even be that the planets affect the solar wind; the issue is not settled and is still under study.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 556 A simplified drawing of the Joint European Torus in operation at Culham, showing the large toroidal chamber and the magnets for the plasma confinement (© EFDA-JET)

Why are fusion reactors not common yet?

Across the world, for over 50 years, a large number of physicists and engineers have tried to build fusion reactors. Fusion reactors try to copy the mechanism of energy release used by the Sun. The first machine that realized macroscopic energy production was the Joint European Torus* (JET for short) located in Culham in the United Kingdom.

Ref. 1077 The idea of JET is to produce an extremely hot plasma that is as dense as possible. At high enough temperature and density, fusion takes place; the energy is released as a particle flux that is transformed (like in a fission reactor) into heat and then into electricity. To achieve ignition, JET used the fusion between deuterium and tritium, because this reaction has the largest cross section and energy gain:

$$\mathrm{D} + \mathrm{T} \to \mathrm{He}^4 + \mathrm{n} + 17.6\,\mathrm{MeV}\ . \tag{737}$$

Because tritium is radioactive, most research experiments are performed with the much less efficient deuterium–deuterium reactions, which have a lower cross section and a lower energy gain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{D} + \mathrm{D} &\to \mathrm{T} + \mathrm{H} + 4\,\mathrm{MeV} \\ \mathrm{D} + \mathrm{D} &\to \mathrm{He}^3 + \mathrm{n} + 3.3\,\mathrm{MeV}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{738}$$

Fusion takes place when deuterium and tritium (or deuterium) collide at high energy. The high energy is necessary to overcome the electrostatic repulsion of the nuclei. In

* See www.jet.edfa.org.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

other words, the material has to be hot. To release energy from deuterium and tritium, one therefore first needs energy to heat it up. This is akin to the ignition of wood: in order to use wood as a fuel, one first has to heat it with a match.

Following the so-called Lawson criterium, published in 1957 by the English engineer John Lawson, (but already known to Russian researchers) a fusion reaction releases energy only if the triple product of density n, reaction (or containment) time τ and temperature T exceeds a certain value. Nowadays this criterium is written as

Ref. 1078

$$n\tau T > 3 \cdot 10^{28}\,\mathrm{s\,K/m^3}\ . \tag{739}$$

In order to realize the Lawson criterium, JET uses temperatures of 100 to 200 MK, particle densities of 2 to $3 \cdot 10^{20}\ \mathrm{m^{-3}}$, and confinement times of 1 s. The temperature is much higher than the 20 MK at the centre of the Sun, because the densities and the confinement times are lower for JET.

Matter at these temperatures is in form of plasma: nuclei and electrons are completely separated. Obviously, it is impossible to pour a plasma at 100 MK into a container: the walls would instantaneously evaporate. The only option is to make the plasma float in a vacuum, and to avoid that the plasma touches the container wall. The main challenge of fusion research in the past has been to find a way to keep a hot gas mixture of deuterium and tritium suspended in a chamber so that the gas never touches the chamber walls. The best way is to suspend the gas using a magnetic field. This works because in the fusion plasma, charges are separated, so that they react to magnetic fields. The most successful geometric arrangement was invented by the famous Russian physicists Igor Tamm and Andrei Sakharov: the *tokamak*. Of the numerous tokamaks around the world, JET is the largest and most successful. Its concrete realization is shown in Figure 556. JET manages to keep the plasma from touching the walls for about a second; then the situation becomes unstable: the plasma touches the wall and is absorbed there. After such a *disruption*, the cycle consisting of gas injection, plasma heating and fusion has to be restarted. As mentioned, JET has already achieved ignition, that is the state were more energy is released than is added for plasma heating. However, so far, no sustained commercial energy production is planned or possible, because JET has no attached electrical power generator.

The successor project, *ITER*, an international tokamak built with European, Japanese, US-American and Russian funding, aims to pave the way for commercial energy generation. Its linear reactor size will be twice that of JET; more importantly, ITER plans to achieve 30 s containment time. ITER will use superconducting magnets, so that it will have extremely cold matter at 4 K only a few metres from extremely hot matter at 100 MK. In other words, ITER will be a high point of engineering. The facility will be located in Cadarache in France and is planned to start operation in the year 2016.

Like many large projects, fusion started with a dream: scientists spread the idea that fusion energy is safe, clean and inexhaustible. These three statements are still found on every fusion website across the world. In particular, it is stated that fusion reactors are not dangerous, produce much lower radioactive contamination than fission reactors, and use water as basic fuel. 'Solar fusion energy would be as clean, safe and limitless as the Sun.' In reality, the only reason that we do not feel the radioactivity of the Sun is that we are far away from it. Fusion reactors, like the Sun, are highly radioactive. The management of

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 557 The comparison between measured nuclide abundances in the solar system and the calculated values predicted by the r-process.

radioactive fusion reactors is much more complex than the management of radioactive fission reactors.

Fusion fuels are almost inexhaustible: deuterium is extracted from water and the tritium – a short-lived radioactive element not found in nature in large quantities – is produced from lithium. The lithium must be enriched, but since material is not radioactive, this is not problematic. However, the production of tritium from lithium is a dirty process that produces large amounts of radioactivity. Fusion energy is thus inexhaustible, but not safe and clean.

In short, of all technical projects ever started by mankind, fusion is by far the most challenging and ambitious. Whether fusion will ever be successful – or whether it ever should be successful – is another issue.

Where do our atoms come from?

People consist of electrons and various nuclei. Electrons, hydrogen and helium nuclei are formed during the big bang. All other nuclei are formed in stars. Young stars run hydrogen burning or helium burning; heavier and older stars run neon-burning or even silicon-burning. These latter processes require high temperatures and pressures, which are found only in stars with a mass at least eight times that of the Sun. However, all fusion processes are limited by photodissociation and will not lead to nuclei heavier than ^{56}Fe.

Page 589
Ref. 1079

Heavier nuclei can only be made by neutron capture. There are two main processes; the s-process (for 'slow') runs inside stars, and gradually builds up heavy elements until the most heavy, lead, from neutron flying around. The rapid r-process occurs in stellar explosions. Many stars die this violent death. Such an explosion has two main effects: on one hand it distributes most of the matter of the star, such as carbon, nitrogen or oxygen, into space in the form of neutral atoms. On the other hand, new elements are synthesized during the explosion. The abundances of the elements in the solar system can be precisely measured. These several hundred data points correspond exactly with what is expected

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 558 The evolution of a solar flare, as observed by the TRACE satellite (mpg film courtesy NASA)

from the material ejected by a (type II) supernova explosion. In other words, the solar system formed from the remnants of a supernova, as did, somewhat later, life on Earth.* We all are recycled stardust.

Curiosities about the stars

It is still not clear whether the radiation of the Sun is constant over long time scales. There is an 11 year periodicity, the famous solar cycle, but the long term trend is still unknown. Precise measurements cover only the years from 1978 onwards, which makes only about 3 cycles. A possible variation of the solar constant might have important consequences for climate research; however, the issue is still open.

* *

The sun is not a static object. An impressive way to experience the violent processes it contains is to watch the film shown in Figure 558, showing the evolution of a solar flare.

* *

In the 1960s and 70s, it was discovered that the Sun pulsates with a frequency of 5 minutes. The amplitude is small, only 3 kilometres out of 1.4 million; nevertheless, it is measurable. In the meantime, helioseismologists have discovered numerous additional oscillations of the Sun, and in 1993, even on other stars. Such oscillations allow to study what is happening inside stars, even separately in each of the layers they consist of.

* *

Some stars shine like a police siren: their luminosity increases and decreases regularly.

* By chance, the composition ratios between carbon, nitrogen and oxygen inside the Sun are the same as inside the human body.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Such stars, called *Cepheids*, are important because their period depends on their average (absolute) brightness. Measuring their period and their brightness on Earth thus allows astronomers to determine their distance.

* *

The first human-made hydrogen bomb explosion took place the Bikini atoll. But nature is much better at this. The most powerful nuclear explosions take place on the surface of neutron stars in X-ray binaries. The matter falling into such a neutron star from the companion star, mostly hydrogen, will heat up until the temperature allows fusion. The resulting explosions can be observed in telescopes as light or X-ray flashes of about 10 s duration; the explosions are millions of times more powerful that those of human-made hydrogen bombs.

* *

Nucleosynthesis is mainly regulated by the strong interaction. However, if the electromagnetic interaction would be much stronger or much weaker, stars would either produce too little oxygen or too little carbon, and we would not exist This famous argument is due to Fred Hoyle. Can you fill in the details?

Challenge 1582 d

Summary on stars

Stars and the Sun burn because of nuclear fusion. When stars at the end of their lifetime explode, they distribute nuclei around them. In the distant past, such nuclei recollected because of gravity and formed the Sun, the Earth and humans.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 46

THE STRONG INTERACTION

Both radioactivity and medical images show that nuclei are composed. But quantum theory makes an additional prediction: protons and neutrons themselves must be composed. There are two reasons: first, nucleons have a finite size and second, their magnetic moments do not match the value predicted for point particles.

The prediction of components inside the protons was confirmed in the late 1960s when Kendall, Friedman and Taylor shot high energy electrons into hydrogen atoms. They found that a proton contains *three* constituents with spin 1/2, which they called called *partons*. The experiment was able to 'see' the constituents through large angle scattering of electrons, in the same way that we see objects through large angle scattering of photons. These constituents correspond in number and (most) properties to the so-called *quarks* predicted in 1964 by George Zweig and also by Murray Gell-Mann.*

Ref. 1080

Ref. 1083

The feeble side of the strong interaction

It turns out that the interaction keeping the protons together in a nucleus, which was first described by Yukawa Hideki,** is only a feeble shadow of the interaction that keeps quarks together in a proton. Both are called by the same name. The two cases correspond

* The physicist George Zweig (b. 1937 Moscow , d.) proposed the quark idea – he called them *aces* – in 1963, with more clarity than Gell-Mann. Zweig stressed the reality of aces, whereas Gell-Mann, in the beginning, did not believe in the existence of quarks. Zweig later moved on to a more difficult field: neurobiology.

Murray Gell-Mann (b. 1929 New York, d.) received the Nobel Prize for physics in 1969. He is the originator of the term 'quark'. (The term has two origins: officially, it is said to be taken from *Finnegans Wake*, a novel by James Joyce; in reality, he took it from a Yiddish and German term meaning 'lean soft cheese' and used figuratively in those languages to mean 'silly idea'.)

Ref. 1081

Gell-Mann was the central figure of particle physics in the 20th century; he introduced the concept of strangeness, the renormalization group, the flavour SU(3) symmetry and quantum chromodynamics. A disturbing story is that he took the idea, the data, the knowledge, the concepts and even the name of the V–A theory of the weak interaction from the bright physics student George Sudarshan and published it, together with Richard Feynman, as his own. The wrong attribution is still found in many textbooks.

Gell-Mann is also known for his constant battle with Feynman about who deserved to be called the most arrogant physicist of their university. A famous anecdote is the following. Newton's once used a common saying of his time in a letter to Hooke: 'If I have seen further than you and Descartes, it is by standing upon the shoulders of giants.' Gell-Mann is known for saying: 'If I have seen further than others, it is because I am surrounded by dwarfs.'

** Yukawa Hideki (1907–1981), important Japanese physicist specialized in nuclear and particle physics. He founded the journal Progress of Theoretical Physics and together with his class mate Tomonaga he was an example to many scientists in Japan. He received the 1949 Nobel Prize for physics for this theory of mesons.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 559 The least massive pseudoscalar and vector mesons that can be built as $q\bar{q}$ composites of the first four quark flavours

somewhat to the two cases of electromagnetism found in atomic matter. Neon atoms show the two cases most clearly: the strongest aspect of electromagnetism is responsible for the attraction of the electrons to the neon nuclei; its feeble 'shadow', the Van-der-Waals interaction, is responsible for the attraction of neon atoms in liquid neon and for processes like evaporation. Both attractions are electromagnetic, but the strengths differ markedly. Similarly, the strongest aspect of the strong interaction leads to the formation of the proton and the neutron through quark binding; the feeble aspect leads to the formation of nuclei and to alpha decay. Obviously, most information can be gathered by studying the strongest aspect.

Bound motion, the particle zoo and the quark model

Physicists are simple people. To understand the constituents of matter, and of nuclei in particular, they had no better idea than to take all particles they could get hold of and to smash them into each other. Many played this game for several decades. (Obviously, this is not a fair comment; in fact, quantum theory forbids any other method. Can you explain why?)

Ref. 1082

Challenge 1583 s

Imagine that you want to study how cars are built just by crashing them into each other. Before you get a list of all components, you must perform and study a non-negligible number of crashes. Most give the same result, and if you are looking for a particular part, you might have to wait for a long time. If the part is tightly attached to others, the crashes have to be especially energetic. Compared to car crashes, quantum

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 560 A selection of baryons and their classification as bound states of quarks (from Ref. 1087)

theory adds the possibility for debris to transform, to react, to bind and to get excited. Therefore the required diligence and patience is even greater than for car crashes. Despite these difficulties, researchers have collected an ever increasing number of debris, also called *hadrons*, for many decades. The list, part of which is given in Appendix E, is overwhelmingly long; the official full list, several hundred pages of fine print, is found at pdg.web.cern.ch and contains hundreds of hadrons.

Then came the quark model. Using the ingenuity of many experimentalists and theoreticians, the model explained the whole catalogue as a consequence of only 6 types of bound quarks. Typically, a large part of the catalogue could be ordered in tables such as the ones given in Figure 559 and Figure 560. These tables were the beginning of the end of high energy physics. They explained all quantum numbers of the debris, and allowed to understand their mass ratios as well as their decays.

Debris were divided into two types: *mesons* consist of a quark and an antiquark; *baryons* consist of three quarks. In particular, the proton and the neutron are seen as combinations of two quark types, called *up* (u) and *down* (d): the proton is a *uud* state, the neutron a *udd* state. The discovery of other hadrons lead to the addition of four additional types of quarks. Their names are somewhat confusing: they are called *strange* (s), *charm* (c), *bottom* (b) – also called 'beauty' in the old days – and *top* (t) – called 'truth' in the past. The quark types are called *flavours*; in total, there are thus 6 quark flavours in nature.

All quarks have spin one half; their electric charges are multiples of 1/3 of the electron charge. In addition, quarks carry a strong charge, called, again confusingly, *colour*. In

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 108 The quarks

Quark	Mass m (see text)	Spin J parity P	Possible colours; possible weak behaviour	Charge Q, isospin I, strangeness S, charm C, beauty B', topness T	Lepton number L, baryon number B
Down d	3.5 to 6 MeV/c^2	$\frac{1}{2}^+$	red, green, blue; singlet, doublet	$-\frac{1}{3}, -\frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, 0, 0$	$0, \frac{1}{3}$
Up u	1.5 to 3.3 MeV/c^2	$\frac{1}{2}^+$	red, green, blue; singlet, doublet	$+\frac{2}{3}, +\frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, 0, 0$	$0, \frac{1}{3}$
Strange s	70 to 130 MeV/c^2	$\frac{1}{2}^+$	red, green, blue; singlet, doublet	$-\frac{1}{3}, 0, -1, 0, 0, 0$	$0, \frac{1}{3}$
Charm c	1.27(11) GeV/c^2	$\frac{1}{2}^+$	red, green, blue; singlet, doublet	$+\frac{2}{3}, 0, 0, +1, 0, 0$	$0, \frac{1}{3}$
Bottom b	4.20(17) GeV/c^2	$\frac{1}{2}^+$	red, green, blue; singlet, doublet	$-\frac{1}{3}, 0, 0, 0, -1, 0$	$0, \frac{1}{3}$
Top t	171.2(2.1) GeV/c^2	$\frac{1}{2}^+$	red, green, blue; singlet, doublet	$+\frac{2}{3}, 0, 0, 0, 0, +1$	$0, \frac{1}{3}$

contrast to electromagnetism, which has only positive, negative, and neutral charges, the strong interaction has red, blue, green quarks on one side, and anti-red, anti-blue and anti-green on the other. The neutral state is called 'white'. All baryons and mesons are white, in the same way that all atoms are neutral.

The theory describing the bound states of quarks is called *quantum chromodynamics*, or QCD, and was formulated in its final form in 1973 by Fritzsch, Gell-Mann and Ref. 1084 Leutwyler. In the same way that in atoms, electrons and protons are held together by the exchange of virtual photons, in protons, quarks are held together by the exchange of virtual gluons. *Gluons* are the quanta of the strong interaction, and correspond to photons, the quanta of the electromagnetic interactions.

The Lagrangian of quantum chromodynamics

Ref. 1085 Quantum chromodynamics describes all motion due to the strong interaction with the three fundamental processes shown in Figure 561: two gluons can scatter, a gluon can emit or absorb another, and a quark can emit or absorb a gluon. In electrodynamics, only the last diagram is possible; in the strong interaction, the first two appear as well. Among others, the first two diagrams are responsible for the confinement of quarks, and thus for the lack of free quarks in nature.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 561 The essence of the QCD Lagrangian

QCD is a gauge theory: the fields of the strong interaction show gauge invariance under the Lie group SU(3). In the case of electrodynamics, the gauge group is U(1), and Abelian, or commutative. In contrast, SU(3) is non-Abelian; QCD is a non-abelian gauge theory, a so-called *Yang-Mills theory*.

Due to the SU(3) gauge symmetry, there are 8 gluons; they are called red-antigreen, blue-antired, etc. Since SU(3) is non-abelian, gluons interact among themselves, as shown in the first two processes in Figure 561. Out of the combinations red-antired, blue-antiblue, green-antigreen, only two gluons are linearly independent, thus giving a total of $3^2 - 1 = 8$ gluons.

The three fundamental processes of the strong interaction, together with its SU(3) gauge symmetry and the observed number of six quarks, completely determine the Lagrangian density of the strong interaction. Indeed, the Lagrangian density of the strong interaction can be seen as a complicated rewriting of Figure 561.

The Lagrangian density of quantum chromodynamics is

$$\mathcal{L}_{QCD} = -\tfrac{1}{4} F^{(a)}_{\mu\nu} F^{(a)\mu\nu} - c^2 \sum_q m_q \overline{\psi}^k_q \psi_{qk} + i\hbar c \sum_q \overline{\psi}^k_q \gamma^\mu (D_\mu)_{kl} \psi^l_q \qquad (740)$$

where the gluon field strength and the gauge covariant derivative are

$$F^{(a)}_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A^a_\nu - \partial_\nu A^a_\mu + g_s f_{abc} A^b_\mu A^c_\nu$$

$$(D_\mu)_{kl} = \delta_{kl} \partial_\mu - i \frac{g_s}{2} \sum_a \lambda^a_{k,l} A^a_\mu \,.$$

We remember from the section on the principle of least action that Lagrangians are always sums of scalar products; this is clearly seen in the expression. The index $a = 1 \ldots 8$ numbers the eight types of gluons and the index $k = 1, 2, 3$ numbers the three colours, all due to SU(3). The index $q = 1 \ldots 6$ numbers the six quark flavours. The fields $A^a_\mu(x)$ are the eight gluon fields, represented by the coiled lines in Figure 561. The fields $\psi^k_q(x)$ are

Page 218

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

those of the quarks of flavour q and colour k, represented by the straight line in the figure. The six times three quark fields, like those of any elementary fermion, are 4-component Dirac spinors with masses m_q.*

The Lagrangian (740) is that of a *local* field theory: observables are functions of position. In other words, QCD can be applied in the same way usual quantum theory, and be compared to experiment in the same way.

The first term of the Lagrangian (740) represents the kinetic energy of the radiation (gluons), the second or mass term the kinetic energy of the matter particles (the quarks) and the third term the interaction between the two.

The mass term in the Lagrangian is the only term that spoils or *breaks flavour symmetry*, i.e., the symmetry under exchange of quark types. (In particle physics, this symmetry is also called *chiral symmetry*, for historical reasons.) Obviously, the mass term also breaks space-time conformal symmetry.

The interaction term thus corresponds to the third diagram in Figure 561. The strength of the strong interaction is described by the *strong coupling constant* g_s. The constant is independent of flavour and colour, as observed in experiment. The Interaction term does not mix different quarks; as observed in experiments, flavour is conserved in the strong interaction, as is baryon number. The strong interaction also conserves spatial parity P and charge conjugation parity C. The strong interaction does not transform matter.

In QCD, the eight gluons are massless; also this property is taken from experiment. Therefore no gluon mass term appears in the Lagrangian. It is easy to see that massive gluons would spoil gauge invariance. In contrast to electromagnetism, where the gauge group U(1) is Abelian, the gauge group SU(3) of the strong interactions is non-Abelian. As a consequence, the colour field itself is charged, i.e., carries colour, and thus the index a appears on the fields A and F. As a result, gluons can interact with each other, in contrast to photons, which pass each other undisturbed. The first two diagrams of Figure 561 are thus reflected in the somewhat complicated definition of the field $F^{(a)}_{\mu\nu}$. In contrast to electrodynamics, the definition has an extra term that is *quadratic* in the fields A; it is described by by the so-called structure constants f_{abc} and the interaction strength g_s. These are the structure constants of the SU(3) Lie algebra. The structure constants of SU(3) describe the detailed interaction between the quarks and the gluons and the interaction between gluons themselves.

Challenge 1584 ny

The behaviour of the gauge transformations and of the gluon field is described by the eight matrices $\lambda^a_{k,l}$. They are a fundamental, 3-dimensional representation of the generators of the SU(3) algebra and can be associated to the eight gluon types. The matrices λ_a, $a = 1..8$, and the structure constants f_{abc} obey the relations

$$[\lambda_a, \lambda_b] = 2i f_{abc} \lambda_c$$
$$\{\lambda_a, \lambda_b\} = 4/3 \delta_{ab} I + 2 d_{abc} \lambda_c \tag{742}$$

* In their simplest form, the matrices γ_μ can be written as

$$\gamma_0 = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & -I \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_n = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma^i \\ -\sigma^i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for } n = 1, 2, 3 \tag{741}$$

Page 882 where the σ^i are the Pauli spin matrices.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

where I is the unit matrix. The structure constants f_{abc}, which are odd under permutation of any pair of indices, and d_{abc}, which are even, are

abc	f_{abc}	abc	d_{abc}	abc	d_{abc}
123	1	118	$1/\sqrt{3}$	355	$1/2$
147	$1/2$	146	$1/2$	366	$-1/2$
156	$-1/2$	157	$1/2$	377	$-1/2$
246	$1/2$	228	$1/\sqrt{3}$	448	$-1/(2\sqrt{3})$
257	$1/2$	247	$-1/2$	558	$-1/(2\sqrt{3})$
345	$1/2$	256	$1/2$	668	$-1/(2\sqrt{3})$
367	$-1/2$	338	$1/\sqrt{3}$	778	$-1/(2\sqrt{3})$
458	$\sqrt{3}/2$	344	$1/2$	888	$-1/\sqrt{3}$
678	$\sqrt{3}/2$				

(743)

All other elements vanish. A fundamental 3-dimensional representation of the generators λ_a is given, for example, by the set of the *Gell-Mann matrices*

$$\lambda_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \lambda_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \lambda_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\lambda_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \lambda_5 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \lambda_6 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\lambda_7 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \lambda_8 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{744}$$

There are eight matrices, one for each gluon type, with 3×3 elements, corresponding to the three colours of the strong interactions. There is no ninth gluon, because that gluon would be colourless, or 'white'.

Only quarks and gluons appear in the Lagrangian of QCD, because only quarks and gluons interact via the strong force. This can be also expressed by saying that only quarks and gluons carry colour; *colour* is the source of the strong force in the same way that electric charge is the source of the electromagnetic field. In the same way as electric charge, colour charge is *conserved* in all interactions. Electric charge comes in two types, positive and negative; in contrast, colour comes in three types, called *red*, *green* and *blue*. The neutral state, with no colour charge, is called *white*. Protons and neutrons, but also electrons or neutrinos, are thus 'white', thus *neutral* for the strong interaction.

Experimental consequences of the quark model

How can we pretend that quarks and gluons exist, even though they are never found alone? There are a number of arguments in favour.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

The quark model explains the non-vanishing magnetic moment of the neutron and explains the magnetic moments μ of the baryons. By describing the proton as a uud state and the neutron a udd state with no orbital angular momentum, we get

$$\mu_u = \tfrac{1}{5}(4\mu_p + \mu_n)\mu_0 \qquad \mu_d = \tfrac{1}{5}(4\mu_n + \mu_p)\mu_0 \qquad \text{where} \qquad \mu_0 = \hbar^2/Mc \tag{745}$$

This means that $m_u = m_d = 330\,\text{MeV}$, a bit more than a third of the nucleon, whose mass is *c.* 940 MeV. If we assume that the quark magnetic moment is proportional to their charge, the quark model predicts a ratio of the magnetic moments of the proton and the neutron of

$$\mu_p/\mu_n = -1.5. \tag{746}$$

This prediction differs from measurements only by 3 %. Furthermore, using the same values for the magnetic moment of the quarks, magnetic moment values of over half a dozen of other baryons can be predicted. The results typically deviate from measurements by around 10 %; the sign is always correctly calculated.

* *

The quark model describes all quantum numbers of mesons and baryons. P-parity, C-parity, and the absence of certain meson parities are all reproduced. The observed conservation of electric charge, baryon number, isospin, strangeness etc. is reproduced. Diagrams such as those shown in Figure 559 and in Figure 560 describe all existing states completely; the states not listed are not observed. The quark model thus produces a complete and correct classification of all hadrons as bound states of quarks.

* *

The quark model also explains the mass spectrum of mesons and baryons. The best predictions are made by QCD lattice calculations. With months of computer time, researchers were able to reproduce the masses of proton and neutron to within a few per cent. Interestingly, if one sets the u and d quark masses to zero, the resulting proton and neutron mass differ from experimental values only by 10 %. The mass of protons and neutrons is almost completely due to the binding.

Ref. 1092
Ref. 1093

* *

The number of colours of quarks must be taken into account to get correspondence of theory and calculation. For example, the measured decay time of the neutral pion is 83 as. The calculation without colour gives 750 as; if each quark is assumed to appear in 3 colours the value must be divided by 9, and then matches the measurement.

* *

In particle colliders, collisions of electrons and positrons sometimes lead to the production of hadrons. The calculated production rates also fit experiments only if quarks have three colours. In more detail, if one compares the ratio of muon–antimuon production and of hadron production, a simple estimate relates them to their charges:

Challenge 1585 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

$$R = \frac{\sum q_{\text{hadrons}}}{\sum q_{\text{muons}}} \tag{747}$$

Between 2 and 4 GeV, when only three quarks can appear, this argument thus predicts $R = 2$ if colours exist, or $R = 2/3$ if they don't. Experiments yield a value of $R = 2.2$, thus confirming the number of colours.

Many other such *branching ratios* can be calculated in this way. They agree with experiments only if the number of colours is three.

* *

Ref. 1094 In 1979, the first clear decays of gluons have been observed at the PETRA accelerator in Hamburg. The occurrence of certain events, called *gluon jets*, are due to the decay of high-energy gluons into narrow beams of particles. Gluon jets appear in coplanar three-jet events. The observed rate and the other properties of these events confirmed the predictions of QCD. Experiments at PETRA also determined the spin $S = 1$ of the gluon and the running of the strong coupling constant. The hero of those times was the project manager Gustav-Adolf Voss, who completed the accelerator on budget and six months ahead of schedule.

Confinement of quarks – and elefants

Many of the particlesquark confinement which are not part of the diagrams of Figure 559 and Figure 560 can be explained as *rotational excitations* of the fundamental mesons. The idea of rotational excitations leads to quantitative predictions, as shown by Tullio Regge in 1957. Regge assumed that mesons and baryons are quarks connected by strings, like rubber bands, and that the force or tension k between the quarks is thus constant over distance.

We assume that the strings, whose length we call $2r_0$, rotate around their centre of mass as rapidly as possible, as shown in Figure 563. Then we have

$$v(r) = c\frac{r}{r_0} \,. \tag{748}$$

The quark masses are assumed negligible. For the total energy this implies the relation

$$E = mc^2 = 2\int_0^{r_0} \frac{k}{\sqrt{1 - v(r)/c^2}} \mathrm{d}r = kr_0\pi \tag{749}$$

and for angular momentum the relation

$$J = \frac{2}{\hbar c^2}\int_0^{r_0} \frac{krv(r)}{\sqrt{1 - v(r)/c^2}} \mathrm{d}r = \frac{kr_0^2}{2\hbar c} \,. \tag{750}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 562 A Regge trajectory, or Chew-Frautschi plot, due to the confinement of quarks, the quark confinement potential, and two approximate ways to describe the confinement: the string model and the bag model of hadrons

Including the spin of the quarks, we thus get

$$J = \alpha_0 + \alpha' m^2 \quad \text{where} \quad \alpha' = \frac{c^3}{2\pi k\hbar} \,. \tag{751}$$

Regge thus deduced a simple expression that relates the mass m of excited hadrons to their total spin J. For bizarre historical reasons, this relation is called a *Regge trajectory*.

The value of the constant α' is predicted to be of the quark–antiquark pairing. A few years later, as shown in Figure 562, such linear relations were found in experiments: the *Chew-Frautschi plots*. For example, the three lowest lying states of Δ are the spin 3/2 $\Delta(1232)$ with m^2 of 1.5 GeV^2, the spin 7/2 $\Delta(1950)$ with m^2 of 3.8 GeV^2, and the spin 11/2 $\Delta(2420)$ with m^2 of 5.9 GeV^2. The value of the constant α' is found experimentally to be around 0.93 GeV^{-2} for almost all mesons and baryons, whereas the value for α_0 varies from particle to particle. The string tension is thus found to be k =0.87 GeV/fm=0.14 MN. In other words, two quarks in a hadron attract each other with a force equal to the weight of two elephants: 15 tons.

Ref. 1085

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 563 Calculating masses of excited hadrons

Experiments are thus clear: the observed Chew-Frautschi plots, as well as several other observations not discussed here, are best described by a quark–quark potential that grows linearly with distance above 1 fm. As a result, quarks never appear as free particles: quarks are always *confined* in hadrons. This is in contrast with QED, where the force between charges goes to zero for large distances; electric charges are thus not confined, but can exist as free particles. At low distances, the potential decreases with the inverse of the distance. In total, experiments lead to a potential given by

Ref. 1082

$$V = -\frac{4}{3}\frac{\alpha_{sc}\hbar c}{r} + kr \tag{752}$$

where k is the mentioned 0.87 GeV/fm, α_{sc} is 0.2, and $\hbar c$ is 0.1975 GeV/fm. It is shown in Figure 562

Even though experiments are clear, theoreticians face a problem. So far, neither the quark-quark potential nor the quark bound states can be deduced from the QCD Lagrangian with a *simple* approximation method. Nevertheless, complicated non-perturbative calculations show that the QCD Lagrangian does predict a force between two coloured particles that levels off at a constant value (corresponding to a linearly increasing potential). These calculations show that the old empirical approximations of hadrons as quarks connected by strings or a quarks in bags, shown in Figure 562, can indeed be deduced from the QCD Lagrangian. However, the calculations are too complex to be summarized in a few lines. Independently, the constant force value has also been reproduced in computer calculations, in which one simplifies space-time to a lattice and then approximates QCD by so-called *lattice QCD* or *lattice gauge theory*. Lattice calculations have also reproduced the masses of most mesons and baryons with reasonable accuracy. Using the most powerful computers available, these calculations have given predictions of the mass of the proton and other baryons within a few per cent. Discussing these complex and fascinating calculations lies outside the scope of this

Ref. 1088

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 564 The measured and the calculated variation of the strong coupling with energy, showing the precision of the QCD Lagrangian and the asymptotic freedom of the strong interaction (© Siegfried Bethke, updated from Ref. 1089)

text, however.

In fact, the challenge of explaining confinement in simple terms is so difficult that the brightest minds have been unable to solve it yet. This is not a surprise, as its solution probably requires the unification of the interactions and, most probably, also the unification with gravity. We therefore leave this issue for later in our adventure.

Asymptotic freedom

QCD has another property that sets it apart form QED: the behaviour of its coupling with energy. In fact, there are three equivalent ways to describe the strong coupling. The quantity appearing in the QCD Lagrangian, g_s, is often used to define the equivalent quantity $\alpha_s = g_s^2/4\pi$. Both α_s and g_s depend on the energy Q of the experiment. If they are known for one energy, they are known for all of them. Presently, the best experimental value is $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.1185 \pm 0.0010$.

Ref. 1085, Ref. 1087

The energy dependence of the strong coupling can be calculated with the standard renormalization procedures and is expected to be

$$\alpha_s(Q^2) = \frac{12\pi}{33-2n_f}\frac{1}{L}\left(1 - \frac{(918-114n_f)\ln L}{(33-2n_f)^2 L} + \dots\right) \quad \text{where} \quad L = \ln\frac{Q^2}{\Lambda^2(n_f)} \qquad (753)$$

where n_f is the number of quarks with mass below the energy scale Q, thus a number between 3 and 6. (The expression has been expanded to many additional terms with help of computer algebra.) The third way to describe the strong coupling is thus the en-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.net Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

ergy parameter $\Lambda(n_f)$. Experiments yield $\Lambda(3)$ =230(60) GeV, $\Lambda(4)$ =180(50) GeV and $\Lambda(5)$ =120(30) GeV.

The accelerator experiments that measure the coupling are extremely involved, and hundreds of people across the world have worked for many years to gather the relevant data. The comparison of QCD and experiment, shown in Figure 564, does not show any contradiction between the two.

Figure 564 and expression (753) also illustrate what is called *asymptotic freedom*: α_s decreases at high energies. In other words, at high energies quarks are *freed* from the strong interaction; they behave as free particles.* As a result of asymptotic freedom, in QCD, a perturbation expansion can be used only at energies much larger than Λ. Historically, the discovery of asymptotic freedom was essential to establish QCD as a theory of the strong interaction.

Asymptotic freedom can be understood qualitatively if the situation is compared to QED. The electron coupling increases at small distances, because the screening due to the virtual electron-positron pairs has less and less effect. In QCD, the effective colour coupling also changes at small distances, due to the smaller number of virtual quark-antiquark pairs. However, the gluon properties lead to the opposite effect, an *antiscreening*: the effective coupling decreases at small distances.

The sizes and masses of quarks

The size of quarks, like that of all elementary particles, is predicted to vanish by qcd, as in all quantum field theory. So far, no experiment has found any effect due to a finite quark size. Measurements show that quarks are surely smaller than 10^{-19} m. No size conjecture has been given by any hypothetical theory. Quarks are assumed point-like, or at most Planck-sized, in all descriptions so far.

Ref. 1095

We noted in several places that a neutral compound of charged particles is always less massive than its components. But when the mass values for quarks are looked up in most tables, the masses of u and d quarks are only of the order of a few MeV/c^2, whereas the proton's mass is 938 MeV/c^2. What is the story here?

It turns out that the definition of the mass is more involved for quarks than than for other particles. Quarks are never found as free particles, but only in bound states. As a result, the concept of quark mass depends on the theoretical framework one is using.

Due to *asymptotic freedom*, quarks behave almost like free particles only at high energies. The mass of such a 'free' quark is called the *current quark mass*; for the light quarks it is only a few MeV/c^2, as shown in Table 108.

At low energy, for example inside a proton, quarks are *not* free, but must carry along a large amount of energy due to the confinement process. As a result, bound quarks have a much larger effective, so-called *constituent quark mass*, which takes into account this confinement energy. To give an idea of the values, take a proton; the indeterminacy relation for a particle inside a sphere of radius 0.9 fm gives a momentum indeterminacy of around 190 MeV/c. In three dimensions this gives an energy of $\sqrt{3}$ times that value, or an effective, constituent quark mass of about 330 MeV/c^2. Three confined quarks are thus

* Asymptotic freedom was discovered in 1972 by Gerard 't Hooft; since he had received the Nobel Prize already, the 2004 Prize was then given to the next people who highlighted it: David Gross, David Politzer and Frank Wilczek, who studied it extensively in 1973.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

heavier than a proton, whose mass is 938 MeV/c^2; we can thus still say that a compound proton is less massive than its constituents.

In short, the mass of the proton and the neutron is (almost exclusively) the kinetic energy of the quarks inside them, as their rest mass is almost negligible. As Frank Wilczek says, some people put on weight even though they never eat anything heavy.

Ref. 1086

But also the small current quark mass values for the up, down, strange and charmed quarks that appear in the QCD Lagrangian are framework dependent. The values of Table 108 are those for a renormalization scale of 2 GeV. For half that energy, the mass values increase by 35%. The heavy quark masses are those used in the so-called $\bar{M}S$ scheme, a particular way to perform perturbation theory.

Ref. 1087

The mass, shape and colour of protons

Frank Wilczek mentions that one of the main results of QCD, the theory of strong interactions, is to explain mass relations such as

Ref. 1086

$$m_{\text{proton}} \sim e^{-k/\alpha} m_{\text{Planck}} \quad \text{and} \quad k = 11/2\pi \,,\ \alpha_{\text{unif}} = 1/25 \,. \tag{754}$$

Here, the value of the coupling constant α_{unif} is taken at the unifying energy, a factor of 1000 below the Planck energy. (See the section of unification below.) In other words, a general understanding of masses of bound states of the strong interaction, such as the proton, requires almost purely a knowledge of the unification energy and the coupling constant at that energy. The approximate value $\alpha_{\text{unif}} = 1/25$ is an extrapolation from the low energy value, using experimental data. The proportionality factor k in expression (754) is not easy to calculate. It is usually determined on computers using lattice QCD.

Page 1295

But the mass is not the only property of the proton. Being a cloud of quarks and gluons, it also has a shape. Surprisingly, it took a long time before people started to become interested in this aspect. The proton, being made of two up quarks and one down quark, resembles a ionized H_2^+ molecule, where one electron forms a cloud around two protons. Obviously, the H_2^+ molecule is elongated, or prolate.

Is the proton prolate? There is no spectroscopically measurable non-sphericty – or quadrupole moment – of the proton. However, the proton has an *intrinsic* quadrupole moment. The quadrupole moments of the proton and of the neutron are predicted to be positive in all known calculation methods, implying an *prolate* shape. Recent measurements at Jefferson Laboratories confirm this prediction. A prolate shape is predicted for all $J = 1/2$ baryons, in contrast to the oblate shape predicted for the $J = 3/2$ baryons. The spin 0 pseudoscalar mesons are predicted to be prolate, whereas the spin 1 vector mesons are expected to be oblate.

Ref. 1090

The shape of any molecule will depend on whether other molecules surround it. Recent research showed that similarly, both the size and the shape of the proton in nuclei is slightly variable; both seem to depend on the nucleus in which the proton is built-in.

Ref. 1091

Apart from shapes, molecules also have a colour. The colour of a molecule, like that of any object, is due to the energy absorbed when it is irradiated. For example, the H_2^+ molecule can absorb certain light frequencies by changing to an excited state. Molecules change mass when they absorb light; the excited state is heavier than the ground state. In the same way, protons and neutrons can be excited. In fact, their excited states have been

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 565 The mass spectrum of the excited states of the proton: experimental and calculated values (from Ref. 1087)

Ref. 1087

studied in detail; a summary, also showing the limitation of the approach, is shown in Figure 565. Many excitations can be explained as excited quarks states, but many more are predicted. The calculated masses agree with observations to about 10%. The quark model and QCD thus structure and explain a large part of the baryon spectrum; but the agreement is not yet perfect.

Obviously, in our everyday environment the energies necessary to excite nucleons do not appear – in fact, they do not even appear inside the Sun – and these excited states can be neglected. They only appear in particle accelerators and in cosmic radiation. In a sense, we can say that in our corner of the universe, the colour of protons usually is not visible.

Curiosities about the strong interactions

The computer calculations necessary to extract particle data from the Lagrangian of quantum chromodynamics are among the most complex calculations ever performed. They beat weather forecasts, fluid simulations and the like by orders of magnitude. Nobody knows whether this will be necessary also in the future: the race for a simple approximation method for finding solutions is still open.

* *

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Even though gluons are massless, like photons and gravitons, there is no colour radiation. Gluons carry colour and couple to themselves; as a result, free gluons were predicted to directly decay into quark–antiquark pairs. This decay has indeed been observed in experiments at particle accelerators.

* *

Something similar to colour radiation, but still stranger might have been found in 1997. It might be that a scalar meson with a mass of 1.5 GeV/c^2 is a *glueball*. This is a hypothetical meson composed of gluons only. Numerical results from lattice gauge theory seem to
Ref. 1096 confirm the possibility of a glueball in that mass range.

* *

There is a growing consensus that most light scalar mesons below 1 GeV/c^2, are
Ref. 1097 tetraquarks. In 2003, experiments provided also candidates for heavier tetraquarks, namely the X(3872), Ds(2317) and Ds(2460). The coming years will show whether this interpretation is correct.

* *

Do particles made of five quarks, so-called *pentaquarks*, exist? So far, they seem to exist only in a few laboratories in Japan, whereas in other laboratories across the world they are not seen. The issue is still open, though most researchers do not believe in them any
Ref. 1098 more.

* *

Whenever we look at a periodic table of the elements, we look at a manifestation of the strong interaction. The Lagrangian of the strong interaction describes the origin and properties of the presently known 115 elements.

Nevertheless one central aspect of nuclei is determined by the electromagnetic interaction. Why are there around 115 different elements? Because the electromagnetic coupling constant α is around 1/137.036. In more detail, the answer is the following. If the charge of a nucleus were much higher than around 130, the electric field around nuclei would lead to spontaneous electron–positron pair generation; the generated electron would fall into the nucleus and transform one proton into a neutron, thus inhibiting a larger proton number. The finite number of the elements is thus due to the electromagnetic interaction.

* *

The instability of the vacuum also yields a (trivial) limit on the fine structure constant. The fine structure constant value of around 1/137.036 cannot be explained by quantum
Ref. 1099 electrodynamics. However, it can be deduced that it must be lower than 1 to lead to a consistent theory. Indeed, if its value were larger than 1, the vacuum would become unstable and would spontaneously generate electron-positron pairs.

* *

To know more about radioactivity, its effects, its dangers and what a government can do about it, see the English and German language site of the Federal Office for Radiation Protection at www.bfs.de.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 109 Correspondence between QCD and superconductivity

QCD	SUPERCONDUCTIVITY
Quark	magnetic monopole
Colour force non-linearities	Electron-lattic interaction
Chromoelectric flux tube	magnetic flux tube
Gluon-gluon attraction	electron-electron attraction
Glueballs	Cooper pairs
Instability of bare vacuum	instability of bare Fermi surface
Discrete centre symmetry	continuous U(1) symmetry
High temperature breaks symmetry	low temperature breaks symmetry

* *

From the years 1990 onwards, it has regularly been claimed that extremely poor countries are building nuclear weapons. Why is this highly unlikely? Challenge 1586 s

* *

Historically, nuclear reactions provided the first test of the relation $E = \gamma mc^2$. This was achieved in 1932 by Cockcroft and Walton. They showed that by shooting protons into lithium one gets the reaction

$$^{7}_{3}\mathrm{Li} + ^{1}_{1}\mathrm{H} \to ^{8}_{4}\mathrm{Be} \to ^{4}_{2}\mathrm{He} + ^{4}_{2}\mathrm{He} + 17\,\mathrm{MeV}\ . \tag{755}$$

The measured energy on the right is exactly the value that is derived from the differences in total mass of the nuclei on both sides.

* *

A large minority of researchers say that QCD is defined by two parameters. Apart from the coupling constant, they count also the strong CP parameter. Indeed, it might be that the strong interaction violates CP invariance. This violation would be described by a second term in the Lagrangian; its strength would be described by a second parameter, a phase usually called θ_{CP}. However, many high-precision experiments have been performed to search for this effect, and no CP violation in the strong interaction has ever been detected.

* *

In a well-known analogy, QCD can be compared to superconductivity. Table 109 gives an overview of the correspondence.

A SUMMARY OF QCD

Quantum chromodynamics, the non-abelian gauge theory based on the SU(3) symmetric Lagrangian, describes the properties of gluons and quarks, the properties of the proton, the neutron and all other hadrons, the properties of atomic nuclei, the working of the stars and the origin of the atoms inside us and around us. Without the strong inter-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

action, we would not have flesh and blood. And all these aspects of nature follow from a single number, the strong coupling constant.

QCD and experiment agree wherever comparisons have been made. The limitations of QCD are only conceptual. Like in all of quantum field theory, also in the case of QCD the mathematical form of the Lagrangian is almost uniquely defined by requiring renormalizability, Lorentz invariance, and gauge invariance – SU(3) in this case. We say 'almost', because the Lagrangian contains a few parameters that remain unexplained:

— The number, 6, and the masses m_q of the quarks are not explained by QCD.
— The coupling constant of the strong interaction g_s, or equivalently, α_s or Λ, is unexplained. QCD predicts its energy dependence, but not its absolute value.
— Experimentally, the strong interaction is found to be CP conserving. This is not obvious; the QCD Lagrangian assumes that any possible CP-violating term vanishes, even though there exist CP-violating Lagrangian terms that are Lorentz-invariant, gauge-invariant and renormalizable.
— The properties of space-time, in particular its Lorentz invariance, its continuity and the number of its dimensions are obviously all unexplained in QCD and assumed from the outset.
— It is also not known how QCD has to be modified in strong gravity, thus in strongly curved space-time.

Before we explore ways to overcome these limits, we have a look at the other nuclear interaction.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 47

THE WEAK NUCLEAR INTERACTION AND THE HANDEDNESS OF NATURE

No interaction is as weird as the weak interaction. It transforms elementary particles into each other, it is extremely weak, its radiation particles have mass, and it violates parity. These properties make it fascinating in many ways.

Transformation of elementary particles

Radioactivity, in particular the so-called β decay, is a bizarre phenomenon. Experiments in the 1910s showed that when beta sources emit electrons, atoms change from one chemical element to another. For example, one observed that tritium decays into Helium as

$$ {}^{3}_{1}\mathrm{H} \to {}^{3}_{2}\mathrm{He} + e^- + \overline{\nu}_e \,. \tag{756}$$

In the 1930s it became clear that this process is due to a neutron in the nucleus changing into a proton (and more):

$$ n \to p + e^- + \overline{\nu}_e \,. \tag{757}$$

In the 1960s, the quark model showed that beta decay is due to an up quark changing to a down quark:

$$ d \to u + e^- + \overline{\nu}_e \,. \tag{758}$$

Elementary particles are thus not immutable. The dream of Democritus and Leucippus about immutable basic building blocks is definitely *not* realized in nature.

Experiments show that quark transformation is not possible to achieve with electromagnetic fields, nor with gluon fields, nor with gravitation. There must be another type of radiation in nature, and thus another interaction. Fortunately, such transformations are rare, otherwise we would not be running around: the interaction is *weak*.

The weak nuclear interaction transforms quarks into each other. But where does the energy go in beta decay? Measurements in 1911 showed that the energy spectrum of the emitted electron is continuous. Then, in 1930, Wolfgang Pauli had the courage and genius to explain this observation in with a daring hypothesis: the energy of the decay is split between the electron and a new, truly astonishing particle, the *neutrino* – more precisely, the electron anti-neutrino $\bar{\nu}_w$. Experiments showed that the neutrino must be uncharged, must not interact strongly, and must be of very low mass. As a result, neutrinos interact with ordinary matter only extremely rarely, and usually fly through the Earth without being affected. This property makes detection very difficult, but not impossible; the particle

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 566 Beta decay in tritium: a modern, tritium-powered illuminated watch, the continuous energy spectrum of the emitted electrons from tritium, and the process occurring in the tritium nucleus (© www.traser.com, Katrin)

TABLE 110 The leptons: the three neutrinos and the three charged leptons (antiparticles have opposite charge Q and parity P)

NEUTRINO	MASS m (SEE TEXT)	SPIN J PARITY P	COLOUR; POSSIBLE WEAK BEHAVIOUR	CHARGE Q, ISOSPIN I, STRANGENESS S, CHARM C, BEAUTY B', TOPNESS T	LEPTON NUMBER L, BARYON NUMBER B
Electron neutrino ν_e	$< 2\,\mathrm{eV}/c^2$	$\frac{1}{2}^+$	white; singlet, doublet	0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0	1, 0
Muon neutrino ν_e	$< 2\,\mathrm{eV}/c^2$	$\frac{1}{2}^+$	white; singlet, doublet	0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0	1, 0
Tau neutrino ν_e	$< 2\,\mathrm{eV}/c^2$	$\frac{1}{2}^+$	white; singlet, doublet	0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0	1, 0
Electron e	0.510 998 910(13) MeV/c^2	$\frac{1}{2}^+$	white; singlet, doublet	−1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0	1, 0
Muon μ	105.658 367(4) MeV/c^2	$\frac{1}{2}^+$	white; singlet, doublet	−1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0	1, 0
Tau τ	1.776 84(17) GeV/c^2	$\frac{1}{2}^+$	white; singlet, doublet	−1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0	1, 0

was detected in 1952.

THE WEAKNESS OF THE WEAK NUCLEAR INTERACTION

'Weak radiation' consists of massive particles; there are two types, the neutral Z boson with a mass of 91.2 GeV – that is the mass of a silver atom – and the electrically charged W boson with a mass of 80.4 GeV. The masses are so large that free radiation exists only

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 111 The intermediate vector bosons of the weak interaction (the Z boson is its own antiparticle; the W boson has an antiparticle of opposite charge)

Boson	Mass m	Spin J	Colour; weak behaviour	Charge Q, isospin I, strangeness S, charm C, beauty B', topness T	Lepton number L, baryon number B
Z boson	91.1876(21) GeV/c^2	1	white; 'triplet'	0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0	0, 0
W boson	80.398(25) GeV/c^2	1	white; 'triplet'	1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0	0, 0

for an extremely short time, about 0.1 ys; then the particles decay. The large mass is the reason that the weak interaction is extremely short range and weak; any exchange of virtual particles scales with the negative exponential of the intermediate particle's mass. In fact, the weak interaction is so weak that neutrinos, particles which interact only weakly, have an overwhelming probability to fly through the Sun without any interaction.

The existence of a massive charged intermediate vector boson, today called the W, was already deduced in the 1940s; but theoretical physicists did not accept the idea until the Dutch physicist Gerard 't Hooft proved that it was possible to have such a mass without having problems in the rest of the theory. For this proof he later received the Nobel Prize in Physics.

Experimentally, the Z boson was first observed as a virtual particle in 1973 at CERN in Geneva. In 1983, CERN groups produced and detected the first real W and Z bosons. This experiment was a five-year effort by thousands of people working together. The energetic manager of the project, Carlo Rubbia, famous for changing one secretary every three weeks, and the chief technologist, Simon van der Meer, received the 1984 Nobel Prize in Physics for the discovery.

In the same way that photons are emitted by accelerated charges, W and Z bosons are emitted by accelerated weak charges. The W and the Z are observed to be elementary.
Ref. 1087 For example, the W gyromagnetic ratio is as predicted for elementary particles.

Distinguishing left from right

The next weird characteristic of the weak interaction is the nonconservation of parity P under spatial inversion. The weak interaction distinguishes between mirror systems, in contrast to everyday life, gravitation, electromagnetism, and the strong interactions. Parity non-conservation had been predicted by 1956 by Lee Tsung-Dao and Yang Chen Ning in order to explain the ability of K^0 mesons to decay either into 2 pions, which have
Ref. 1100 even parity, or into 3 pions, which have odd parity.

Lee and Yang suggested an experiment to Wu Chien-Shiung* The experiment she performed with her team is shown schematically in Figure 567. A few months after the

* Wu Chien-Shiung (1912–1997) was called 'madame Wu' by everybody. She was a bright and driven physi-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 567 The measured behaviour of β-decay, and its imagined, but unobserved behaviour under spatial inversion P (corresponding to a mirror reflection plus subsequent rotation by π around an axis perpendicular to the mirror plane)

FIGURE 568 Wu Chien-Shiung (1912–1997)

first meetings with Lee and Yang, the Wu and her team found that in the β-decay of cobalt nuclei aligned along a magnetic field, the emitted electrons are emitted mostly *against* the spin of the nuclei. In the parity-inversed experiment, the electrons would be emitted *along* the spin direction; however, this case is not observed. Parity is violated. This earned Lee and Yang a Nobel Prize in 1957.

Parity is violated in the weak interaction. This is not only the case for β-decay. The result has been confirmed for muon decay and every other weak process studied so far.

cist born in China. She worked also on nuclear weapons; later in life she was president of the American Physical Society.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

? The weak interaction is not parity invariant. In particular, when two electrons collide, those collisions that occur through the weak interaction behave differently in a mirror experiment. The number of experiments showing this increases from year to year. In 2004, two polarized beams of electrons – one left-handed and one right-handed – were shot at a matter target and the reflected electrons were counted. The difference was 175 parts per billion – small, but measurable. The experiment also confirmed the predicted weak charge of −0.046 of the electron.

A beautiful consequence of parity violation is its influence on the *colour* of certain Ref. 1101 atoms. This prediction was made in 1974 by Bouchiat and Bouchiat. The weak interaction is triggered by the weak charge of electrons and nuclei; therefore, electrons in atoms do not exchange only virtual photons with the nucleus, but also virtual Z particles. The chance for this latter process is extremely small, around 10^{-11} times smaller than for exchange of virtual photons. But since the weak interaction is not parity conserving, this process allows electron transitions which are impossible by purely electromagnetic effects. In 1984, measurements confirmed that certain optical transitions of caesium atoms that are impossible via the electromagnetic interaction, are allowed when the weak inter- Ref. 1102 action is taken into account. Several groups have improved these results and have been able to confirm the calculations based on the weak interaction properties, including the Ref. 1103 weak charge of the nucleus, to within a few per cent.

The weak interaction thus allows one to distinguish left from right. Nature contains processes who differ from their mirror version. This is in full contrast to everyday life. In short, particle physics has shown that nature is weakly left-handed.

The handedness of nature is to be taken literally: further experiments confirmed to Challenge 1587 e central statements on the weak interaction that can be already guessed from Figure 567. First, the weak interaction only couples to left-handed particles and to right-handed antiparticles. Parity is *maximally violated* in the weak interaction. Secondly, all neutrinos observed so far are left-handed, and that all antineutrinos are right-handed. (This can only be true if their mass vanishes or is negligibly small.) These statements define several aspects of the Lagrangian of the weak interaction and of the standard model of particle physics.

Distinguishing particles and antiparticles, CP violation

In the weak interaction, the observation that only right-handed particles and left-handed antiparticles are affected has an important consequence: it implies a violation of charge Challenge 1588 e conjugation parity C. Observations of muons into electrons shows this most clearly: antimuon decay differs from muon decay. The weak interaction distinguishes particles from antiparticles. In fact, C parity, like P parity, is *maximally violated* in the weak interaction. Also this effect has been confirmed in all subsequent observations ever performed on the weak interaction.

But that is not all. The weak interaction also violates the combination of parity inversion with particle-antiparticle symmetry, the so-called CP invariance. In contrast to P violation and C violation, which are maximal, CP violation is a tiny effect. Its observation was made first in 1964 by Val Fitch and James Cronin in the decay of the neutral K mesons. This experiment earned them the Nobel Prize in 1980. CP violation has also been observed in neutral B mesons, in several different processes and reactions. The search for

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 569 The essence of the electroweak interaction Lagrangian

other manifestations of CP violation, such as in non-vanishing electric dipole moments of elementary particles, is an intense research field. The search is not simple because CP violation is a small effect in an already very weak interaction; this tends to makes experiments large and expensive.

Since the weak interaction violates CP invariance, it also violates motion (or time) reversal T. But like all gauge theories, the weak interaction is invariant under the combined CPT transformation. If CPT would be violated, the masses. lifetimes and magnetic moments of particles and antiparticles would differ. That is not observed.

Weak charge, mixings and symmetry breaking

All weak interaction processes can be described by the Feynman diagrams in Figure 569. But a few remarks are necessary. First of all, the W and Z act only on left-handed fermion and on right-handed anti-fermions. Secondly, the weak interaction conserves a *weak charge*, or *weak isospin* T_3. The three quarks u, c and t, as well as the neutrinos, have weak isospin $T_3 = 1/2$; the other three quarks and the charged leptons have weak isospin $T_3 = -1/2$. In an idealized, SU(2) world, the three vector bosons W^+, W^0, W^- would have weak isospin values 1, 0 and −1 and be massless. However, three aspects complicate the issue.

First of all, it turns out that the quarks appearing in Figure 569 are not those of the strong interaction: there is a slight difference, due to quark mixing. Secondly, also neutrinos mix. And thirdly, the vector bosons are massive and break the SU(2) symmetry of the imagined idealized world; the Lie group SU(2) is not an exact symmetry of the weak interaction, and the famous Higgs boson has mass.

1. Surprisingly, the weak interaction eigenstates of the quarks are not the same as the mass eigenstates. This is described by the so-called Cabibbo–Kobayashi–Maskawa or CKM mixing matrix. It is defined by

$$\begin{pmatrix} d' \\ s' \\ b' \end{pmatrix} = (V_{ij}) \begin{pmatrix} d \\ s \\ b \end{pmatrix} . \tag{759}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

where, by convention, the states of the +2/3 quarks (u, c, t) are unmixed. In its standard parametrization, the CKM matrix reads

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} c_{12}c_{13} & s_{12}c_{13} & s_{13}e^{-i\delta_{13}} \\ -s_{12}c_{23} - c_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta_{13}} & c_{12}c_{23} - s_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta_{13}} & s_{23}c_{13} \\ s_{12}s_{23} - c_{12}c_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta_{13}} & -c_{12}s_{23} - s_{12}c_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta_{13}} & c_{23}c_{13} \end{pmatrix} \quad (760)$$

where $c_{ij} = \cos\theta_{ij}$, $s_{ij} = \sin\theta_{ij}$ and i and j label the generation ($1 \leqslant i, j \leqslant 3$). In the limit $\theta_{23} = \theta_{13} = 0$, i.e., when only two generations mix, the only remaining parameter is the angle θ_{12}, called the *Cabibbo angle*, which was introduced when only the first two generations of fermions were known. The phase δ_{13}, lying between 0 and 2π, is different from zero in nature, and expresses the fact that CP invariance is violated in the case of the weak interactions. It appears in the third column and shows that CP violation is related to the existence of (at least) three generations.

The CKM mixing matrix is predicted to be unitary in the standard model. This is confirmed by all experiments so far. The 90 % confidence upper and lower limits for the *magnitude* of the complex CKM matrix are given by

Ref. 1087

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} 0.97419(22) & 0.2257(10) & 0.00359(16) \\ 0.2256(10) & 0.97334(23) & 0.0415(11) \\ 0.00874(37) & 0.0407(10) & 0.999133(44) \end{pmatrix} \quad (761)$$

The CP violating phase δ_{13} is usually expressed with the *Jarlskog invariant*, defined as $J = \sin\theta_{12}\sin\theta_{13}\sin\theta_{23}^2\cos\theta_{12}\cos\theta_{13}\cos\theta_{23}\sin\delta_{13}$. This expression is independent of the definition of the phase angles; it was discovered by Cecilia Jarlskog, an important Swedish particle physicist. Its measured value is $J = 3.05(20)\cdot 10^{-5}$.

Ref. 1104

2. Also neutrinos mix, in the same way as the d, s and b quarks. The determination of the matrix elements is not as complete as for the quark case. This is an intense research field. Like for quarks, also for neutrinos the mass eigenstates and the flavour eigenstates differ. There is a dedicated neutrino mixing matrix, with 6 angles, and many experiments are trying to measure the parameters. Only a few are known so far, but no surprises are expected.

3. Finally, the electroweak interaction does not show a SU(2) symmetry. Electromagnetic and the weak processes lead to a single interaction, the so-called *electroweak interaction*. The electroweak interaction is described by a *coupling constant* g and by the *weak mixing angle* θ_W. The mixing angle describes the strength of the breaking of the SU(2) symmetry.

Ref. 1087

The usual electromagnetic coupling constant e is related to the electroweak coupling by

$$e = g\sin\theta_w\,, \quad (762)$$

which at low four-momentum transfers is the fine structure constant with the value 1/137.036. The electroweak coupling constant g also defines the historically defined *Fermi*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

constant G_F by

$$G_F = \frac{g^2\sqrt{2}}{8M_W^2} \,. \tag{763}$$

The broken SU(2) symmetry implies that in the *real* world, in contrast to the *ideal* SU(2) world, the intermediate vector bosons are
— the massless, neutral photon, given as $A = B\cos\theta_W + W^3\sin\theta_W$;
— the massive neutral Z boson, given as $Z = -B\sin\theta_W + W^3\cos\theta_W$;
— the massive charged W bosons, given as $W^\pm = (W^1 \mp iW^2)/\sqrt{2}$.
This implies that the electroweak interaction relates the electromagnetic coupling, the weak coupling and the intermediate boson masses by the impressive relation

$$\left(\frac{m_W}{m_Z}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{e}{g}\right)^2 = 1 \tag{764}$$

The relation is well verified by experiments.

The electroweak interaction also predicts a scalar, elementary Higgs boson. This particle is currently being searched in a large experiment at CERN.

The Lagrangian of the electroweak interaction

If we combine the observed properties of the weak interaction mentioned above, namely its observed Feynman diagrams, its particle transforming ability, P and C violation, quark mixing, neutrino mixing and symmetry breaking, we arrive at the full Lagrangian density. It is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{EW} = \;& \textstyle\sum_k \overline{\psi}_k (i\,\partial\!\!\!/ - m_k - \frac{g m_k H}{2 m_W})\psi_k && \text{1. fermion mass terms}\\
& -e\textstyle\sum_k q_k \overline{\psi}_k \gamma^\mu \psi_k A_\mu && \text{2. e.m. interaction}\\
& -\frac{g}{2\sqrt{2}}\textstyle\sum_k \overline{\psi}_k \gamma^\mu (1-\gamma^5)(T^+ W_\mu^+ + T^- W_\mu^-)\psi_k && \text{3. charged weak currents}\\
& -\frac{g}{2\cos\theta_W}\textstyle\sum_k \overline{\psi}_k \gamma^\mu (g_V^k - g_A^k \gamma^5)\psi_k Z_\mu && \text{4. neutral weak currents}\\
& -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} && \text{5. electromagetic field}\\
& -\frac{1}{2}W_{\mu\nu}^+ W^{-\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4}Z_{\mu\nu}Z^{\mu\nu} && \text{6. weak W and Z fields}\\
& +m_W^2 W^+ W^- + \frac{1}{2}m_Z^2 Z^2 && \text{7. W and Z mass terms}\\
& -gWWA - gWWZ && \text{8. cubic interaction}\\
& -\frac{g^2}{4}(W^4 + Z^4 + W^2F^2 + Z^2F^2) && \text{9. quartic interaction}\\
& +\frac{1}{2}(\partial^\mu H)(\partial_\mu H) - \frac{1}{2}m_H^2 H^2 && \text{10. Higgs boson mass}\\
& -\frac{g m_H^2}{4 m_W}H^3 - \frac{g^2 m_H^2}{32 m_W^2}H^4 && \text{11. Higgs self-interaction}\\
& +(g m_W H + \frac{g^2}{4}H^2)(W_\mu^+ W^{-\mu} + \frac{1}{2\cos^2\theta_w}Z_\mu Z^\mu) && \text{12. Higgs–W and Z int.}
\end{aligned} \tag{765}$$

The terms in the Lagrangian are easily associated to the Feynman diagrams of Figure 569:

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

1. this term describes the inertia of every object around us, yields the motion of fermions, and represents the kinetic energy of the quarks and leptons, as it appears in the usual Dirac equation, modified by the so-called *Yukawa coupling* to the Higgs field H and possibly by a Majorana term for the neutrinos (not shown);
2. the second term describes the well-known interaction of matter and electromagnetic radiation, and explains practically all material properties and colours observed in daily life;
3. the term is the so-called *charged current interaction*, due to exchange of virtual W bosons, that is responsible for the beta decay and for the fact that the Sun is shining;
4. this term is the *neutral current interaction*, the '$V - A$ theory' of George Sudarshan, that explains the elastic scattering of neutrinos in matter;
5. this term represents the kinetic energy of photons and yields the evolution of the electromagnetic field in vacuum, thus the basic Maxwell equations;
6. this term represents the kinetic energy of the weak radiation field and gives the evolution of the intermediate W and Z bosons of the weak interaction;
7. this term is the kinetic energy of the vector bosons;
8. this term represents the triple vertex of the self-interaction of the vector boson;
9. this term represents the quadruple vertex of the self-interaction of the vector boson;
10. this term is predicted to be the kinetic energy of Higgs boson;
11. this term is predicted to be the self-interaction of the Higgs;
12. the last term is predicted to represent the interaction of the vector bosons with the Higgs boson that restoring unitarity at high energies.

Let us look into the formal details. The quantities appearing in the Lagrangian are:

— The wave functions $\psi_k = (\nu'_k \;\; l^-_k)$ for leptons and $(u_k \;\; d'_k)$ for quarks are the left-handed fermion fields of the k-th fermion generation; every component is a spinor. The index $k = 1, 2, 3$ numbers the generation: the value 1 corresponds to (u d $\nu_e e^-$), the second generation is (c s $\nu_\mu \mu^-$) and the third (t b $\nu_\tau \tau^-$). The ψ_k transform as doublets under SU(2); the right handed fields are SU(2) singlets.

In the doublets, one has

$$d'_k = \sum_l V_{kl} d_l \;, \tag{766}$$

where V_{kl} is the Cabibbo–Kobayashi–Maskawa mixing matrix, d'_k are the quark flavour eigenstates and d_k are the quark mass eigenstates. A similar expression holds for the mixing of the neutrinos:

$$\nu'_k = \sum_l P_{kl} \nu_l \;, \tag{767}$$

where P_{kl} is the Pontecorvo–Maki–Nakagawa–Sakata mixing matrix, ν'_l the neutrino flavour eigenstates and ν_l the neutrino mass eigenstates.

— For radiation, A^μ and $F^{\mu\nu}$ is the field of the massless vector boson of the electromagnetic field, the *photon* γ.

$W^\pm_\mu$ are the massive charged gauge vector bosons of the weak interaction; the corresponding particles, W^+ and W^-, are each other's antiparticles.

Z_μ is the field of the massive neutral gauge vector boson of the weak interactions;

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

the neutral vector boson itself is usually called Z^0.

— H is the field of the neutral scalar Higgs boson H^0, the only elementary scalar particle in the standard model. It is not yet discovered, so that all terms involving H still need final confirmation.

— Two charges appear, one for each interaction. The number q_k is the well-known *electric charge* of the particle ψ_k in units of the positron charge. The number $t_{3L}(k)$ is the *weak isospin*, or *weak charge*, of fermion k, whose value is +1/2 for u_k and ν_k and is −1/2 for d_k and l_k. These two charges together define the so-called *vector coupling*

$$g_V^k = t_{3L}(k) - 2q_k \sin^2\theta_W \tag{768}$$

and the axial coupling

$$g_A^k = t_{3L}(k)\ . \tag{769}$$

The combination $g_V^k - g_A^k$, or $V - A$ for short, expresses the maximal violation of P and C parity in the weak interaction.

— The operators T^+ and T^- are the weak isospin raising and lowering operators. Their action on a field is given e.g. by $T^+ l_k^- = \nu_k$ and $T^- u_k = d_k$.

We see that the Lagrangian indeed contains all the ideas developed above. The electroweak Lagrangian is *unique*: it could not have a different mathematical form, because both the electromagnetic terms and the weak terms are fixed by the requirements of Lorentz invariance, U(1) and broken SU(2) gauge invariance, permutation symmetry and renormalizability.

Curiosities about the weak interaction

The Lagrangian of the weak interaction has been checked by thousands of experiments. Many experiments have been design specifically to probe it to the highest precision possible. In all these cases, no contradictions between observation and calculation has ever been found. Ref. 1087

Nevertheless, the weak interaction, with its breaking of parity and its elusive neutrino, exerts a deep fascination on all those who have explored it. Let us explore this fascination a bit more. Ref. 1106

* *

The weak interaction is responsible for the burning of hydrogen to helium in the early universe. Without helium, there would be no path to make still heavier elements. Thus we owe our own existence to the weak interaction.

* *

The weak interaction is required to have an excess of matter over antimatter. Without the parity violation of the weak interactions, there would be no matter at all in the universe. Also this property of the weak interaction is necessary for our own existence.

* *

Through the emitted neutrinos, the weak interaction helps to get the energy out of a

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

supernova. If that were not the case, black holes would form in almost every supernova, heavier elements – of which we are made – would not have been spread out into space, and we would not exist.

* *

The fascination of the Higgs boson is underlined by the fact that it is the only fundamental observable field which bears the name of a physicist.

* *

The weak interaction is also responsible for the heat produced inside the Earth. This heat keeps the magma liquid. As a result, the weak interaction, despite its weakness, is responsible for most earthquakes, tsunamis and volcanic eruptions.

* *

Ref. 1105 The paper by Peter Higgs on the boson named after him is only 79 lines long, and has only five equations.

* *

Beta decay, due to the weak interaction, separates electrons and protons. Only in 2005 people have managed to propose practical ways to use this effect to build long-life batteries that could be used in satellites. Future will tell whether the method will be successful.

* *

Already in 1957, the great physicist Bruno Pontecorvo imagined that travelling neutrinos could spontaneously change into their own antiparticles. Today, it is known experimentally that travelling neutrinos can change generation, and one speaks of *neutrino oscillations*.

* *

Ref. 1107 Every second around 10^{16} neutrinos fly through our body. They have five sources:

— *Solar neutrinos* arrive on Earth at $6 \cdot 10^{14}\,/\mathrm{m}^2\mathrm{s}$, with an energy from 0 to 0.42 MeV; they are due to the p-p reaction in the sun; a tiny is due to the ^{8}B reaction and has energies up to 15 MeV.

— *Atmospheric neutrinos* are products of cosmic rays hitting the atmosphere, consist of 2/3 of muon neutrinos and one third of electron neutrinos, and have energies mainly between 100 MeV and 5 GeV.

Page 1236 — *Earth neutrinos* from the radioactivity that keeps the Earth warm form a flux of $6 \cdot 10^{10}\,/\mathrm{m}^2\mathrm{s}$.

— *Fossil neutrinos* from the big bang, with a temperature of 1.95 K are found in the universe with a density of $300\,\mathrm{cm}^{-3}$, corresponding to a flux of $10^{15}\,/\mathrm{m}^2\mathrm{s}$.

— *Man-made neutrinos* are produced in nuclear reactors (at 4 MeV) and as neutrino beams in accelerators, using pion and kaon decay. A standard nuclear plant produces $5 \cdot 10^{20}$ neutrinos per second. Neutrino beams are produced, for example, at the CERN in Geneva. They are routinely sent 700 km across the Earth to central Italy, where they are detected.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

They are mainly created in the atmosphere by cosmic radiation, but also coming directly from the background radiation and from the centre of the Sun. Nevertheless, during our whole life – around 3 thousand million seconds – we have only a 10 % chance that one of them interacts with one of the $3 \cdot 10^{27}$ atoms of our body. The reason is that the weak interaction is felt only over distances less than 10^{-17} m, about 1/100th of the diameter of a proton. The weak interaction is indeed weak.

* *

In the years 1993 and 1994 an intense marketing campaign was carried out across the United States of America by numerous particle physicists. They sought funding for the 'superconducting supercollider', a particle accelerator with a circumference of 80 km. This should have been the largest machine ever built, with a planned cost of more than twelve thousand million dollars, aiming at finding the Higgs boson before the Europeans would do so at a fraction of that cost. The central argument brought forward was the following: since the Higgs boson was the basis of mass, it was central to US science to know about it first. Apart from the issue of the relevance of the conclusion, the worst is that the premise is wrong.

Page 1269

We have seen above that 99 % of the mass of protons, and thus of the universe, is due to confinement; this part of mass appears even if the quarks are approximated as massless. The Higgs boson is *not* responsible for the origin of mass itself; it just might shed some light on the issue. In particular, discovering the Higgs boson will not allow to calculate or understand the mass of any particle. The whole campaign was a classic case of disinformation, and many people involved have shown their lack of honesty.* In the end, the project was stopped, mainly for financial reasons.

Ref. 1086

> Difficile est saturam non scribere.**
>
> Juvenal, *Saturae* 1, 30.

* *

There is no generally accepted name for the quantum field theory of the weak interaction. Expressions such as *quantum asthenodynamics* (QAD) – from the Greek word for 'weak' – have not yet been universally adopted.

* *

The weak interaction is so weak that a neutrino–antineutrino annihilation – which is only possible by producing a massive intermediate Z boson – has never been observed up to this day.

* *

* We should not be hypocrites. The supercollider lie is negligible when compared to other lies. The biggest lie in the world is probably the one that states that to ensure its survival, the USA government need to spend more on the military than all other countries in the world combined. This lie is, every single year, around 40 times as big as the once-only supercollider lie. Many other governments devote even larger percentages of their gross national product to their own version of this lie. As a result, the defence spending lie is directly responsible for most of the poverty in all the countries that use it.

** 'It is hard not to be satirical.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Only one type of particles interacts (almost) only weakly: neutrinos. Neutrinos carry no electric charge, no colour charge and almost no gravitational charge (mass). To get an impression of the weakness of the weak interaction, it is usually said that the probability of a neutrino to be absorbed by a lead screen of the thickness of one light-year is less than 50 %. The universe is thus essentially empty for neutrinos. Is there room for bound states of neutrinos circling masses? How large would such a bound state be? Can we imagine bound states, which would be called neutrinium, of neutrinos and antineutrinos circling each other? The answer depends on the mass of the neutrino. Bound states of massless particles do not exist. They could and would decay into two free massless particles.*

Challenge 1589 ny

Since neutrinos are massive, a neutrino–antineutrino bound state is possible in principle. How large would it be? Does it have excited states? Can they ever be detected? These issues are still open.

* *

Ref. 1108

Do ruminating *cows* move their jaws equally often in clockwise and anticlockwise direction? In 1927, the theoretical physicists Pascual Jordan and Ralph de Laer Kronig published a study showing that in Denmark the two directions are almost equally distributed. The rumination direction of cows is thus not related to the weak interaction.

* *

Page 1248

Challenge 1590 e

The weak interaction plays an important part in daily life. First of all, the Sun is shining. The fusion of two protons to deuterium, the first reaction of the hydrogen cycle, implies that one proton changes into a neutron. This transmutation and the normal beta decay have the same first-order Feynman diagram. The weak interaction is thus essential for the burning of the Sun. The weakness of the process is one of the guarantees that the Sun will continue burning for quite some time.

* *

Of course, the weak interaction is responsible for radioactive beta decay, and thus for part of the radiation background that leads to mutations and thus to biological evolution.

* *

What would happen if the Sun suddenly stopped shining? Obviously, temperatures would fall by several tens of degrees within a few hours. It would rain, and then all water would freeze. After four or five days, all animal life would stop. After a few weeks, the oceans would freeze; after a few months, air would liquefy.

* *

Not everything about the Sun is known. For example, the neutrino flux from the Sun oscillates with a period of 28.4 days. That is the same period with which the magnetic field of the Sun oscillates. The connections are still being studied.

* *

The energy carried away by neutrinos is important in supernovas; if neutrinos would not

* In particular, this is valid for photons bound by gravitation; this state is not possible.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

carry it away, supernovas would collapse instead of explode. That would have prevented the distribution of heavier elements into space, and thus our own existence.

* *

Even earlier on in the history of the universe, the weak interaction is important, as it prevents the symmetry between matter and antimatter, which is required to have an excess of one over the other in the universe.

* *

Due to the large toll it placed on society, research in nuclear physics, like poliomyelitis, has almost disappeared from the planet. Like poliomyelitis, nuclear research is kept alive only in a few highly guarded laboratories around the world, mostly by questionable figures, in order to build dangerous weapons. Only a small number of experiments carried on by a few researchers are able to avoid this involvement and continue to advance the topic.

* *

Interesting aspects of nuclear physics appear when powerful lasers are used. In 1999, a British team led by Ken Ledingham observed laser induced uranium fission in ^{238}U nuclei. In the meantime, this has even be achieved with table-top lasers. The latest feat, in 2003, was the transmutation of ^{129}I to ^{128}I with a laser. This was achieved by focussing a 360 J laser pulse onto a gold foil; the ensuing plasma accelerates electrons to relativistic speed, which hit the gold and produce high energy γ rays that can be used for the transmutation.

Ref. 1109

A summary of the electroweak interaction

The electroweak interaction is described by a non-abelian gauge theory based on a broken SU(2) gauge group for weak processes and an unbroken U(1) group for electrodynamic processes. This description matches the observed properties of neutrinos, of the W and Z boson, of parity violation, of β decay, of the heat production inside the Earth, of several important reactions in the Sun, and of the origin of matter in the universe. The weak interaction might be weak, but it is a bit everywhere.

Theory and experiment disagree only on the Higgs boson, which has not yet been observed, due to the large investments that were needed to do so. In all other cases, theory and experiment agree whenever comparisons have been made.

The limitatons of the theory are only conceptual. Like in all of quantum field theory, also in the case of the weak interaction the mathematical form of the Lagrangian is almost uniquely defined by requiring renormalizability, Lorentz invariance, and (broken) gauge invariance – SU(2) in this case. We say again 'almost', as we did for the case of the strong interaction, because the Lagrangian contains a few parameters that remain unexplained:

— The two coupling constants g and g' of the electroweak interaction are unexplained. (They define weak mixing angle $\theta_W = \arctan(g'/g)$.)
— The mass $M_Z = 91\,\mathrm{GeV}/c^2$ of the neutral Z boson is unexplained.
— The mass M_H of the neutral scalar Higgs boson is unknown, since the particle has not

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

been discovered yet; the present limit is $m_H > 110\,\mathrm{GeV}/c^2$.
— The number $n = 3$ of generations is unexplained.
— The masses of the six leptons and the six quarks are unexplained.
— The four parameters of the Cabibbo–Kobayashi–Maskawa quark mixing matrix and the six parameters of the neutrino mixing matrix are unexplained, including the CP violating phases.
— The properties of space-time, in particular its Lorentz invariance, its continuity and the number of its dimensions are obviously all unexplained and assumed from the outset.
— It is also not known how the weak interaction behaves in strong gravity, thus in strongly curved space-time.

Before exploring how to overcome these limitations, we summarize all results so far in the so-called *standard model of particle physics*.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 48

THE STANDARD MODEL OF ELEMENTARY PARTICLE PHYSICS – AS SEEN ON TELEVISION

The following table lists the known and predicted elementary particles. he list has not changed since the mid-1970s, mainly because of the inefficient use hat was made of the relevant research budgets across the world since then, and possibly also because the list is not far from final. The table contains *all knowledge* about matter and radiation. It is the basis for materials science, geology, chemistry, biology, medicine, the neurosciences and psychology. For this reasons, it regularly features on television.

TABLE 112 The elementary particles

Radiation	electromagnetic interaction	weak interaction	strong interaction
	γ	W^+, W^-, Z^0	g_1 ... g_8
	photon	intermediate vector bosons	gluons
	Radiation particles are bosons with spin 1. W^- is the antiparticle of W^+; all others are their own antiparticles.		
Matter	generation 1	generation 2	generation 3
Leptons	e, ν_e	μ, ν_μ	τ, ν_τ
Quarks (each in three colours)	d, u	s, c	t, b
	Matter particles are fermions with spin 1/2; all have a corresponding antiparticle.		
Hypothetical matter			
Higgs boson	H	predicted to have spin 0 and to be elementary	

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The next table lists *all* properties of the elementary particles. For reasons of space, colour and weak isospin are not mentioned explicitly. Also the decay modes of the unstable particles are not given in detail; they are found in the standard references. The table that follows is fascinating. It allows us to give a *complete* characterization of the intrinsic properties of any *composed* moving entity, be it an object or an image. The aim from the beginning of our study of motion, namely to have a complete list of the *intrinsic properties* of moving entities, is thus achieved.

Ref. 1087

Page 34

The other aim that we formulated at the same time was to have a complete list of all *state properties*. This aim is also achieved, namely by the wave function. Were it not for the possibility of space-time curvature, we would be at the end of our exploration. In short, the previous and the following table lists everything about motion in flat space-time.

TABLE 113 Elementary particle properties

Particle	Mass m [a]	Lifetime τ or energy width, [b] main decay modes	Isospin I, spin J, [c] parity P, charge parity C	Charge, isospin, strangeness, [c] charm, beauty, topness: $QISCBT$	Lepton & baryon [e] numbers LB
Elementary radiation (bosons)					
photon γ	0 ($<10^{-53}$ kg)	stable	$I(J^{PC}) = 0,1(1^{--})$	000000	0, 0
$W^{\pm}$	80.398(25) GeV/c^2	2.124(41) GeV 67.60(27)% hadrons, 32.12(36)% $l^+\nu$	$J = 1$	±100000	0, 0
Z	91.1876(21) GeV/c^2	2.4952(23) GeV/c^2 69.91(6)% hadrons 10.0974(69)% l^+l^-	$J = 1$	000000	0, 0
gluon	0	stable	$I(J^P) = 0(1^-)$	000000	0, 0
Elementary matter (fermions): leptons					
electron e	9.109 381 88(72) · 10^{-31} kg = 81.871 0414(64) pJ/c^2 = 0.510 998 910(13) MeV/c^2 = 0.000 548 579 909 43(23) u gyromagnetic ratio $\mu_e/\mu_B = -1.001\,159\,652\,1811(7)$ electric dipole moment $d = (0.7 \pm 0.7) \cdot 10^{-29}\, e$ m [f]	$> 13 \cdot 10^{30}$ s	$J = \frac{1}{2}$	−100 000	1, 0
muon μ	0.188 353 109(16) yg = 105.658 376(4) MeV/c^2 = 0.113 428 9256(29) u gyromagnetic ratio $\mu_\mu/(e\hbar/2m_\mu) = -1.001\,165\,9208(6)$	2.197 03(4) µs 99 % $e^-\bar{\nu}_e\nu_\mu$	$J = \frac{1}{2}$	−100000	1, 0

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

PARTICLE	MASS m [a]	LIFETIME τ OR ENERGY WIDTH, [b] MAIN DECAY MODES	ISOSPIN I, SPIN J, [c] PARITY P, CHARGE PARITY C	CHARGE, ISOSPIN, STRANGENESS, [c] CHARM, BEAUTY, TOPNESS: $QISCBT$	LEPTON & BARYON [e] NUMBERS LB
	electric dipole moment $d = (3.7 \pm 3.4) \cdot 10^{-21} e$ m				
tau τ	1.776 84(17) GeV/c^2	290.6(1.0) fs	$J = \frac{1}{2}$	–100000	1, 0
el. neutrino ν_e	< 2 eV/c^2		$J = \frac{1}{2}$		1, 0
muon neutrino ν_μ	< 2 eV/c^2		$J = \frac{1}{2}$		1, 0
tau neutrino ν_τ	< 2 eV/c^2		$J = \frac{1}{2}$		1, 0
Elementary matter (fermions): quarks [g]					
up u	1.5 to 3.3 MeV/c^2	see proton	$I(J^P) = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2}^+)$	$+\frac{2}{3}+\frac{1}{2}0000$	$0, \frac{1}{3}$
down d	3.5 to 6 MeV/c^2	see proton	$I(J^P) = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2}^+)$	$-\frac{1}{3}-\frac{1}{2}0000$	$0, \frac{1}{3}$
strange s	70 to 130 MeV/c^2		$I(J^P) = 0(\frac{1}{2}^+)$	$-\frac{1}{3}0{-}1000$	$0, \frac{1}{3}$
charm c	1.27(11) GeV/c^2		$I(J^P) = 0(\frac{1}{2}^+)$	$+\frac{2}{3}00{+}100$	$0, \frac{1}{3}$
bottom b	4.20(17) GeV/c^2	τ = 1.33(11) ps	$I(J^P) = 0(\frac{1}{2}^+)$	$-\frac{1}{3}000{-}10$	$0, \frac{1}{3}$
top t	171.2(2.1) GeV/c^2		$I(J^P) = 0(\frac{1}{2}^+)$	$+\frac{2}{3}0000{+}1$	$0, \frac{1}{3}$
Hypothetical, maybe elementary (boson)					
Higgs [h] H	> 114 GeV/c^2		$J = 0$		

Notes:

a. See also the table of SI prefixes on page 910. About the eV/c^2 mass unit, see page 914.

b. The *energy width* Γ of a particle is related to its lifetime τ by the indeterminacy relation $\Gamma\tau = \hbar$. There is a difference between the *half-life* $t_{1/2}$ and the lifetime τ of a particle: they are related by $t_{1/2} = \tau \ln 2$, where $\ln 2 \approx 0.693\,147\,18$; the half-life is thus shorter than the lifetime. The unified *atomic mass unit* u is defined as 1/12 of the mass of a carbon 12 atom at rest and in its ground state. One has $1\,\mathrm{u} = \frac{1}{12} m(^{12}\mathrm{C}) = 1.660\,5402(10)$ yg.

c. To keep the table short, the header does not explicitly mention *colour*, the charge of the strong interactions. This has to be added to the list of basic object properties. Quantum numbers containing the word 'parity' are multiplicative; all others are additive. Time parity T (not to be confused with topness T), better called motion inversion parity, is equal to CP. The isospin I (or I_Z) is defined only for up and down quarks and their composites, such as the proton and the neutron. In the literature one also sees references to the so-called G-parity, defined as $G = (-1)^{IC}$.

The header also does not mention the *weak charge* of the particles. The details on weak charge g, or, more precisely, on the *weak isospin*, a quantum number assigned to all left-handed fermions (and right-handed anti-fermions), but to no right-handed fermion (and no left-handed antifermion), are given in the section on the weak interactions. Page 1277

d. 'Beauty' is now commonly called *bottomness*; similarly, 'truth' is now commonly called *topness*. The signs of the quantum numbers S, I, C, B, T can be defined in different ways. In the standard assignment shown here, the sign of each of the non-vanishing quantum numbers is given by the sign of the charge of the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

corresponding quark.
e. If supersymmetry exists, *R*-parity must be added to this column. *R*-parity is a multiplicative quantum number related to the lepton number *L*, the baryon number *B* and the spin *J* through the definition $R = (-1)^{3B+L+2J}$. All particles from the standard model are *R*-even, whereas their superpartners are *R*-odd.
Ref. 1164, Ref. 1165 *f*. The electron radius is less than 10^{-22} m. It is possible to store single electrons in traps for many months.
g. See page 1269 for the precise definition and meaning of the quark masses.
h. Currently a hypothetical particle.

To complete the standard model, apart from the above two tables, we need the Lagrangians of the electroweak and strong interaction. The combination of the Lagrangians, based on the U(1), SU(3) and broken SU(2) gauge groups, is possible only in one particular way. The resulting Lagrangian is a bit complex; since it does not contain more information than already discussed, it is not written down here. All the information on the standard model Lagrangian is contained in the Feynman diagrams of the electroweak and strong interactions, taking into account the mixing of quarks and neutrinos.

In summary, the standard model includes a minimum action, a maximum speed, electric charge quantization and conservation, colour conservation and weak charge conservation. With these basic ideas, the standard model describes *every* observation ever made in flat space-time.

Summary and open questions

The standard model of particle physics clearly distinguishes *elementary* from *composed* particles. It provides the full list of properties that characterizes a particle – and thus any moving object and image. The properties are: mass, spin, charge, colour, weak isospin, parity, charge parity, isospin, strangeness, charm, topness, beauty, lepton number and baryon number.

The standard model also describes electromagnetic and nuclear interactions as gauge theories, i.e., as exchange of virtual radiation particles. The standard model describes the three types of radiation that are observed in nature at all experimentally accessible energies. As a result, the standard model describes the structure of the atoms, their formation in the history of the universe, the properties of matter and the mechanisms of life.

In short, the standard model realizes the dream of Leucippus and Democritus, plus a bit more: we know the bricks that compose all of matter and radiation, and in addition we know precisely how they move, interact and transform.

But in addition, we also know what we still do *not* know:

— we have not yet observed the Higgs boson;
— we do not know the origin of the coupling constants;
— we do not know the origin of the masses of the particles;
— we do not know the origin of the mixing and CP violation parameters;
— we do not know the origin of the gauge groups;
— we do not know the origin of the three generations;
— we do not know why positrons and protons have the same charge;
— we do not know whether the particle concept survives at high energy;
— we do not know what happens in curved space-time.

To study these issues, the simplest way is to explore nature at particle energies that are

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

as high as possible. There are two methods: building large experiments and exploring hypothetical models. Both are useful.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 49

DREAMS OF UNIFICATION

> Materie ist geronnenes Licht.*
>
> Albertus Magnus

Is there a common origin to the three particle interactions? We have seen in the preceding sections that the Lagrangians of the electromagnetic, the weak and the strong nuclear interactions are determined almost uniquely by two types of requirements: to possess a certain symmetry and to possess mathematical consistency. The search for *unification* of the interactions thus seems to require the identification of the one, unified symmetry of nature. (Do you agree?)

Challenge 1591 s

In the past decades, several candidate models have fuelled the hope to achieve unification through higher symmetry: grand unification, supersymmetry, conformal invariance and coupling constant duality. We start with the first, which is conceptually the simplest.

Grand unification

At all measured energies, thus below about 1 TeV, there are no contradictions between the Lagrangian of the standard model and observation. On the other hand, the Lagrangian can be seen as a low energy approximation. It should thus be possible – attention, this a belief – to find a unifying symmetry that *contains* the symmetries of the electroweak and strong interactions as subgroups and thus as different aspects of a single, unified interaction; we can then examine the physical properties that follow and compare them with observation. This approach, called *grand unification*, attempts the unified description of all types of matter. All known elementary particles are seen as fields which appear in a Lagrangian determined by a single symmetry group.

Like for each gauge theory described so far, also the grand unified Lagrangian is mainly determined by the symmetry group, the representation assignments for each particle, and the corresponding coupling constant. A general search for the symmetry group starts with all those (semisimple) Lie groups which contain $U(1) \times SU(2) \times SU(3)$. The smallest groups with these properties are SU(5), SO(10) and E(6); they are defined in Appendix B. For each of these candidate groups, the experimental consequences of the model must be studied and compared with experiment.

Ref. 1110

Ref. 1111

* 'Matter is coagulated light.' Albertus Magnus (b. *c.* 1192 Lauingen, d. 1280 Cologne), the most important thinker of his time.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The data

Grand unification models make several predictions that can be matched with experiment. First of all, any grand unified model predicts relations between the quantum numbers of quarks and those of leptons. In particular, grand unification explains why the electron charge is exactly the opposite of the proton charge.

Grand unification models predict a value for the weak mixing angle θ_w; its value is not fixed by the standard model. The most frequently predicted value,

$$\sin^2 \theta_{w,th} = 0.2 \tag{770}$$

is close to the measured value of

$$\sin^2 \theta_{w,ex} = 0.231(1) \,, \tag{771}$$

which is not a good match, but might be correct.

All grand unified models predict the existence of magnetic monopoles, as was shown by Gerard 't Hooft. However, despite extensive searches, no such particles have been found yet. Monopoles are important even if there is only one of them in the whole universe: the existence of a single monopole implies that electric charge is quantized. Grand unification thus explains why electric charge appears in multiples of a smallest unit.

Ref. 1112

Grand unification predicts the existence of heavy intermediate vector bosons, called *X bosons*. Interactions involving these bosons do not conserve baryon or lepton number, but only the difference $B - L$ between baryon and lepton number. To be consistent with experiment, the X bosons must have a mass of the order of 10^{16} GeV. However, this mass is outside the range of experiments.

Most spectacularly, the X bosons of grand unification imply that the *proton decays*. This prediction was first made by Pati and Salam in 1974. If protons decay, means that neither coal nor diamond* – nor any other material – would be for ever. Depending on the precise symmetry group, grand unification predicts that protons decay into pions, electrons, kaons or other particles. Obviously, we know 'in our bones' that the proton lifetime is rather high, otherwise we would die of leukaemia; in other words, the low level of cancer already implies that the lifetime of the proton is larger than 10^{16} years.

Detailed calculations for the proton lifetime τ_p using the gauge group SU(5) yield the expression

$$\tau_p \approx \frac{1}{\alpha_G^2(M_X)} \frac{M_X^4}{M_p^5} \approx 10^{31\pm1}\,\text{a} \tag{772}$$

where the uncertainty is due to the uncertainty of the mass M_X of the gauge bosons involved and to the exact decay mechanism. Several large experiments aim to measure this lifetime. So far, the result is simple but clear. Not a single proton decay has ever been observed. The data can be summarized by

Ref. 1113

* As is well known, diamond is not stable, but metastable; thus diamonds are not for ever, but coal might be, as long as protons do not decay.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 570 The behaviour of the three coupling constants with energy, for simple grand unification (left) and for the minimal supersymmetric model (right); the graph shows the constants $\alpha_1 = \frac{5}{3}\alpha_{em}/\cos^2\theta_W$ for the electromagnetic interaction (the factor 5/3 appears in GUTs), $\alpha_2 = \alpha_{em}/\sin^2\theta_W$ for the weak interaction and the strong coupling constant $\alpha_3 = \alpha_s$ (© Wim de Boer)

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(\mathrm{p} \to e^+ \pi^0) &> 5 \cdot 10^{33}\,\mathrm{a} \\ \tau(\mathrm{p} \to K^+ \bar{\nu}) &> 1.6 \cdot 10^{33}\,\mathrm{a} \\ \tau(\mathrm{n} \to e^+ \pi^-) &> 5 \cdot 10^{33}\,\mathrm{a} \\ \tau(\mathrm{n} \to K^0 \bar{\nu}) &> 1.7 \cdot 10^{32}\,\mathrm{a} \end{aligned} \tag{773}$$

These values are higher than the prediction by SU(5) models. For the other gauge groups the situation is not settled.

The state of grand unification

To settle the issue of grand unification definitively, one last prediction of grand unification remains to be checked: the unification of the coupling constants. Most estimates of the grand unification energy are near the Planck energy, the energy at which gravitation starts to play a role even between elementary particles. As grand unification does not take gravity into account, for a long time there was a doubt whether something was lacking in the approach. This doubt changed into certainty when the precision measurements
Ref. 1114 of the coupling constants became available. This happened in 1991, when these measurements were put into the diagram of Figure 570. It turned out that the GUT prediction of the way the constants evolve with energy imply that the three constants do *not* meet at the grand unification energy. Simple grand unification by SU(5), SU(10) or E_6 is thus ruled out by experiment.

This state of affairs is changed if *supersymmetry* is taken into account. Supersymmetry is a hypothesis on the way to take into account low-energy effects of gravitation in the particle world. Supersymmetry predicts new particles that change the curves at inter-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

mediate energies, so that they all meet at a grand unification energy of about 10^{16} GeV. (The line thicknesses in Figure 570 represent the experimental errors.) The inclusion of supersymmetry also puts the proton lifetime prediction back to a value higher (but not by much) than the present experimental bound and predicts the correct value of the mixing angle. With supersymmetry, we can thus retain the advantages of grand unification (charge quantization, one coupling constant) without being in contradiction with experiments. The predicted particles, not yet found, are in a region accessible to the LHC collider at CERN in Geneva. We will explore supersymmetry in a bit more detail below.

Pure grand unification is thus in contradiction with experiments. This is not a surprise, as its goal, to unify the description of matter, *cannot* been achieved in this way. Most of all, the symmetry group must be put in from the beginning, as grand unification cannot deduce it from a general principle. Neither does grand unification tell us what elementary particles are. In other words, grand unification only *shifts* the open questions of high energy physics to the next level, while keeping most of them unanswered. The name 'grand unification' is ridiculous.

The story of grand unification is a first hint that looking at higher energies using only low-energy concepts is not the way to solve the mystery of motion. We definitively need to continue our adventure.

Searching for higher symmetries

Since we want to reach the top of Motion Mountain, we go on. We have seen in the preceding sections that the symmetry properties are the main ingredients of the Lagrangian that describes nature. The discovery of the correct symmetry, together with mathematical consistency, usually restricts the possible choices for a Lagrangian down to a limited number (to one in the best case), and then allows to make experimental predictions.

The history of particle physics has also shown that progress was always coupled to the discovery of *larger* symmetries, in the sense that the newly discovered symmetries always included the old ones as a subgroup. Therefore, the aim soon became to find the biggest possible symmetry consistent with experiments on one hand and with gauge theories on the other hand. Since grand unification is a failure, a better approach is to search directly for a symmetry that includes gravity.

Supersymmetry

In the search for possible symmetries of a Lagrangian describing a gauge theory, one way to proceed is to find general theorems which make statements on the symmetries that a Lagrangian can possibly have.

Ref. 1115

A well-known theorem by Coleman and Mandula states that if the symmetry transformations transform fermions into fermions and bosons into bosons, no quantities other than the following can be conserved:

- the energy momentum tensor $T^{\mu\nu}$, consequence of the *external*, Poincaré space-time symmetry, and
- the internal quantum numbers, which are scalars, associated with each gauge group generator, such as electric charge, colour, etc., and are consequences of the *internal* symmetries of the Lagrangian.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

But, and here comes the way out, if transformations that *mix* fermions and bosons are considered, new conserved quantities become possible. This family of symmetries includes gravity and came to be known as *supersymmetry*. Its conserved quantities are not scalars but spinors. Therefore, *classical* supersymmetry does not exist; it is a purely quantum-mechanical symmetry. The study of supersymmetry is a research field in its own. Supersymmetry generalizes Yang-Mills gauge theory to super-Yang-Mills gauge theory. The possible super-gauge groups have been completely classified.

Supersymmetry can be extended to incorporate gravitation by changing it into a local gauge theory; in that case it is called *supergravity*. Supergravity is based on the idea that coordinates can be fermionic as well as bosonic. It thus makes specific statements on the behaviour of space-time at small distances. Supergravity predicts N additional conserved, spinorial charges. The number N lies between 1 and 8; each value leads to a different candidate Lagrangian. The simplest case is called $N = 1$ supergravity.

In short, supersymmetry is an option to unify matter and radiation at low energies. Supersymmetry, and in particular $N = 1$ supergravity, might be an approximation to reality.

Supersymmetric models make a number of predictions that can be tested by experiment.

— Supersymmetry predicts partners to the usual elementary particles. Fermions are predicted to have boson partners, and vice versa. For example, supersymmetry predicts a *photino* as fermionic partner of the photon. However, none of these particles have been observed yet; this might be due to their large mass.
— Superymmetry allows for the unification of the coupling constants in a way compatible with the data, as shown already above. Page 1297
— Supersymmetry slows down the proton decay rates predicted by grand unified theories. The slowed-down down rates are compatible with observation.
— Supersymmetry predicts electric dipole moments for the neutron (and other elementary particles). The largest predicted values, $10^{-30}\,e$ m, are in contradiction with observations; the smallest predictions have not yet been reached by experiment. In comparison, the values expected from the standard model are at most $10^{-33}\,e$ m. This is a vibrant research field.

In summary, the experimental situation of supersymmetry is weak. Is supersymmetry is an ingredient to the unified theory? The safe answer is: nobody knows yet. The optimistic answer is: supersymmetry might be discovered in upcoming experiments at CERN in Geneva. The pessimistic answer is: supersymmetry has not been confirmed by experiment, but is a belief system made up to correct the failings of grand unified theories. Time will tell which answer is correct.

Dualities – the most incredible symmetries of nature

One of the great discoveries of theoretical physics took place in 1977, when Claus Montonen and David Olive proved that the standard concept of symmetry could be expanded dramatically in a different and new way.

The standard class of symmetry transformations, which turns out to be only the first class, acts on fields. This class encompasses gauge symmetries, space-time symmetries,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

motion reversal, parities, flavour symmetries and supersymmetry.

The second, new class is quite different. If one takes all coupling constants of nature, collected in the table on page 1340, one can imagine that they are members of a continuous space of all possible coupling constants, called the *parameter space*.* Montonen and Olive showed that there are transformations in parameter space that leave nature invariant. These transformations thus form a new, second class of symmetries of nature.

In fact, we already encountered a member of this class: renormalization symmetry. But Olive and Montonen expanded the symmetry class considerably by the discovery of *electromagnetic duality*. Electromagnetic duality is a discrete symmetry exchanging

Page 718

$$e \leftrightarrow \frac{4\pi\hbar c}{e} \tag{774}$$

where the right hand turns out to be the unit of magnetic charge. Electro-magnetic duality thus relates the electric charge e and the magnetic charge m

$$Q_{\text{el}} = me \quad \text{and} \quad Q_{\text{mag}} = ng = 2\pi\hbar c/e \tag{775}$$

and puts them on equal footing. In other words, the transformation exchanges

$$\alpha \leftrightarrow \frac{1}{\alpha} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{1}{137.04} \leftrightarrow 137.04\,, \tag{776}$$

and thus exchanges weak and strong coupling. In other words, electromagnetic duality relates a regime where particles make sense (the low coupling regime) with one where particles do not make sense (the strong coupling regime). It is the most mind-boggling symmetry ever conceived.

Dualities are among the deepest connections of physics. They contain $\hbar$ and are thus intrinsically quantum. They do not exist in classical physics and show that quantum theory is more fundamental than classical physics. More clearly stated, dualities are intrinsically non-classical symmetries. Dualities confirm that quantum theory stands on its own.

Obviously, if we want to understand the values of unexplained parameters such as coupling constants, the obvious thing to do is to study *all* possible symmetries in parameter space, thus all possible symmetries of the second class, possibly combining them with those of the first symmetry class. (Indeed, the combination of duality with supersymmetry is studied in string theory.)

Page 1514

These investigations showed that there are several types of dualities, which all are *non-perturbative* symmetries:

Ref. 1116

— S duality, the generalization of electromagnetic duality for all interactions;
— T duality, also called space-time duality, a mapping between small and large lengths and times following $l \leftrightarrow = l_{\text{Pl}}^2/l$;**

* The space of solutions for all value of the parameters is called the *moduli space*.

** Space-time duality, the transformation between large and small sizes, leads one to ask whether there is an inside and an outside to particles. (We encountered this question already in our study of gloves.) The issue has not been addressed in research yet. Sometimes one has to be patient.

Page 1052

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

— infrared dualities.

So far, research into dualities has not led to experimental predictions; however, they have led to a deeper understanding of field theory. Dualities play an important role in string theory.

Page 1514

Collective aspects of quantum field theory

For many decades, mathematicians asked physicists: What is the essence of quantum field theory? Despite intensive research, this question has yet to be answered precisely.

The first half of the answer is given by the usual definition given by physicists: QFT is the most general known way to describe quantum mechanically continuous systems with a finite number of types of quanta but with an infinite number of degrees of freedom. (Of course, this definition implies that the Lagrangian must be relativistically invariant and must be described by a gauge theory.) However, this half of the answer is already sufficient to spell trouble. We will show in the next part of our ascent that neither space-time nor physical systems are continuous; we will discover that nature does not have infinite numbers of degrees of freedom. In other words, *quantum field theory is an effective theory*; this is the modern way to say that it is approximate, or more bluntly, that it is wrong.

The second, still partly unknown half of the answer would specify which (mathematical) conditions a physical system, i.e., a Lagrangian, actually needs to realize in order to become a quantum field theory. Despite the work of many mathematicians, no complete list of conditions is known yet. It is known that the list includes at least two conditions. First of all, a quantum field theory must be *renormalizable*. Secondly, a quantum field theory must be *asymptotically free*; in other words, the coupling must go to zero when the energy goes to infinity. This condition ensures that interactions are defined properly. Only a subset of renormalizable Lagrangians obey this condition.

In four dimensions, the *only* known theories with these two properties are the non-Abelian gauge theories. These Lagrangians have several general aspects which are not directly evident when we arrive at them through the usual way, i.e., by generalizing naive wave quantum mechanics. This standard approach, the historical one, emphasizes the *perturbative* aspects: we think of elementary fermions as field quanta and of interactions as exchanges of virtual bosons, to various orders of perturbation.

On the other hand, all field theory Lagrangians also show two other configurations, apart from particles, which play an important role. These mathematical solutions appear when a non-perturbative point of view is taken; they are *collective* configurations.

— Quantum field theories show solutions which are static and of finite energy, created by non-local field combinations, called *solitons*. In quantum field theories, solitons are usually magnetic monopoles and dyons; also the famous *skyrmions* are solitons. In this approach to quantum field theory, it is assumed that the actual equations of nature are nonlinear at high energy. Like in liquids, one then expects stable, localized and propagating solutions, the solitons. These solitons could be related to the observed particles.

Page 240

— Quantum field theories show self-dual or anti-self dual solutions, called *instantons*. Instantons play a role in QCD, and could also play a role in the fundamental Lagrangian of nature.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Ref. 1117 These fascinating topics have been explored in detail by mathematical physicists. Even though this has deepened the understanding of gauge theories, all the results have not helped in the path towards unification.

A summary on higher symmetries

No research program trying to unravel larger symmetries than those of the standard model has been successful so far. This includes many topics not mentioned here. For example, the topic of *quantum groups* was very popular around the year 2000. Non-commutative space-time was another fashion in elementary particle physics around the same time.

Despite hundreds of extremely smart people exploring potential higher symmetries of all kinds, their effort has not been successful for the description of nature. This leads to a question: Did researchers rely on incorrect assumptions on the structure of particles or of space-time? Or is the search for higher symmetry the wrong way to go? Before we explore these two questions, we take a break.



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 50

BACTERIA, FLIES AND KNOTS

> La première et la plus belle qualité de la nature est le mouvement qui l'agite sans cesse ; mais ce mouvement n'est qu'une suite perpétuelle de crimes ; ce n'est que par des crimes qu'elle le conserve.
>
> Donatien de Sade, *Justine, ou les malheurs de la vertu*.*

Wobbly entities, in particular jellyfish or amoebas, open up a fresh vision of the world of motion, if we allow to be led by the curiosity to study them in detail. We have missed many delightful insights by leaving them aside. In particular, wobbly entities yield surprising connections between shape change and motion that will be of great use in the last part of our mountain ascent. Instead of continuing to look at the smaller and smaller, we now take a second look at everyday motion and its mathematical description.

To enjoy this chapter, we change a dear habit. So far, we always described any general example of motion as composed of the motion of *point particles*. This worked well in classical physics, in general relativity and in quantum theory; we based the approach on the silent assumption that during motion, each point of a complex system can be followed separately. We will soon discover that this assumption is *not* realized at smallest scales. Therefore the most useful description of motion of *extended* bodies uses methods that do not require that body parts be followed piece by piece. We explore these methods in this chapter; doing so is a lot of fun in its own right.

If we describe elementary particles as extended entities – as we soon will have to – a particle moving through space is similar to a dolphin swimming through water or to a bee flying through air. Let us explore how these animals do this.

Bumblebees and other miniature flying systems

If a butterfly passes by during our mountain ascent, we can stop a moment to appreciate a simple fact: a butterfly flies, and it is rather small. If we leave some cut fruit in the kitchen until it rots, we observe the even smaller fruit flies (*Drosophila melanogaster*), just around one millimetre in size. If you have ever tried to build small model aeroplanes, or if you

* 'The primary and most beautiful of nature's qualities is motion, which agitates her at all times; but this motion is simply a perpetual consequence of crimes; she conserves it by means of crimes only.' Donatien Alphonse François de Sade (1740–1814) is the intense French writer from whom the term 'sadism' was deduced.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 571 A flying fruit fly, tethered to a string

FIGURE 572 Vortices around a butterfly wing (© Robert Srygley/Adrian Thomas)

even only compare these insects to paper aeroplanes (probably the smallest man-made flying thing you ever saw) you start to get a feeling for how well evolution optimized flying insects.

Compared to paper planes, insects also have engines, flapping wings, sensors, navigation systems, gyroscopic stabilizers, landing gear and of course all the features due to life, reproduction and metabolism, built into an incredibly small volume. Evolution really is an excellent engineering team. The most incredible flyers, such as the common house fly (*Musca domestica*), can change flying direction in only 30 ms, using the stabilizers that nature has given them by reshaping the original second pair of wings. Human engineers are getting more and more interested in the technical solutions evolution has developed; many engineers trying to achieve similar miniaturization. The topic of miniature flying systems is extremely vast, so that we will pick out only a few examples.

Ref. 1125

How does a bumblebee (Bombus terrestris) fly? The lift mg generated by a *fixed* wing (as explained before) follows the empirical relation

Page 262

$$mg = f A v^2 \rho \tag{777}$$

where A is the surface of the wing, v is the speed of the wing in the fluid of density ρ. The factor f is a pure number, usually with a value between 0.2 and 0.4, that depends on the angle of the wing and its shape; here we use the average value 0.3. For a Boeing 747, the surface is 511 m^2, the top speed at sea level is 250 m/s; at an altitude of 12 km the density of air is only a quarter of that on the ground, thus only 0.31 kg/m^3. We deduce (correctly) that a Boeing 747 has a mass of about 300 ton. For bumblebees with a speed of 3 m/s and a wing surface of 1 cm^2, we get a lifted mass of about 35 mg, much less than the weight of the bee, namely about 1 g. The mismatch is even larger for fruit flies. In other words, an insect cannot fly if it keeps its wings *fixed*. It could not fly with fixed wings even if it had tiny propellers attached to them!

Ref. 1126

Page 43

Challenge 1592 e

Due to the limitations of fixed wings at small dimensions, insects and small birds must *move* their wings, in contrast to aeroplanes. They must do so not only to take off or to gain height, but also to simply remain airborne in horizontal flight. In contrast, aeroplanes generate enough lift with *fixed* wings. Indeed, if you look at flying animals,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 573 Examples of the three larger wing types in nature, all optimized for rapid flows: turkey vulture (*Cathartes aura*), ruby-throated hummingbird (*Archilochus colubris*) and a dragonfly (© S.L. Brown, Pennsylvania Game Comission/Joe Kosack and nobodythere)

such as the ones shown in Figure 573, you note that the larger they are, the less they need to move their wings (at cruising speed).

Challenge 1593 s Can you deduce from equation (777) that birds or insects can fly but people cannot? Conversely, the formula also (partly) explains why human-powered aeroplanes must be so large.*

But *how* do insects, small birds, flying fish or bats have to move their wings in order to fly? This is a tricky question and the answer has been uncovered only recently. The main point is that insect wings move in a way to produce eddies at the front edge which in turn thrust the insect upwards. Aerodynamic studies of butterflies – shown in Figure 572 – and studies of enlarged insect models moving in oil instead of in air explore the precise way insects make use of vortices. At the same time, more and more 'mechanical birds' and 'model aeroplanes' that use flapping wings for their propulsion are being built around the world. The field is literally in full swing.** Researchers are especially interested in understanding how vortices allow change of flight direction at the small dimensions typical for insects. One aim is to reduce the size of flying machines. However, none of the human-built systems is yet small enough that it actually *requires* wing motion to fly, as is the case for insects.

Ref. 1127
Ref. 1128

The expression (777) for the lift of wings also shows what is necessary for safe take-off and landing. The lift of all wings *decreases* for smaller speeds. Thus both animals and aeroplanes *increase* their wing surface in these occasions. Many birds also vigorously increase the flapping of wings in these situations. But even strongly flapping, enlarged wings often are insufficient for take-off. Many flying animals, such as swallows, therefore avoid landing completely. For flying animals which do take off from the ground, nature most commonly makes them hit the wings against each other, over their back, so that when the wings separate again, the low pressure between them provides the first lift. This method is used by insects and many birds, including pheasants. As every hunter knows, pheasants make a loud 'clap' when they take off. The clap is due to the low pressure region thus created.

* Another part of the explanation requires some aerodynamics, which we will not study here. Aerodynamics shows that the power consumption, and thus the resistance of a wing with given mass and given cruise speed, is inversely proportional to the square of the wingspan. Large wingspans with long slender wings are thus of advantage in (subsonic) flying, especially when energy is scarce.

** The website www.aniprop.de presents a typical research approach and the sites ovirc.free.fr and www.ornithopter.org give introductions into the way to build such systems for hobbyists.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Both wing use and wing construction depend on size. There are four types of wings in nature.

1. First of all, all large flying objects, such aeroplanes and large birds, fly using *fixed* wings, except during take-off and landing.
2. Second, common size birds use *flapping* wings. (Hummingbirds can have over 50 wing beats per second.) These first two types of wings have a thickness of about 10 to 15 % of the wing depth.
3. At smaller dimensions, a third wing type appears, as seen in dragonflies and other insects. At these scales, at Reynolds numbers of around 1000 and below, thin *membrane* wings are the most efficient. The *Reynolds number* measures the ratio between inertial and viscous effects in a fluid. It is defined as

$$R = \frac{l v \rho}{\eta} \tag{778}$$

   where l is a typical length of the system, v the speed, ρ the density and η the dynamic *viscosity* of the fluid.* A Reynolds number much larger than one is typical for rapid air flow and fast moving water. In fact, the Reynolds numbers specifies what is meant by a 'rapid' or 'fluid' flow on one hand, and a 'slow' or 'viscous' flow on the other. The first three wing types, shown in Figure 573, are all for rapid flows.
4. The fourth type of wings is found at the smallest possible dimensions, for insects smaller than one millimetre; their wings are not membranes at all. Typical are the cases of thrips and of parasitic wasps, which can be as small as 0.3 mm. All these small insects have wings which consist of a central *stalk* surrounded by hair. In fact, Figure 574 shows that some species of thrips have wings which look like miniature toilet brushes.

At even smaller dimensions, corresponding to Reynolds number below 10, nature does not use wings any more, though it still makes use of air transport. In principle, at the smallest Reynolds numbers gravity plays no role any more, and the process of flying merges with that of swimming. However, air currents are too strong compared with the speeds that such a tiny system could realize. No active navigation is then possible any more. At these small dimensions, which are important for the transport through air of spores and pollen, nature uses the air currents for passive transport, making use of special, but fixed shapes.

* The viscosity is the resistance to flow a fluid poses. It is defined by the force F necessary to move a layer of surface A with respect to a second, parallel one at distance d; in short, the (coefficient of) *dynamic viscosity* is defined as $\eta = d F/A v$. The unit is 1 kg/s m or 1 Pa s or 1 N s/m^2, once also called 10 P or 10 poise. In other words, given a horizontal tube, the viscosity determines how strong the pump needs to be to pump the fluid through the tube at a given speed. The viscosity of air 20 °C is 1.8×10^{-5} kg/s m or 18 μPa s and increases with temperature. In contrast, the viscosity of liquids decreases with temperature. (Why?) The viscosity of water at 0 °C is 1.8 mPa s, at 20 °C it is 1.0 mPa s (or 1 cP), and at 40 °C is 0.66 mPa s. Hydrogen has a viscosity smaller than 10 μPa s, whereas honey has 25 Pa s and pitch 30 MPa s.

Challenge 1594 ny

Physicists also use a quantity ν called the *kinematic viscosity*. It is defined with the help of the mass density of the fluid as $\nu = \eta/\rho$ and is measured in m^2/s, once called 10^4 stokes. The kinematic viscosity of water at 20 °C is 1 mm^2/s (or 1 cSt). One of the smallest values is that of acetone, with 0.3 mm^2/s; a larger one is glycerine, with 2000 mm^2/s. Gases range between 3 mm^2/s and 100 mm^2/s.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 574 The wings of a few types of insects smaller than 1 mm (thrips, *Encarsia*, *Anagrus*, *Dicomorpha*) (HortNET)

We can summarize that active flying is only possible through shape change. Only two types of shape changes are possible for active flying: that of propellers (or turbines) and that of wings. Engineers are studying with intensity how these shape changes have to take place in order to make flying most effective. Interestingly, the same challenge is posed by swimming.

Ref. 1129
Ref. 1130

Swimming

Swimming is a fascinating phenomenon. The Greeks argued that the ability of fish to swim is a proof that water is made of atoms. If atoms would not exist, a fish could not advance through it. Indeed, swimming is an activity that shows that matter cannot be continuous. Studying swimming can thus be quite enlightening. But how exactly do fish swim?

Whenever dolphins, jellyfish, submarines or humans *swim*, they take water with their fins, body, propellers, hands or feet and push it backwards. Due to momentum conservation they then move forward.* In short, people swim in the same way that fireworks or rockets fly: by throwing matter behind them. This is macroscopic swimming. Does all swimming work in this way? In particular, do *small* organisms advancing through the molecules of a liquid use the same method? No. They use a different, *microscopic* way of swimming.

Small organisms such as bacteria do *not* have the capacity to propel or accelerate water against their surroundings. Indeed, the water remains attached around a microorganism without ever moving away from it. Physically speaking, in these cases of swimming the kinetic energy of the water is negligible. In order to swim, unicellular beings thus need to use other effects. In fact, their only possibility is to change their body shape in controlled ways. From far away, the swimming of microorganisms thus resembles the motion of particles through vacuum. Like microorganisms, also particles have nothing to throw behind them.

A good way to distinguish macroscopic from microscopic swimming is provided by scallops. *Scallops* are molluscs up to a few cm in size. Scallops have a double shell connected by a hinge that they can open and close. If they close it *rapidly*, water is expelled

Page 85

* Fish could use propellers, as the arguments against wheels we collected at the beginning of our walk do not apply for swimming. But propellers with blood supply would be a weak point in the construction, and thus in the defence of a fish.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 575 A swimming scallop (here from the genus *Chlamys*) (© Dave Colwell)

and the mollusc is accelerated; the scallop then can glide for a while through the water. Then the scallop opens the shell again, this time *slowly*, and repeats the feat. When swimming, the larger scallops look like clockwork false teeth. If we reduce the size of the scallop by a thousand times to the size of single cells we get a simple result: such a tiny scallop *cannot* swim.

The origin of the lack of scalability of swimming methods is the changing ratio between inertial and dissipative effects at different scales. This ratio is measured by the Reynolds number. For the scallop the Reynolds number is about 100, which shows that when it swims, inertial effects are much more important than dissipative, viscous effects. For a bacterium the Reynolds number is much smaller than 1, so that inertial effects effectively play no role. There is no way to accelerate water *away* from a bacterial-sized scallop, and thus no way to glide. But this is not the only problem microorganism face when they want to swim.

A famous theorem states that no cell-sized being can move if the shape change is the same in the two halves of the motion (opening and closing). Such a shape change would simply make it move back and forward. There is also a mathematical theorem, the so-called *scallop theorem*, that states that no microscopic system can swim if it uses movable parts with only *one* degree of freedom. Thus it is impossible to move at cell dimensions using the method the scallop uses on centimetre scale.

Ref. 1131

In order to swim, microorganisms thus need to use a more evolved, *two-dimensional motion* of their shape. Indeed, biologists found that all microorganisms use one of the following three swimming styles:

1. Microorganisms of compact shape of diameter between 20 μm and about 20 mm, use *cilia*. Cilia are hundreds of little hairs on the surface of the organism. The organisms move the cilia in waves wandering around their surface, and these surface waves make the body advance through the fluid. All children watch with wonder *Paramecium*, the unicellular animal they find under the microscope when they explore the water in which some grass has been left for a few hours. *Paramecium*, which is between 100 μm and 300 μm in size, as well as many plankton species* use cilia for its motion. The cilia and their motion are clearly visible in the microscope. A similar swimming method is even used by some large animals; you might have seen similar waves on the borders of certain ink fish; even the motion of the manta (partially) belongs into this class. Ciliate motion is an efficient way to change the shape of a body making use of two dimensions and thus avoiding the scallop theorem.

Ref. 1132

* See the www.liv.ac.uk/ciliate website for an overview.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

figure to be added

FIGURE 576 Ciliated and flagellate motion

2. Sperm and eukaryote microorganisms whose sizes are in the range between 1 µm and 50 µm swim using an (eukaryote) flagellum.* Flagella, Latin for 'small whips', work like flexible oars. Even though their motion sometimes appears to be just an oscillation, flagella get a kick only during one half of their motion, e.g. at every swing to the left. Flagella are indeed used by the cells like miniature oars. Some cells even twist their flagellum in a similar way that people rotate an arm. Some microorganisms, such as *Chlamydomonas*, even have two flagella which move in the same way as people move their legs when they perform the breast stroke. Most cells can also change the sense in which the flagellum is kicked, thus allowing them to move either forward or backward. Through their twisted oar motion, bacterial flagella avoid retracing the same path when going back and forward. As a result, the bacteria avoid the scallop theorem and manage to swim despite their small dimensions. The flexible oar motion they use is an example of a non-adiabatic mechanism; an important fraction of the energy is dissipated.

Ref. 1134 Ref. 1135

3. The smallest swimming organisms, bacteria with sizes between 0.2 µm and 5 µm, swim using *bacterial* flagella. These flagella, also called prokaryote flagella, are different from the ones just mentioned. Bacterial flagella move like turning corkscrews. They are used by the famous *Escherichia coli* bacterium and by all bacteria of the genus *Salmonella*. This type of motion is one of the prominent exceptions to the non-existence of wheels in nature; we mentioned it in the beginning of our walk. Corkscrew motion is an example of an adiabatic mechanism.

Ref. 1136 Page 85

A Coli bacterium typically has a handful of flagella, each about 30 nm thick and of corkscrew shape, with up to six turns; the turns have a 'wavelength' of 2.3 µm. Each flagellum is turned by a sophisticated rotation motor built into the cell, which the cell can control both in rotation direction and in angular velocity. For Coli bacteria, the range is between 0 and about 300 Hz.

Ref. 1137

A turning flagellum does not propel a bacterium like a propeller; as mentioned, the velocities involved are much too small, the Reynolds number being only about 10^{-4}. At these dimensions and velocities, the effect is better described by a corkscrew turning in honey or in cork: a turning corkscrew produces a motion against the material around it, in the direction of the corkscrew axis. The flagellum moves the bacterium in the same way that a corkscrew moves the turning hand with respect to the cork.

Note that still smaller bacteria do not swim at all. Indeed, each bacterium faces a minimum swimming speed requirement: is must outpace diffusion in the liquid it lives in. Slow swimming capability makes no sense; numerous microorganisms therefore do not

Ref. 1138

Ref. 1133 * The largest sperm, of 6 cm length, are produced by the 1.5 mm sized *Drosophila bifurca* fly, a relative of the famous *Drosophila melanogaster*. Even when thinking about the theory of motion, it is impossible to avoid thinking about sex.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 577 Cats can turn themselves, even with *no* initial angular momentum (photographs by Etienne-Jules Marey, 1894)

manage or do not try to swim at all. Some microorganisms are specialized to move along liquid–air interfaces. Others attach themselves to solid bodies they find in the liquid. Some of them are able to *move* along these solids. The amoeba is an example for a microorganism moving in this way. Also the smallest active motion mechanisms known, namely the motion of molecules in muscles and in cell membranes, work this way.

Page 1122

Let us summarize these observations in a different way. All known active motion, or self-propulsion, (in flat space) takes place in fluids – be it air or liquids. All active motion requires shape change. In order that shape change leads to motion, the environment, e.g. the water, must itself consist of moving components always pushing onto the swimming entity. The motion of the swimming entity can then be deduced from the particular shape change it performs. To test your intuition, you may try the following puzzle: is microscopic swimming possible in two spatial dimensions? In four?

Challenge 1595 ny

Rotation, falling cats and the theory of shape change

At small dimensions, flying and swimming takes place through phase change. In the last decades, the description of shape change has changed from a fashionable piece of research to a topic whose results are both appealing and useful. There are many studies, both experimental and theoretical, about the exact way small systems move in water and air, about the achievable and achieved efficiency, and much more. The focus is on motion through translation.

But shape change can also lead to a *rotation* of a body. In this case, the ideas are not restricted to microscopic systems, but apply at all scales. In particular, the theory of shape change is useful in explaining how falling cats manage to fall always on their feet. Cats are not born with this ability; they have to learn it. But the feat has fascinated people since centuries, as shown in the ancient photograph given in Figure 577. In fact, cats confirm in three dimensions what we already knew for two dimensions: a deformable body can change its own orientation in space without outside help. Also humans can perform the feat: simply observe the second, lateral rotation of the diver in Figure 578. Astronauts in the space station and passengers of parabolic 'zero-gravity' flights regularly do the same, as do many artificial satellites sent into space.

Page 107

In the 1980s, following the pioneering work by Michael Berry, Wilczek and Zee as well as Shapere and Wilczek made the point that all motion due to shape change is described by a gauge theory. The equivalence is shown in Table 114. A simple and beautiful example for these ideas has been given by Putterman and Raz and is shown in Figure 579. Imagine four spheres on perfect ice, all of the same mass and size, connected by four rods forming a parallelogram. Now imagine that this parallelogram can change length along one side, called a, and that it can also change the angle θ between the sides. Putterman and Raz call

Ref. 1139
Ref. 1140

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 578 Humans can turn themselves in mid air like cats: see the second, lateral rotation of Artem Silchenko, at the 2006 cliff diving world championship (© World High Diving Federation)



FIGURE 579 The square cat: in free space, or on perfect ice, a deformable body made of four masses that can change one body angle and one extension is able to rotate itself

this the *square cat*. The figure shows that the square cat can change its own orientation on the ice while, obviously, keeping its centre of mass at rest. The figure also shows that this only works because the two motions that the cat can perform, the stretching and the angle change, do *not* commute.

The rotation of the square cat occurs in *strokes*; large rotations are achieved by repeating strokes, similar to the situation of swimmers. If the square cat would be swimming

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 114 The correspondence between shape change and gauge theory

Concept	Shape change	Gauge theory
System	deformable body	matter–field combination
Gauge freedom	freedom of description of body orientation and position	freedom to define vector potential
Gauge-dependent quantity	shape's angular orientation and position	vector potential, phase
	orientation and position change along an open path	vector potential and phase change along open path
Gauge transformation	changes angular orientation and position	changes vector potential
Gauge-independent quantities	orientation and position after full stroke	phase difference on closed path, integral of vector potential along a closed path
	deformations	field strengths
Gauge group	e.g. possible rotations SO(3) or motions E(3)	U(1), SU(2), SU(3)

in a liquid, the cat could thus rotate itself – though it could not advance.

When the cat rotates itself, each stroke results in a rotation angle that is independent of the speed of the stroke. (The same experience can be made when rotating oneself on an office chair by rotating the arm above the head: the chair rotation angle after arm turn is independent of the arm speed.) This leads to a puzzle: what is the largest angle that a cat can turn in one stroke? Challenge 1596 d

Rotation in strokes has a number of important implications. First of all, the the number of strokes is a quantity that all observers agree upon: it is observer-invariant. Secondly, the orientation change after a *complete* stroke is also observer-invariant. Thirdly, the orientation change for incomplete strokes is observer-invariant: it depends on the way that orientation is defined. For example, if orientation is defined by the direction of the body diagonal through the blue mass (see Figure 579), it changes in a certain way during a stroke. If the orientation is defined by the direction of the fixed bar attached to the blue mass, it changes in a different way during a stroke. Only when a full stroke is completed do the two values coincide. Mathematicians say that the choice of the definition and thus the value of the orientation is *gauge-dependent*, but that the value of the orientation change at a full stroke is *gauge-invariant*.

In summary, the square cat shows two interesting points. First, the orientation of a deformable body can change if the deformations it can perform are *non-commuting*. Secondly, such deformable bodies are described by *gauge theories*: certain aspects of the bodies are gauge-invariant, others are gauge-dependent. This summary leads to a question: can we use these ideas to increase our understanding of the gauge theories of the electromagnetic, weak and strong interaction? We will find out later on. In fact, shape change bears even more surprises.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 580 Swimming on a curved surface using two discs

Swimming in curved space

In flat space it is not possible to move through shape change. Only orientation changes are possible. Surprisingly, if space is *curved*, motion does become possible. A simple example was published in 2003 by Jack Wisdom. He found that cyclic changes in the shape of a body can lead to net translation, a rotation of the body, or both.

Ref. 1141

There is a simple system that shows the main idea. We know from Galilean physics that on a frictionless surface we cannot move, but that we can change orientation. This is true only for a flat surface. On a curved surface, we can use the ability to turn and translate it into motion.

Take to massive discs that lie on the surface of a frictionless, spherical planet, as shown in Figure 580. Consider the following four steps: 1. the disc separation φ is increased by the angle $\Delta\varphi$, 2. the discs are rotated oppositely about their centres by the angle $\Delta\theta$, 3. their separation is decreased by $-\Delta\varphi$, and 4. they are rotated back by $-\Delta\theta$. Due to to the conservation of angular momentum, the two-disc system changes its longitude $\Delta\psi$ as

Challenge 1597 ny

$$\Delta\psi = \frac{1}{2}\gamma^2 \Delta\theta\Delta\varphi \,, \tag{779}$$

where γ is the angular radius of the discs. This cycle can be repeated over and over. The cycle it allows a body, located on the surface of the Earth, to swim along the surface. Unfortunately, for a body of size of one metre, the motion for each swimming cycle is only around 10^{-27} m.

Wisdom showed that the same procedure also works in curved space, thus in the presence of gravitation. The mechanism thus allows a falling body to swim away from the path of free fall. Unfortunately, the achievable distances for everyday objects are negligibly small. Nevertheless, the effect exists.

In other words, there is a way to swim through curved space that looks similar to swimming at low Reynolds numbers, where swimming results of simple shape change. Does this tell us something about fundamental descriptions of motion? The last part of our ascent will tell.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 581 A way to turn a sphere inside out, with intermediate steps ordered clockwise (© John Sullivan)

Turning a sphere inside out

> A text should be like a lady's dress; long enough to cover the subject, yet short enough to keep it interesting.

Exploring the theme of motion of wobbly entities, a famous example cannot be avoided. In 1957, the mathematician Stephen Smale proved that a sphere can be turned inside out. Ref. 1142 The discovery brought him the Fields medal in 1966, the highest prize for discoveries in mathematics. Mathematicians call his discovery the *eversion* of the sphere.

To understand the result, we need to describe more clearly the rules of mathematical eversion. First of all, it is assumed that the sphere is made of a thin membrane which has the ability to stretch and bend without limits. Secondly, the membrane is assumed to be able to *intersect* itself. Of course, such a ghostly material does not exist in everyday life; but in mathematics, it can be imagined. A third rule requires that the moves must be performed in such a way that the membrane is not punctured, ripped nor creased; in short, everything must happen *smoothly* (or differentiably, as mathematicians like to say).

Even though Smale proved that eversion is possible, the first way to actually perform it was discovered by the blind topologist Bernard Morin in 1961, based on ideas of Arnold Shapiro. Ref. 1143, Ref. 1144 After him, several additional methods have been discovered.

Several computer videos of sphere eversions are now available.* Ref. 1145 The most famous ones

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

are Outside in, which shows an eversion due to William P. Thurston, and The Optiverse, which shows the most efficient method known so far, discovered by a team led by John Sullivan and shown in Figure 581.

Why is sphere eversion of interest to physicists? If elementary particles were extended and at the same time were of spherical shape, eversion might be a symmetry of particles. To make you think a little, we mention the effects of eversion on the whole surrounding space, not only on the sphere itself. The final effect of eversion is the transformation

$$(x, y, z) \to \frac{(x, y, -z)\, R^2}{r^2} \tag{780}$$

where R is the radius of the sphere and r is the length of the coordinate vector (x, y, z), thus $r = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2 + z^2}$. Due to the minus sign in the z-coordinate, eversion is thus different from inversion, but not by too much. As we will find out shortly, a transformation similar to eversion, space-time duality, is a fundamental symmetry of nature.

Page 1445

Clouds

Clouds are another important class of wobbly objects. The lack of a definite boundary makes them even more fascinating than amoebas, bacteria or falling cats. We can observe the varieties of clouds from an aeroplane.

Page 776

The common cumulus or cumulonimbus in the sky, like all the other types, are vapour and water droplet clouds. Galaxies are clouds of stars. Stars are clouds of plasma. The atmosphere is a gas cloud. Atoms are clouds of electrons. Nuclei are clouds of protons and neutrons, which in turn are clouds of quarks. Comparing different cloud types is illuminating and fun.

Clouds of all types can be described by a shape and a size, even though in theory they have no bound. An *effective* shape and size can be defined by that region in which the cloud density is only, say, 1 % of the maximum density; slightly different procedures can also be used. All clouds are described by *probability densities* of the components making up the cloud. All clouds show *conservation* of the number of their constituents.

Whenever we see a cloud, we can ask why it does not collapse. Every cloud is an aggregate; all aggregates are kept from collapse in only *three* ways: through rotation, through pressure, or through the Pauli principle, i.e., the quantum of action. For example, galaxies are kept from collapsing by rotation. Most stars, the atmosphere and rain clouds are kept from collapsing by gas pressure. Neutron stars, the Earth, atomic nuclei, protons or the electron clouds of atoms are kept apart by the quantum of action.

Page 202

A rain cloud is a method to keep several thousand tons of water suspended in the air. Can you explain what keeps it afloat, and what else keeps it from continuously diffusing into a thinner and thinner structure?

Challenge 1598 ny

Two rain clouds can merge. So can two atomic electron clouds. So can galaxies. But

* Summaries of the videos can be seen at the www.geom.umn.edu/docs/outreach/oi website, which also has a good pedagogical introduction. Another simple eversion and explanation is given by Erik de Neve on the www.xs4all.nl/~alife/sphere1.htm website. It is even possible to run the film software at home; see the www.cslub.uwaterloo.ca/~mjmcguff/eversion website. Figure 581 is from the new.math.uiuc.edu/optiverse website.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 582 Vortices: a waterspout and a vortex lattice in cold Lithium gas (© Zé Nogueira, Andre Schirotzek)

only atomic clouds are able to *cross* each other. We remember that a normal atom can be inside a Rydberg atom and leave it again without change. In contrast, rain clouds, stars, galaxies or other macroscopic clouds cannot cross each other. When their paths cross, they can only merge or be ripped into pieces. Due to this lack of crossing ability, only microscopic clouds can be counted. In the macroscopic cases, there is no real way to define a 'single' cloud in an accurate way. If we aim for full precision, we are unable to claim that there is more than one rain cloud, as there is no clear-cut boundary between them. Electronic clouds are different. True, in a piece of solid matter we can argue that there is only a single electronic cloud throughout the object; however, when the object is divided, the cloud is divided in a way that makes the original atomic clouds reappear. We thus can speak of 'single' electronic clouds.

If one wants to be strict, galaxies, stars and rain clouds can be seen as made of localized particles. Their cloudiness is only apparent. Could the same be true for electron clouds? And what about space itself? Let us explore some aspects of these questions.

Vortices and the Schrödinger equation

Fluid dynamics is a topic with many interesting aspects. Take the *vortex* that can be observed in any deep, emptying bath tub: it is an extended, one-dimensional 'object', it is deformable, and it is observed to wriggle around. Larger vortices appear as tornadoes on Earth and on other planets, as *waterspouts*, and at the ends of wings or propellers of all kinds. Smaller vortices appear in superfluids. Some examples are shown in Figure 582.

Vortices, also called *vortex tubes* or *vortex filaments*, are thus wobbly entities. Now, a beautiful result from the 1960s states that a vortex filament in a rotating liquid is described by the one-dimensional Schrödinger equation. Let us see how this is possible.

Ref. 1146

Any deformable linear vortex, as illustrated in Figure 583, is described by a continuous set of position vectors $\boldsymbol{r}(t, s)$ that depend on time t and on a single parameter s. The parameter s specifies the relative position along the vortex. At each point on the vortex, there is a unit tangent vector $\boldsymbol{e}(t, s)$, a unit normal curvature vector $\boldsymbol{n}(t, s)$ and a unit

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 583 The mutually perpendicular tangent $\boldsymbol{e}$, normal $\boldsymbol{n}$, torsion $\boldsymbol{w}$ and velocity $\boldsymbol{v}$ of a vortex in a rotating fluid

torsion vector $\boldsymbol{w}(t, s)$. The three vectors, shown in Figure 583, are defined as usual as

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{e} &= \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{r}}{\partial s} \,, \\ \kappa \boldsymbol{n} &= \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{e}}{\partial s} \,, \\ \tau \boldsymbol{w} &= -\frac{\partial(\boldsymbol{e} \times \boldsymbol{n})}{\partial s} \,, \end{aligned} \tag{781}$$

where κ specifies the value of the curvature and τ specifies the value of the torsion. In general, both numbers depend on time and on the position along the line.

In the simplest possible case the rotating environment induces a local velocity $\boldsymbol{v}$ for the vortex that is proportional to the curvature κ, perpendicular to the tangent vector $\boldsymbol{e}$ and perpendicular to the normal curvature vector $\boldsymbol{n}$:

$$\boldsymbol{v} = \eta \kappa (\boldsymbol{e} \times \boldsymbol{n}) \,, \tag{782}$$

Ref. 1146 where η is the so-called *coefficient of local self-induction* that describes the coupling between the liquid and the vortex motion. This is the evolution equation of the vortex.

We now assume that the vortex is deformed only *slightly* from the straight configuration. Technically, we are thus in the *linear* regime. For such a linear vortex, directed along the x-axis, we can write

$$\boldsymbol{r} = (x, y(x, t), z(x, t)) \,. \tag{783}$$

Slight deformations imply $\partial s \approx \partial x$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{e} &= (1, \frac{\partial y}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial z}{\partial x}) \approx (1, 0, 0) \,, \\ \kappa \boldsymbol{n} &\approx (0, \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial x^2}, \frac{\partial^2 z}{\partial x^2}) \,, \text{ and} \\ \boldsymbol{v} &= (0, \frac{\partial y}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial z}{\partial t}) \,. \end{aligned} \tag{784}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 584 Motion of a vortex: the fundamental helical solution and a moving helical 'wave packet'

We can thus rewrite the evolution equation (782) as

$$(0, \frac{\partial y}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial z}{\partial t}) = \eta\,(0, -\frac{\partial^2 z}{\partial x^2}, \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial x^2})\ . \tag{785}$$

This equation is well known; if we drop the first coordinate and introduce complex numbers by setting $\Phi = y + iz$, we can rewrite it as

$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} = i\eta \frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial x^2}\ . \tag{786}$$

This is the one-dimensional Schrödinger equation for the evolution of a free wave function! The complex function Φ specifies the transverse deformation of the vortex. In other words, we can say that the Schrödinger equation in one dimension describes the evolution of the deformation for an almost linear vortex in a rotating liquid. We note that there is no constant $\hbar$ in the equation, as we are exploring a *classical* system.

Ref. 1147

Schrödinger's equation is linear in Φ. Therefore the fundamental solution is

$$\Phi(x, y, z, t) = a\ \mathrm{e}^{i(\tau x - \omega t)} \quad \text{with} \quad \omega = \eta\tau^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa = a\tau^2\ , \tag{787}$$

The amplitude a and the wavelength or pitch $b = 1/\tau$ can be freely chosen, as long as the approximation of small deviation is fulfilled; this condition translates as $a \ll b$.* In the present interpretation, the fundamental solution corresponds to a vortex line that is deformed into a *helix*, as shown in Figure 584. The angular speed ω is the rotation speed around the axis of the helix.

Challenge 1599 ny

A helix moves along the axis with a speed given by

* The curvature is given by $\kappa = a/b^2$, the torsion by $\tau = 1/b$. Instead of $a \ll b$ one can thus also write $\kappa \ll \tau$.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

$$v_{\text{helix along axis}} = 2\eta\tau \,. \tag{788}$$

In other words, for extended entities following evolution equation (782), rotation and translation are coupled.* The momentum p can be defined using $\partial\Phi/\partial x$, leading to

$$p = \tau = \frac{1}{b} \,. \tag{789}$$

Momentum is thus inversely proportional to the helix wavelength or pitch, as expected. The energy E is defined using $\partial\Phi/\partial t$, leading to

$$E = \eta\tau^2 = \frac{\eta}{b^2} \,. \tag{790}$$

Energy and momentum are connected by

$$E = \frac{p^2}{2\mu} \quad \text{where} \quad \mu = \frac{1}{2\eta} \,. \tag{791}$$

In other words, a vortex with a coefficient η – describing the coupling between environment and vortex – is thus described by a number μ that behaves like an effective mass. We can also define the (real) quantity $|\Phi| = a$; it describes the *amplitude* of the deformation.

Page 1317

In the Schrödinger equation (786), the second derivative implies that the deformation 'wave packet' has tendency to spread out over space. Can you confirm that the wavelength–frequency relation for a vortex wave group leads to something like the indeterminacy relation (however, without a $\hbar$ appearing explicitly)?

Challenge 1601 ny

In summary, the complex amplitude Φ for a linear vortex in a rotating liquid behaves like the one-dimensional wave function of a non-relativistic free particle. In addition, we found a suggestion for the reason that complex numbers appear in the Schrödinger equation of quantum theory: they could be due to the intrinsic rotation of an underlying substrate. Is this suggestion correct? We will find out in the last part of our adventure.

Fluid space-time

General relativity shows that space can move and oscillate: space is a wobbly entity. Is space more similar to clouds, to fluids, or to solids?

Ref. 1148

An intriguing approach to space-time as a fluid was published in 1995 by Ted Jacobson. He explored what happens if space-time, instead of assumed to be continuous, is assumed to be the statistical average of numerous components moving in a disordered fashion.

Page 505

The standard description of general relativity describes space-time as an entity similar to a flexible mattress. Jacobson studied what happens if the mattress is assumed to be made of a fluid. A fluid is a collection of (undefined) components moving randomly and described by a temperature varying from place to place.

Page 1193

Jacobson started from the Fulling–Davies–Unruh effect and assumed that the local

Challenge 1600 ny

* A wave packet moves along the axis with a speed given by $v_{\text{packet}} = 2\eta\tau_0$, where τ_0 is the torsion of the helix of central wavelength.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 585 The two pure dislocation types, edge and screw dislocations, seen from the outside of a cubic crystal (left) and the mixed dislocation – a quarter of a dislocation loop – joining them in a horizontal section of the same crystal (right) (© Ulrich Kolberg)

fluid temperature is given by a multiple of the local gravitational acceleration. He also used the proportionality – correct on horizons – between area and entropy. Since the energy flowing through a horizon can be called heat, one can thus translate the expression $\delta Q = T\delta S$ into the expression $\delta E = a\delta A(c^2/4G)$, which describes the behaviour of space-time at horizons. As we have seen, this expression is fully equivalent to general relativity.

Page 1462

In other words, imagining space-time as a fluid is a powerful analogy that allows to deduce general relativity. Does this mean that space-time actually *is* similar to a fluid? So far, the analogy is not sufficient to answer the question and we have to wait for the last part of our adventure to settle it. In fact, just to confuse us a bit more, there is an old argument for the opposite statement.

Dislocations and solid space-time

General relativity tells us that space behaves like a deformable mattress; space thus behaves like a solid. There is a second argument that underlines this point and that exerts a continuing fascination. This argument is connected to a famous property of the motion of dislocations.

Dislocations are one-dimensional construction faults in crystals, as shown in Figure 585. A general dislocation is a mixture of the two pure dislocation types: *edge dislocations* and *screw dislocations*. Both are shown in Figure 585.

If one explores how the atoms involved in dislocations can rearrange themselves, one finds that edge dislocations can only move perpendicularly to the added plane. In contrast, screw dislocations can move in all directions.* An important case of general, mixed dislocations, i.e., of mixtures of edge and screw dislocations, are closed *dislocation rings*.

Challenge 1602 e

* See the uet.edu.pk/dmems/edge_dislocation.htm, uet.edu.pk/dmems/screw_dislocation.htm and uet.edu.pk/dmems/mixed_dislocation.htm web pages to watch a moving dislocation.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

On such a dislocation ring, the degree of mixture changes continuously from place to place.

Any dislocation is described by its *strength* and by its effective *size*; they are shown, respectively, in red and blue in Figure 585. The strength of a dislocation is measured by the so-called *Burgers vector*; it measures the misfits of the crystal around the dislocation. More precisely, the Burgers vector specifies by how much a section of perfect crystal needs to be displaced, after it has been cut open, to produce the dislocation. Obviously, the strength of a dislocation is quantized in multiples of a minimal Burgers vector. In fact, dislocations with large Burgers vectors can be seen as composed of dislocations of minimal Burgers vector, so that one usually studies only the latter.

The size or *width* of a dislocation is measured by an *effective width* w. Also the width is a multiple of the lattice vector. The width measures the size of the deformed region of the crystal around the dislocation. Obviously, the size of the dislocation depends on the elastic properties of the crystal, can take continuous values and is direction-dependent. The width is thus related to the energy content of a dislocation.

A general dislocation can move, though only in directions which are both perpendicular to its own orientation and to its Burgers vector. Screw dislocations are simpler: they can move in any direction. Now, the motion of screw dislocations has a peculiar property. We call c the speed of sound in a pure (say, cubic) crystal. As Frenkel and Kontorowa found in 1938, when a screw dislocation moves with velocity v, its width w changes as

Ref. 1149

$$w = \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}} \,. \tag{792}$$

In addition, the energy of the moving dislocation obeys

$$E = \frac{E_0}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}} \,. \tag{793}$$

A screw dislocation thus cannot move faster than the speed of sound c in a crystal and its width shows a speed-dependent contraction. (Edge dislocations have similar, but more complex behaviour.) The motion of screw dislocations in solids is thus described by the same effects and formulae that describe the motion of bodies in special relativity; the speed of sound is the limit speed for dislocations in the same way that the speed of light is the limit speed for objects.

Does this mean that elementary particles are dislocations of space or even of space-time, maybe even dislocation rings? The speculation is appealing, even though it supposes that space-time is a solid crystal, and thus contradicts the model of space or space-time as a fluid. Worse, we will soon encounter other reasons to reject modelling space-time as a lattice; maybe you can find a few arguments already by yourself. Still, expressions (792) and (793) for dislocations continue to fascinate.

Page 1410

Challenge 1603 s

At this point, we are confused. Space-time seems to be solid and liquid at the same time. Despite this contrast, the discussion somehow gives the impression that there is something waiting to be discovered. But what? We will find out in the last part of our adventure.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Polymers

Ref. 1150 The study of polymers is both economically important and theoretically fascinating. Polymers are materials built of long and flexible macromolecules that are sequences of many ('poly' in Greek) similar monomers. These macromolecules are thus wobbly entities.

Polymers form *solids*, like rubber or plexiglas, *melts*, like those used to cure teeth, and many kinds of *solutions*, like glues, paints, eggs, or people. Polymer gases are of lesser importance.

All the material properties of polymers, such as their elasticity, their viscosity, their electric conductivity or their unsharp melting point, depend on the number of monomers and the topology of their constituent molecules. In many cases, this dependence can be calculated. Let us explore an example.

If L is the contour length of a free, ideal, unbranched polymer molecule, the *average* end-to-end distance R is proportional to the square root of the length L:

$$R = \sqrt{Ll} \sim \sqrt{L} \quad \text{or} \quad R \sim \sqrt{N} \tag{794}$$

where N is the number of monomers and l is an effective monomer length describing the scale at which the polymer molecule is effectively stiff. R is usually much smaller than L; this means that free, ideal polymer molecules are usually in a *coiled* state.

Obviously, the end-to-end distance R varies from molecule to molecule, and follows a Gaussian distribution for the probability P of a end-to-end distance R:

$$P(R) \sim \mathrm{e}^{\frac{-3R^2}{2Nl^2}} \,. \tag{795}$$

The average end-to-end distance mentioned above is the root-mean-square of this distribution. Non-ideal polymers are polymers which have, like non-ideal gases, interactions with neighbouring molecules or with solvents. In practice, polymers follow the ideal behaviour quite rarely: polymers are ideal only in certain solvents and in melts.

If a polymer is *stretched*, the molecules must rearrange. This changes their entropy and produces an elastic force f that tries to inhibit the stretching. For an ideal polymer, the force is not due to molecular interactions, but is entropic in nature. Therefore the force can be deduced from the *free energy*

$$F \sim -T \ln P(R) \tag{796}$$

of the polymer: the force is then simply given as $f = \partial F(R)/\partial R$. For an ideal polymer, using its probability distribution, the force turns out to be proportional to the stretched
Challenge 1604 e length. Thus the spring constant k can be introduced, given by

$$k = \frac{f}{R} = \frac{3T}{Ll} \,. \tag{797}$$

We thus deduced a material property, the spring constant k, from the simple idea that polymers are made of long, flexible molecules. The proportionality to temperature T is a result of the entropic nature of the force; the dependence on L shows that longer

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 586 The knot diagrams for the simplest prime knots (© Robert Scharein)

molecules are more easy to stretch. For a real, non-ideal polymer, the calculation is more complex, but the procedure is the same. Indeed, this is the mechanism at the basis of the elasticity of rubber.

Using the free energy of polymer conformations, we can calculate the material properties of macromolecules in many other situations, such as their reaction to compression, their volume change in the melt, their interactions in solutions, the effect of branched molecules, etc. This is a vast field of knowledge on its own, which we do not pursue here. Modern research topics include the study of knotted polymers and the study of polymer mixtures. Extensive computer calculations and experiments are regularly compared.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Knots and links

> Don't touch this, or I shall tie your fingers into knots!
>
> (Surprisingly efficient child education technique.)

Knots and their generalization are central to the study of wobbly object motion. A *(mathematical) knot* is a closed piece of rubber string, i.e., a string whose ends have been glued together, which cannot be deformed into a circle or a simple loop. The simple loop is also called the *trivial knot*.

Knots are of importance in the context of this chapter as they visualize the limitations of the motion of wobbly entities. In addition, we will discover other reasons to study knots later on. In this section, we just have a bit of fun.* Ref. 1151

In 1949, Schubert proved that every knot can be decomposed in a unique way as sum of prime knots. Knots thus behave similarly to integers. Ref. 1152

If prime knots are ordered by their crossing numbers, as shown in Figure 586, the trivial knot (0_1) is followed by the trefoil knot (3_1) and by the figure-eight knot (4_1). The figure only shows *prime knots*, i.e., knots that cannot be decomposed into two knots that are connected by two parallel strands. In addition, the figure only shows one of the often possible two mirror versions.

Together with the search for invariants, the tabulation of knots is a modern mathematical sport. Flat knot diagrams are usually ordered by the minimal number of crossings as done in Figure 586. There is 1 knot with zero, 1 with three and 1 with four crossings (not counting mirror knots); there are 2 knots with five and 3 with six crossings, 7 knots with seven, 21 knots with eight, 41 with nine, 165 with ten, 552 with eleven, 2176 with twelve, 9988 with thirteen, 46 972 with fourteen, 253 293 with fifteen and 1 388 705 knots with sixteen crossings. Ref. 1152

The mirror image of a knot usually, but not always, is different from the original. If you want a challenge, try to show that the trefoil knot, the knot with three crossings, is different from its mirror image. The first mathematical proof was by Max Dehn in 1914.

Antiknots do not exist. An *antiknot* would be a knot on a rope that cancels out the corresponding knot when the two are made to meet along the rope. It is easy to prove that this is impossible. We take an infinite sequence of knots and antiknots on a string, $K - K + K - K + K - K \ldots$. On one hand, we could make them disappear in this way $K-K+K-K+K-K\ldots = (K-K)+(K-K)+(K-K)\ldots = 0$. On the other hand, we could do the same thing using $K-K+K-K+K-K\ldots = K(-K+K)+(-K+K)+(-K+K)\ldots = K$. The only knot K with an antiknot is thus the unknot $K = 0$.** Ref. 1154

How do we describe such a knot through the telephone? Mathematicians have spent a lot of time to figure out smart ways to achieve it. The obvious way is to flatten the knot onto a plane and to list the position and the type (below or above) of the crossings. But what is the *simplest* way to describe knots by the telephone? The task is not completely finished, but the end is in sight. Mathematicians do not talk about 'telephone messages',

* Beautiful illustrations and detailed information about knots can be found on the Knot Atlas website at katlas.math.toronto.edu and at the KnotPlot website at www.knotplot.com.

** This proof does *not* work when performed with numbers; we would be able to deduce $1 = 0$ by setting K=1. Why is this proof valid with knots but not with numbers? Challenge 1605 s

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 587 Crossing types in knots



FIGURE 588 The Reidemeister moves and the flype

they talk about *knot invariants*, i.e., about quantities that do not depend on the precise shape of the knot. At present, the best description of knots use polynomial invariants. Most of them are based on a discovery by Vaughan Jones in 1984. However, though the Jones polynomial allows to uniquely describe most simple knots, it fails to do so for more complex ones. But the Jones polynomial finally allowed to prove that a diagram which is alternating and eliminates nugatory crossings (i.e. if it is 'reduced') is indeed one which has minimal number of crossings. The polynomial also allows to show that any two reduced alternating diagrams are related by a sequence of flypes.

– CS – More on knot polynomials and moves will be included here – CS –

In short, the simplest way to describe a knot through the telephone is to give its Kauffman polynomial, together with a few other polynomials.

Since knots are stable in time, a knotted line in three dimensions is equivalent to a knotted surface in space-time. When thinking in higher dimensions, we need to be careful. Every knot (or knotted line) can be untied in four or more dimensions. However, there is no surface *embedded* in four dimensions which has as $t = 0$ slice a knot, and as $t = 1$ slice the circle. Such a surface embedding needs at least five dimensions.

In higher dimensions, knots are thus possible *only* if n-spheres are tied instead of circles; for example, as just said, 2-spheres can be tied into knots in 4 dimensions, 3-spheres in 5 dimensions and so forth.

The hardest open problems that you can tell your grandmother

Even though mathematicians have achieved good progress in the classification of knots, surprisingly, they know next to nothing about the *shapes* of knots. Here are a few problems that are still open today:

— Take a piece of rope, and tie a knot into it. Pull the rope as tight as possible. By how many diameters did the ends of the rope come closer? Mathematicians call this the *ropelength* of an open knot (or of a long knot). Of course, there are computer approxi-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 589 The diagrams for the simplest links with two and three components (© Robert Scharein)



FIGURE 590 The ropelength problem for the simple clasp, and the candidate configuration that probably minimizes ropelenth, leaving a gap between the two ropes (© Jason Cantarella)

Ref. 1155, Ref. 1156

mations for the value – though only a few. The ropelength for the open granny/trefoil knot is about 10.1 diameters, and for the open figure-eight knot it is around 13.7 diameters. But there *no* formula giving these numbers is known.

— For mathematical knots, i.e., *closed* knots, the problem is equally unsolved. For example: the ropelength of the tight trefoil knot is known to be around 16.37 diameters, and that of the figure-eight knot about 21.04 diameters. For beautiful visualizations of the tightening process, see the animations on the website www.jasoncantarella.com/movs. But what is the formula giving the ropelength values? Nobody knows, because the precise shape of the trefoil knot – or of any other knot – is unknown. Lou Kauffman has a simple comment for the situation: 'It is a scandal of mathematics!'

Ref. 1156

— Mathematicians also study more general structures than knots. *Links* are the generalization of knots to several closed strands. *Braids* and *long links* are the generalization of links to *open* strands. Now comes the next surprise, illustrated in Figure 590.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Even for two ropes that form a simple *clasp*, i.e., two linked letters 'U', the ropelength problem is unsolved – and there is not even a knot involved! In fact, in 2004, Jason Cantarella and his colleagues have presented a candidate for the shape that minimizes ropelength. Astonishingly, the candidate configuration leaves a small gap between the two ropes, as shown in Figure 590.

Ref. 1157

In short, the shape of knots is a research topic that has barely taken off. Therefore we have to leave these questions for a future occasion.

Curiosities and fun challenges on knots and wobbly entities

> Any pair of shoes proves that we live on the inside of a sphere. Their soles are worn out at the ends, and hardly at all in between.
>
> Anonymous

Proteins, the molecules that make up many cell structures, are chains of aminoacids. It seems that very few proteins are knotted, and that most of these form trefoil knots. However, a figure-eight knotted protein has been discovered in 2000 by William Taylor.

Ref. 1158

* *

Knots form also in other polymers. They seem to play a role in the formation of radicals in carbohydrates. Research on knots in polymers is presently in full swing.

* *

This is the simplest unsolved knot problem: Imagine an ideally wobbly rope, that is, a rope that has the same radius everywhere, but whose curvature can be changed as one prefers. Tie a trefoil knot into the rope. By how much do the ends of the rope get nearer? In 2006, there are only numerical estimates for the answer: about 10.1 radiuses. There is no formula yielding the number 10.1. Alternatively, solve the following problem: what is the rope length of a closed trefoil knot? Also in this case, only numerical values are known – about 16.33 radiuses – but no exact formula. The same is valid for any other knot, of course.

Challenge 1606 r

* *

A famous type of eel, the *knot fish Myxine glutinosa*, also called hagfish or slime eel, is able to make a knot in his body and move this knot from head to tail. It uses this motion to cover its body with a slime that prevents predators from grabbing it; it also uses this motion to escape the grip of predators, to get rid of the slime after the danger is over, and to push against a prey it is biting in order to extract a piece of meat. All studied knot fish form only left handed trefoil knots, by the way; this is another example of chirality in nature.

Ref. 1159

* *

One of the most incredible discoveries of recent years is related to knots in DNA molecules. The *DNA molecules* inside cell nuclei can be hundreds of millions of base pairs long; they regularly need to be packed and unpacked. When this is done, often the same

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 591 A hagfish tied into a knot (© Christine Ortlepp)



FIGURE 592 How apparent order for long rope coils (left) changes over time when shaking the container (right) (© 2007 PNAS)

happens as when a long piece of rope or a long cable is taken out of a closet.

It is well known that you can roll up a rope and put it into a closet in such a way that it looks orderly stored, but when it is pulled out at one end, a large number of knots is suddenly found. In 2007, this effects was finally explored in detail. Strings of a few metres in length were put into square boxes and shaken, in order to speed up the effect. The result, shown partly in Figure 592, was astonishing: almost every imaginable knot – up to a certain complexity that depends on the length and flexibility of the string – was formed in this way.

Ref. 1160

To make a long story short, this also happens to nature when it unpacks DNA in cell nuclei. Life requires that DNA molecules move inside the cell nucleus without hindrance. So what does nature do? Nature takes a simpler approach: when there are unwanted crossings, it cuts the DNA, moves it over and puts the ends together again. In cell nuclei, there are special enzymes, the so-called topoisomerases, which perform this process. The details of this fascinating process are still object of modern research.

* *

The great mathematician Carl-Friedrich Gauß was the first person to ask what would happen when an electrical current I flows along a wire A linked with a wire B. He discovered a beautiful result by calculating the effect of the magnetic field of one wire onto the other. Gauss found the expression

Ref. 1161

$$\frac{1}{4\pi I}\int_A \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}_A \cdot \boldsymbol{B}_B = \frac{1}{4\pi}\int_A \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}_A \cdot \int_B \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}_B \times \frac{(\boldsymbol{x}_A - \boldsymbol{x}_B)}{|\boldsymbol{x}_A - \boldsymbol{x}_B|^3} = n\,, \tag{798}$$

where the integrals are performed along the wires. Gauss found that the number n does

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 593 A large raindrop falling downwards



FIGURE 594 Is this possible?

not depend on the precise shape of the wires, but only on the way they are linked. Deforming the wires does not change it. Mathematicians call such a number a *topological invariant*. In short, Gauss discovered a physical method to calculate a mathematical invariant for links; the research race to do the same for other invariants, also for knots and braids, is still going on today.

In the 1980s, Edward Witten was able to generalize this approach to include the nuclear interactions, and to define more elaborate knot invariants, a discovery that brought him the Fields medal.

* *

Knots are also of importance at Planck scales, the smallest dimensions possible in nature. We will soon explore how knots and the structure of elementary particles are related.

* *

Challenge 1607 r

Knots appear rarely in nature. For example, tree roots do not seem to grow many knots during the lifetime of a plant. How do plants avoid this? In other words, why are there no knotted bananas in nature?

* *

Challenge 1608 ny

If we move along the knot and count the crossings where we stay above and subtract the number of crossings where we pass below, we get a number called the *writhe* of the knot. It is not an invariant, but usually a tool in building them. The writhe is not necessarily invariant under one of the three Reidemeister moves. Can you see which one? However, the writhe is invariant under flypes.

* *

Challenge 1609 s

Ref. 1162

What is the shape of raindrops? Try to picture it. However, use your reason, not your prejudice! By the way, it turns out that there is a maximum size for raindrops, with a value of about 4 mm. The shape of such a large raindrop is shown in Figure 593. Can you imagine where the limit comes from?

Page 740

Page 752

For comparison, the drops in clouds, fog or mist are in the range of 1 to 100 μm, with a peak at 10 to 15 μm. In situations where all droplets are of similar size and where light is scattered only once by the droplets, one can observe coronae, glories or fogbows.

* *

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 595 A flying snake, *Chrysopelea paradisii*, performing the feat that gave it its name (QuickTime film © Jake Socha)

Challenge 1610 s What is the entity shown in Figure 594 – a knot, a braid or a link?

* *

Challenge 1611 d Can you find a way to classify tie knots?

* *

Challenge 1612 s Are you able to find a way to classify the way shoe laces can be threaded?

* *

A striking example of how wobbly entities can behave is given in Figure 595. There is indeed a family of snakes that like to jump off a tree and sail through the air to a neighbouring tree. Both the jump and the sailing technique have been studied in recent years. The website www.flyingsnake.org by Jake Socha provides additional films. His fascinating publications tell more about these intriguing reptiles. Ref. 1163

* *

When a plane moves at supersonic speed through humid air, sometimes a conical cloud forms and moves with the plane. How does this cloud differ from the ones studied above? Page 247 Challenge 1613 e

* *

Challenge 1614 ny One of the biggest challenges about clouds: is it possible to make rain on demand? So far, there are almost no positive results. Inventing a method, possibly based on hygroscopic salt injection, will be a great help to mankind.

Summary on wobbly objects

We can sum up the possible motions of extended systems in a few key themes. In earlier chapters we studied the first: waves, solitons and interpenetration. In this chapter we explored the way to move through shape change, explored eversion and duality, studied Page 240

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

polymers, knots and their rearrangement, and looked at the relation between clouds and extension. As an interesting application, we explored some possible analogies for the Schrödinger equation and for space-time.

The motion of wobbly objects is often a neglected topic in textbooks on motion. Research is progressing at full speed; it is expected that many beautiful analogies will be discovered in the near future. For example, in this chapter we have not explored any possible analogy for the motion of light; similarly, including quantum theory into the description of wobbly bodies' motion remains a fascinating issue for anybody aiming to publish in a new field.

Challenge 1615 r



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 51

QUANTUM PHYSICS IN A NUTSHELL

Compared to classical physics, quantum theory is remarkably more complex. The basic idea however, is simple: in nature there is a minimum change, or a minimum action, or again, a minimum angular momentum $\hbar/2$. The minimum action leads to all the strange observations made in the microscopic domain, such as wave behaviour of matter, tunnelling, indeterminacy relations, randomness in measurements, quantization of angular momentum, pair creation, decay, indistinguishability and particle reactions.

The essence of quantum theory is thus the lack of the infinitely small. The mathematics of quantum theory is often disturbingly involved. Was this part of our walk worth the effort? It was; the accuracy is excellent and the results profound. We give an overview of both and then turn to the list of questions that are still left open.

Achievements in precision

Quantum theory improved the accuracy of predictions from the few – if any – digits common in classical mechanics to the full number of digits – sometimes thirteen – that can be measured today. The limited precision is usually *not* given by the inaccuracy of theory, it is given by the measurement accuracy. In other words, the agreement is only limited by the amount of money the experimenter is willing to spend. Table 115 shows this in more detail.

TABLE 115 Selected comparisons between classical physics, quantum theory and experiment

Observable	Classical prediction	Prediction of quantum theory[a]	Measurement	Cost estimate[b]
Simple motion of bodies				
Indeterminacy	0	$\Delta x \Delta p \geqslant \hbar/2$	$(1 \pm 10^{-2})\,\hbar/2$	10 k€
Matter wavelength	none	$\lambda p = 2\pi\hbar$	$(1 \pm 10^{-2})\,\hbar$	10 k€
Tunnelling rate in alpha decay	0	$1/\tau$ is finite	$(1 \pm 10^{-2})\,\tau$	5 k€
Compton wavelength	none	$\lambda_c = h/m_e c$	$(1 \pm 10^{-3})\,\lambda$	20 k€
Pair creation rate	0	σE	agrees	100 k€
Radiative decay time in hydrogen	none	$\tau \sim 1/n^3$	(1 ± 10^{-2})	5 k€

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Observable	Classical prediction	Prediction of quantum theory [a]	Measurement	Cost [b] estimate
Smallest action and angular momentum	0	$\hbar/2$	$(1 \pm \pm 10^{-6})\,\hbar/2$	10 k€
Casimir effect	0	$ma/A = (\pi^2\hbar c)/(240r^4)$	(1 ± 10^{-3})	30 k€
Colours of objects				
Spectrum of hot objects	diverges	$\lambda_{max} = hc/(4.956\,kT)$	$(1 \pm 10^{-4})\ \Delta\lambda$	10 k€
Lamb shift	none	$\Delta\lambda = 1057.86(1)$ MHz	$(1 \pm 10^{-6})\,\Delta\lambda$	50 k€
Rydberg constant	none	$R_\infty = m_e c\alpha^2/2h$	$(1 \pm 10^{-9})\,R_\infty$	50 k€
Stefan–Boltzmann constant	none	$\sigma = \pi^2 k^4/60\hbar^3 c^2$	$(1 \pm 3 \cdot 10^{-8})\,\sigma$	20 k€
Wien's displacement constant	none	$b = \lambda_{max} T$	$(1 \pm 10^{-5})\,b$	20 k€
Refractive index of water	none	1.34	a few %	1 k€
Photon-photon scattering	0	from QED: finite	agrees	50 M€
Particle and interaction properties				
Electron gyromagnetic ratio	1 or 2	2.002 319 304 3(1)	2.002 319 304 3737(82)	30 M€
Z boson mass	none	$m_Z^2 = m_W^2(1 + \sin\theta_W^2)$	$(1 \pm 10^{-3})\,m_Z$	100 M€
proton mass	none	$(1 \pm 5\,\%)\,m_p$	m_p =1.67 yg	1 M€
Proton lifetime	≈ 1 µs	∞	$> 10^{35}$ a	100 M€
Composite matter properties				
Atom lifetime	≈ 1 µs	∞	$> 10^{20}$ a	1 €
Molecular size	none	from QED	within 10^{-3}	20 k€
Von Klitzing constant	∞	$h/e^2 = \mu_0 c/2\alpha$	$(1 \pm 10^{-7})\,h/e^2$	1 M€
AC Josephson constant	0	$2e/h$	$(1 \pm 10^{-6})\,2e/h$	5 M€
Heat capacity of metals at 0 K	25 J/K	0	$< 10^{-3}$ J/K	10 k€
Heat capacity of diatomic gas at 0 K	25 J/K	0	$< 10^{-3}$ J/K	10 k€
Water density	none	1000.00 kg/m^3 at 4 °C	agrees	10 k€
Minimum electr. conductivity	0	$G = 2e^2/\hbar$	$G(1 \pm 10^{-3})$	3 k€
Ferromagnetism	none	exists	exists	2 €
Superfluidity	none	exists	exists	200 k€
Bose–Einsein condensation	none	exists	exists	2 M€
Superconductivity (metal)	none	exists	exists	100 k€

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Observable	Classical prediction	Prediction of quantum theory[a]	Measurement	Cost[b] estimate
Superconductivity (high T)	none	*none yet*	exists	100 k€

a. All these predictions are calculated from the quantities of Table 116, and no other input. Their most precise experimental values are given in Appendix C.

b. Sometimes the cost for the calculation of the prediction is higher than that of the experimental observation. (Can you spot the examples?) The sum of the two is given.

We notice that the predicted values are not noticeably different from the measured ones. If we remember that classical physics does not allow to calculate any of the predicted values we get an idea of the progress quantum physics has allowed. But despite this impressive agreement, there still are *unexplained* observations. In fact, these unexplained observations provide the input for the calculations just cited; we list them in detail below, in Table 116.

In summary, in the microscopic domain we are left with the impression that quantum theory is in *perfect* correspondence with nature; despite prospects of fame and riches, despite the largest number of researchers ever, no contradiction with observation has been found yet.

Physical results of quantum theory

> Deorum offensae diis curae.
> Voltaire, *Traité sur la tolérance.*

All of quantum theory can be resumed in two sentences.

▷ *In nature, actions smaller than* $\hbar/2 = 0.53 \cdot 10^{-34}$ Js *are not observed.*

▷ *All intrinsic properties in nature – with the exception of mass – such as electric charge, spin, parities, etc., appear as integer numbers; in composed systems they either add or multiply.*

In fact, the second statement results from the first. The existence of a smallest action in nature directly leads to the main lesson we learned about motion in the quantum part of our adventure:

▷ *If it moves, it is made of quantons, or quantum particles.*

This statement applies to everything, thus to all objects and to all images, i.e., to matter and to radiation. Moving stuff is made of *quantons*. Stones, water waves, light, sound waves, earthquakes, gelatine and everything else we can interact with is made of quantum particles. We started the quantum part of our mountain ascent with the title question: what is matter and what are interactions? Now we know: they are composites of

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

elementary particles.

To be clear, an *elementary particle* is a countable entity, smaller than its own Compton wavelength, described by energy, momentum, and the following *complete* list of intrinsic properties: mass, spin, electric charge, colour, weak isospin, parity, charge parity, isospin, strangeness, charm, topness, beauty, lepton number and baryon number. Experiments so far failed to detect a non-vanishing size for any elementary particle.

Page 1290

Moving entities are made of quantum particles. To see how deep this result is, you can apply it to all those moving entities for which it is usually forgotten, such as ghosts, spirits, angels, nymphs, daemons, devils, gods, goddesses and souls. You can check yourself what happens when their particle nature is taken into account.

Challenge 1617 e

Quantons, or quantum particles, differ from everyday particles: quantum particles interfere: they behave like a mixture of particles and waves. This property, follows from the existence of $\hbar$, the smallest action in nature. From the existence of a minimum action, quantum theory deduces all its statements about quantum particle motion. We summarize the main ones.

There is *no rest* for microscopic particles. All objects obey the indeterminacy principle, which states that the indeterminacies in position x and momentum p follow

$$\Delta x \Delta p \geqslant \hbar/2 \quad \text{with} \quad \hbar = 1.1 \cdot 10^{-34}\,\text{Js} \tag{799}$$

and making rest an impossibility. The state of particles is defined by the same observables as in classical physics, with the difference that observables do not commute. Classical physics appears in the limit that the Planck constant $\hbar$ can effectively be set to zero.

Quantum theory introduces a *probabilistic element* into motion. It results from the minimum action value through the interactions with the baths in the environment of any system.

Large number of identical particles with the same momentum behave like *waves*. The so-called de Broglie wavelength λ is given by the momentum p of a single particle through

$$\lambda = \frac{h}{p} = \frac{2\pi\hbar}{p} \tag{800}$$

both in the case of matter and of radiation. This relation is the origin of the wave behaviour of light. The light particles are called photons; their observation is now standard practice. All waves interfere, refract and diffract. This applies to electrons, atoms, photons and molecules. All waves being made of particles, all waves can be seen, touched and moved. Light for example, can be 'seen' in photon-photon scattering, can be 'touched' using the Compton effect and it can be 'moved' by gravitational bending. Matter particles, such as molecules or atoms, can be seen, e.g. in electron microscopes, as well as touched and moved, e.g. with atomic force microscopes. The interference and diffraction of wave particles is observed daily in the electron microscope.

Particles cannot be enclosed. Even though matter is impenetrable, quantum theory shows that tight boxes or insurmountable obstacles do not exist. Waiting long enough always allows to overcome boundaries, since there is a finite probability to overcome any obstacle. This process is called *tunnelling* when seen from the spatial point of view and is called *decay* when seen from the temporal point of view. Tunnelling explains the working

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

of television tubes as well as radioactive decay.

Particles possess an intrinsic angular momentum called *spin*, specifying their behaviour under rotations. Bosons have integer spin, fermions have half integer spin. An even number of bound fermions or any number of bound bosons yield a composite boson; an odd number of bound fermions or an infinite number of interacting bosons yield a low-energy fermion. Solids are impenetrable because of the fermion character of its electrons in the atoms.

Identical particles are *indistinguishable*. Radiation is made of indistinguishable particles called bosons, matter of fermions. Under exchange, fermions commute at space-like separations, whereas bosons anticommute. All other properties of quantum particles are the same as for classical particles, namely countability, interaction, mass, charge, angular momentum, energy, momentum, position, as well as impenetrability for matter and penetrability for radiation.

In collisions, particles *interact locally*, through the exchange of other particles. When matter particles collide, they interact through the exchange of virtual bosons, i.e., off-shell bosons. Motion change is thus due to particle exchange. Exchange bosons of even spin mediate only attractive interactions. Exchange bosons of odd spin mediate repulsive interactions as well.

Quantum theory defines *elementary* particles as particles smaller than their own Compton wavelength. Experiments so far failed to detect a non-vanishing size or a inner structure for any elementary particle.

The properties of collisions imply the existence of *antiparticles*, as regularly observed in experiments. Elementary fermions, in contrast to many elementary bosons, differ from their antiparticles; they can be created and annihilated only in pairs. Apart from neutrinos, elementary fermions have non-vanishing mass and move slower than light.

Images, made of radiation, are described by the same properties as matter. Images can only be localized with a precision of the wavelength λ of the radiation producing it.

The appearance of Planck's constant $\hbar$ implies that *length scales* and *time scales* exist in nature. Quantum theory introduces a fundamental jitter in every example of motion. Thus the infinitely small is eliminated. In this way, lower limits to structural dimensions and to many other measurable quantities appear. In particular, quantum theory shows that it is impossible that on the electrons in an atom small creatures live in the same way that humans live on the Earth circling the Sun. Quantum theory shows the impossibility of Lilliput.

Clocks and metre bars have *finite precision*, due to the existence of a smallest action and due to their interactions with baths. On the other hand, all measurement apparatuses must contain baths, since otherwise they would not be able to record results.

Ref. 1118 Quantum physics leaves no room for cold fusion, astrology, teleportation, telekinesis, supernatural phenomena, multiple universes, or faster than light phenomena – the EPR paradox notwithstanding.

Results of quantum field theory

Quantum field theory is that part of quantum theory that includes the process of transformation of particles into each other. The possibility of transformation results from the

Page 988 existence of a minimum action and of a maximum speed. Particle transformations have

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

important consequences.

Radioactivity, the working of the sun, the history of the composite matter we are made of is due to particle transformations.

Objects are composed of quantum particles. Quantum field theory provides a complete list of the intrinsic properties which make up what is called an 'object' in everyday life, namely the same which characterize particles. All other properties of objects, such as shape, temperature, (everyday) colour, elasticity, density, magnetism, etc., are merely combinations of the properties from the particle properties. In particular, quantum theory specifies an object, like every system, as a part of nature interacting weakly and incoherently with its environment.

Page 1291

Composite matter is separable because of the finite interaction energies of the constituents. Atoms are made of a nucleus made of quarks surrounded by electrons. Their interactions provide an effective minimal length scale to all everyday matter.

Elementary particles have the same properties as either objects or images, except divisibility. The elementary fermions (objects) are: the six leptons electron, muon, tau, each with its corresponding neutrino, and the six quarks. The elementary bosons (images) are the photon, the eight gluons and the two weak interaction bosons.

Page 1290

Quantum electrodynamics is the quantum field description of electromagnetism. Like all the other interactions, its Lagrangian is determined by the gauge group, the requirements of space-time (Poincaré) symmetry, permutation symmetry and renormalizability. The latter requirement follows from the continuity of space-time. Through the effects of virtual particles, QED describes decay, pair creation, vacuum energy, Unruh radiation for accelerating observers, the Casimir effect, i.e., the attraction of neutral conducting bodies, and the limit for the localization of particles. In fact, an object of mass m can be localized only within intervals of the Compton wavelength

$$\lambda_C = \frac{h}{mc} = \frac{2\pi\hbar}{mc} \,, \tag{801}$$

where c is the speed of light. At the latest at these distances we must abandon the classical description and use quantum field theory. Quantum field theory introduces corrections to classical electrodynamics; among others, the nonlinearities thus appearing produce small departures from the superposition principle for electromagnetic fields, resulting in photon-photon scattering.

Quantum chromodynamics, the field theory of the strong interactions, explains the masses of mesons and baryons through its descriptions as bound quark states. At fundamental scales, the strong interaction is mediated by eight elementary gluons. At femtometre scales, the strong interaction effectively acts through the exchange of spin 0 pions, is strongly attractive, and leads to the formation of atomic nuclei.

Page 1248

The theory of electroweak interactions describes electromagnetism and the weak interactions. It includes the Higgs mechanism, massive Vector bosons, quark mixings and neutrino mixings.

Quantum theory explains the origin of material properties and the origin of the properties of life. Quantum theory, especially the study of the electroweak and the strong forces, has allowed to give a common basis of concepts and descriptions to materials science, nuclear physics, chemistry, biology, medicine and to most of astronomy.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

For example, the same concepts allow to answer questions such as why water is liquid at room temperature, why copper is red, why the rainbow is coloured, why the Sun and the stars continue to shine, why there are about 110 elements, where a tree takes the material to make its wood and why we are able to move our right hand at our own will.

Matter objects are permanent because, in contrast to radiation, matter particles can only disappear when their antiparticles are present. It turns out that in our environment antimatter is almost completely absent, except for the cases of radioactivity and cosmic rays, where it appears in tiny amounts.

The particle description of nature, e.g. particle number conservation, follows from the possibility to describe interactions perturbatively. This is possible only at low and medium energies. At extremely high energies the situation changes and non-perturbative effects come into play.

Is quantum theory magic?

Studying nature is like experiencing magic. Nature often looks different from what it is. During magic we are fooled – but only if we forget our own limitations. Once we start to see ourselves as part of the game, we start to understand the tricks. That is the fun of it. The same happens in physics.

* *

The world looks irreversible, even though it isn't. We never remember the future. We are fooled because we are macroscopic.

* *

The world looks decoherent, even though it isn't. We are fooled again because we are macroscopic.

* *

There are no clocks possible in nature. We are fooled because we are surrounded by a huge number of particles.

* *

Motion seems to disappear, even though it is eternal. We are fooled again, because our senses cannot experience the microscopic domain.

* *

The world seems dependent on the choice of the frame of reference, even though it is not. We are fooled because we are used to live on the surface of the Earth.

* *

Objects seem distinguishable, even though the statistical properties of their components show that they are not. We are fooled because we live at low energies.

* *

Matter looks continuous, even though it isn't. We are fooled because of the limitations of

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

our senses.

In short, our human condition permanently fools us. The answer to the title question is affirmative: quantum theory is magic. That is its main attraction.

The dangers of buying a can of beans

Another summary of our walk so far is given by the ultimate product warning, which according to certain well-informed lawyers should be printed on every cans of beans and on every product package. It shows in detail how deeply our human condition fools us.

Ref. 1119

Warning: care should be taken when **looking** at this product:

- It emits heat radiation.
- Bright light has the effect to compress this product.

Warning: care should be taken when **touching** this product:

- Part of it could heat up while another part cools down, causing severe burns.

Warning: care should be taken when **handling** this product:

- This product consists of at least 99.999 999 999 999 % empty space.
- This product contains particles moving with speeds higher than one million kilometres per hour.
- Every kilogram of this product contains the same amount of energy as liberated by about one hundred nuclear bombs.*
- In case this product is brought in contact with antimatter, a catastrophic explosion will occur.
- In case this product is rotated, it will emit gravitational radiation.

Warning: care should be taken when **transporting** this product:

- The force needed depends on its velocity, as does its weight.
- This product will emit additional radiation when accelerated.
- This product attracts, with a force that increases with decreasing distance, every other object around, including its purchaser's kids.

Warning: care should be taken when **storing** this product:

- It is impossible to keep this product in a specific place and at rest at the same time.
- Except when stored underground at a depth of several kilometres, over time cosmic radiation will render this product radioactive.
- This product may disintegrate in the next 10^{35} years.
- It could cool down and lift itself into the air.

* A standard nuclear warhead has an explosive yield of about 0.2 megatons (implied is the standard explosive trinitrotoluene or TNT), about thirteen times the yield of the Hiroshima bomb, which was 15 kilotonne. A megatonne is defined as 1 Pcal=4.2 PJ, even though TNT delivers about 5 % slightly less energy than this value. In other words, a megaton is the energy content of about 47 g of matter. That is less than a handful for most solids or liquids.

Ref. 1120

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

- Parts of this product are hidden in other dimensions.
- This product warps space and time in its vicinity, including the storage container.
- Even if stored in a closed container, this product is influenced and influences all other objects in the universe, including your parents in law.
- This product can disappear from its present location and reappear at any random place in the universe, including your neighbour's garage.

Warning: care should be taken when **travelling away from** this product:

- It will arrive at the expiration date before the purchaser does so.

Warning: care should be taken when **using** this product:

- Any use whatsoever will increase the entropy of the universe.
- The constituents of this product are exactly the same as those of any other object in the universe, including those of rotten fish.
- The use could be disturbed by the (possibly) forthcoming collapse of the universe.

The impression of a certain paranoid side to physics is purely coincidental.

The essence of quantum theory

We can summarize quantum physics with a simple statement: *quantum physics is the description of matter and radiation* without *the concept of infinitely small*. Matter and radiation are described by finite quantities.

We had already eliminated the infinitely large in our exploration of relativity. Quantum theory eliminates the infinitely small from the description of matter and radiation. However, some types of infinities remain. We had to retain the infinitely small in the description of space or time, and in topics related to them, such as renormalization. Therefore, we did not manage to eliminate all infinities yet; we are not yet at the end of our quest. Surprisingly, we shall soon find out that a completely finite description of all of nature is equally impossible. Let us have a look at the path that still remains to be followed.

What is unexplained by quantum theory and general relativity?

The material gathered in this quantum part of our mountain ascent, together with the earlier summary of general relativity, allows us to describe all observed phenomena connected to motion. Therefore, we are also able to provide a complete list of the *unexplained* properties of nature. Whenever we ask 'why?' about an observation and continue doing so after each answer, we arrive at one of the points listed in Table 116.

TABLE 116 *Everything* quantum field theory and general relativity do *not* explain; in other words, a list of *the only* experimental data and criteria available for tests of the unified description of motion

Observable	Property unexplained so far
Local quantities, from quantum theory	
α_{em}	the low energy value of the electromagnetic coupling constant
α_{w}	the low energy value of the weak coupling constant
α_{s}	the value of the strong coupling constant at one specific energy value

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Observable	Property unexplained so far
m_q	the values of the 6 quark masses
m_l	the values of 6 lepton masses
m_W	the value of the mass of the W vector boson
m_H	the value of the mass of the scalar Higgs boson
θ_w	the value of the weak mixing angle
$\theta_{12}, \theta_{13}, \theta_{23}$	the value of the three quark mixing angles
δ	the value of the CP violating phase for quarks
$\theta^\nu_{12}, \theta^\nu_{13}, \theta^\nu_{23}$	the value of the three neutrino mixing angles
$\delta^\nu, \alpha_1, \alpha_2$	the value of the three CP violating phases for neutrinos
3	the number of particle generations
$3+1$	the number of space and time dimensions
Global quantities, from general relativity	
$1.2(1) \cdot 10^{26}$ m (?)	the distance of the horizon, i.e., the 'size' of the universe (if it makes sense)
10^{82} (?)	the number of baryons in the universe (if it makes sense), i.e., the average matter density in the universe
10^{92} (?)	the initial conditions for more than 10^{92} particle fields in the universe (if or as long as they make sense), including those at the origin of galaxies or stars
$\rho_{de} = 0.5\,\mathrm{nJ/m^3}$	the value and nature of the observed vacuum energy density, dark energy or cosmological constant
ρ_{dm}	the nature of dark matter
Local structures, from quantum theory	
$S(n)$	the origin of particle identity, i.e., of permutation symmetry
Ren. group	the renormalization properties, i.e., the existence of point particles
SO(3,1)	the origin of Lorentz (or Poincaré) symmetry (i.e., of spin, position, energy, momentum)
C^*	the origin of the algebra of observables
Gauge group	the origin of gauge symmetry, in particular:
U(1)	the origin of the electromagnetic gauge group (i.e., of the quantization of electric charge, as well as the vanishing of magnetic charge)
SU(2)	the origin of weak interaction gauge group
SU(3)	the origin of strong interaction gauge group
Global structures, from general relativity	
maybe $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{S}^3$ (?)	the unknown topology of the universe (if it makes sense)

The table has several notable aspects.* First of all, neither quantum mechanics nor gen-

* Every now and then, researchers provide other lists of open questions. However, they all fall into the list above. The elucidation of dark matter and of dark energy, the details of the big bang, the modifications of general relativity by quantum theory, the mass of neutrinos, the quest for unknown elementary particles such as the inflaton field, magnetic monopoles or others, the functioning of cosmic high-energy particle accelerators, the stability or decay of protons, the origins of the heavy chemical elements, other interactions

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 596 A simplified history of the description of motion in physics, by giving the limits to motion included in each description

eral relativity explain any property unexplained in the other field. The two theories do not help each other; the unexplained parts of both fields simply add up. Secondly, both in quantum theory and in general relativity, motion still remains the change of position with time. In short, in the first two parts of this walk we did not achieve our goal: we still do not understand motion. Our basic questions remain: What is time and space? What is mass? What is charge and what are the other properties of objects? What are fields? Why are all the electrons the same?

We also note that Table 116 lists extremely *different* concepts. That means that at this point of our walk there is *a lot* we do not understand. Finding the answers will not be easy, but will require effort.

On the other hand, the list of unexplained properties of nature is also *short*. The description of nature our adventure has produced so far is concise and precise. No discrepancies from experiments are known. In other words, we have a good description of motion *in practice*. Going further is unnecessary if we only want to improve measurement

between matter and radiation or the possibility of higher spatial dimensions are questions that all fall into the table above.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

precision. Simplifying the above list is mainly important from the *conceptual* point of view. For this reason, the study of physics at university often stops at this point. However, as Table 116 shows, even though we have *no* known discrepancies with experiments, we are *not* at the top of Motion Mountain.

Another summary of the progress and open issues of physics, already given in the introduction, is shown in Figure 596. From the lowest corner of a cube, representing Galilean physics and related topics, three edges – labelled c, G and $\hbar$, e, k – lead to classical gravity, special relativity and quantum theory. Each constant implies a limit to motion; in the corresponding theory, this limit is taken into account. From these first level theories, corresponding parallel edges lead to general relativity, quantum field theory and quantum theory in gravity, which take into account two of the limits.* From the second level theories, all edges lead to the last missing corner: the theory of motion. The theory of motion takes into account all limits found so far. Only this theory is a complete or unified description of motion. The important point is that we already know all limits to motion. To arrive at the last point, no new experiments are necessary. No new knowledge is required. We only have to advance in the right direction, with careful thinking. Reaching the final theory of motion is the topic of the last part of our adventure.

How to delude oneself that one has reached the top of Motion Mountain

Nowadays it is deemed chic to pretend that the adventure is over at the stage we have just reached.** The reasoning is as follows. If we change the values of the unexplained constants from Table 116 only ever so slightly, nature would look completely different from what it does. The consequences have been studied in great detail; Table 117 gives an overview of the results. Ref. 1122

TABLE 117 A selection of the consequences of changing the properties of nature

Observable	Change	Result
Local quantities, from quantum theory		
α_{em}	smaller:	only short lived, smaller and hotter stars; no Sun
	larger:	darker Sun, animals die of electromagnetic radiation, too much proton decay, no planets, no stellar explosions, no star formation, no galaxy formation
	+60%:	quarks decay into leptons

* Of course, Figure 596 gives a simplified view of the history of physics. A more precise diagram would use three different arrows for $\hbar$, e and k, making the figure a five-dimensional cube. However, not all of its corners would have dedicated theories (can you confirm this?), and moreover, the diagram would be much less appealing. Challenge 1618 e

** Actually this attitude is not new. Only the arguments have changed. Maybe the greatest physicist ever, James Clerk Maxwell, already fought against this attitude over a hundred years ago: 'The opinion seems to have got abroad that, in a few years, all great physical constants will have been approximately estimated, and that the only occupation which will be left to men of science will be to carry these measurements to another place of decimals. ... The history of science shows that even during that phase of her progress in which she devotes herself to improving the accuracy of the numerical measurement of quantities with which she has long been familiar, she is preparing the materials for the subjugation of new regions, which would have remained unknown if she had been contented with the rough methods of her early pioneers.' Ref. 1121

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Observable	Change	Result
	+200%:	proton-proton repulsion makes nuclei impossible
α_w	−50%:	carbon nucleus unstable
	very weak:	no hydrogen, no p-p cycle in stars, no C-N-O cycle
	+2%:	no protons from quarks
	$G_F m_e^2 \not\ll \sqrt{G m_e^2}$:	either no or only helium in the universe
	much larger:	no stellar explosions, faster stellar burning
α_s	−9%:	no deuteron, stars much less bright
	−1%:	no C resonance, no life
	+3.4%:	diproton stable, faster star burning
	much larger:	carbon unstable, heavy nuclei unstable, widespread leukaemia
n-p mass difference	larger:	neutron decays in proton inside nuclei; no elements
	smaller:	free neutron not unstable, all protons into neutrons during big bang; no elements
	smaller than m_e:	protons would capture electrons, no hydrogen atoms, star life much shorter
m_l changes:		
e-p mass ratio	much different:	no molecules
	much smaller:	no solids
3 generations	6-8:	only helium in nature
	>8:	no asymptotic freedom and confinement
Global quantities, from general relativity		
horizon size	much smaller:	no people
baryon number	very different:	no smoothness
	much higher:	no solar system
Initial condition changes:		
Moon mass	smaller:	small Earth magnetic field; too much cosmic radiation; widespread child skin cancer
Moon mass	larger:	large Earth magnetic field; too little cosmic radiation; no evolution into humans
Sun's mass	smaller:	too cold for the evolution of life
Sun's mass	larger:	Sun too short lived for the evolution of life
Jupiter mass	smaller:	too many comet impacts on Earth; extinction of animal life
Jupiter mass	larger:	too little comet impacts on Earth; no Moon; no dinosaur extinction
Oort cloud object number	smaller:	no comets; no irregular asteroids; no Moon; still dinosaurs

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Observable	Change	Result
galaxy centre distance	smaller:	irregular planet motion; supernova dangers
initial cosmic speed	+0.1%:	1000 times faster universe expansion
	−0.0001%:	universe recollapses after 10 000 years
vacuum energy density	change by 10^{-55}:	no flatness
3 + 1 dimensions	different:	no atoms, no planetary systems
Local structures, from quantum theory		
permutation symmetry	none:	no matter
Lorentz symmetry	none:	no communication possible
U(1)	different:	no Huygens principle, no way to *see* anything
SU(2)	different:	no radioactivity, no Sun, no life
SU(3)	different:	no stable quarks and nuclei
Global structures, from general relativity		
topology	other:	unknown; possibly correlated gamma ray bursts or star images at the antipodes

Some even speculate that the table can be condensed into a single sentence: if any parameter in nature is changed, the universe would either have too many or too few black holes. However, the proof of this condensed summary is not complete yet.

Ref. 1123

Challenge 1619 r

In fact, Table 117, on the effects of changing nature, is overwhelming. Obviously, even the tiniest changes in the properties of nature are incompatible with our existence. What does this mean? Answering this question too rapidly is dangerous. Many fall into a common trap, namely to refuse admitting that the unexplained numbers and other properties need to be explained, i.e., deduced from more general principles. It is easier to throw in some irrational belief. The three most fashionable beliefs are that the universe is *created* or *designed*, that the universe is *designed for people*, or that the values are random, as our universe happens to be *one of many others*.

All these beliefs have in common that they have no factual basis, that they discourage further search and that they sell many books. Physicists call the issue of the first belief *fine tuning*, and usually, but not always, steer clear from the logical errors contained in the so common belief in 'creation' discussed earlier on. However, many physicists subscribe to the second belief, namely that the universe is designed for people, calling it the *anthropic principle*, even though we saw that it is indistinguishable both from the simian principle or from the simple request that statements be based on observations. In 2004, this belief has even become fashionable among older string theorists. The third belief, namely *multiple universes*, is a minority view, but also sells well.

Page 862

Page 868

Stopping our mountain ascent with a belief at the present point is not different from doing so directly at the beginning. Doing so used to be the case in societies which lacked the passion for rational investigation, and still is the case in circles which discourage the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

use of reason among their members. Looking for beliefs instead of looking for answers means to give up the ascent of Motion Mountain while pretending to have reached the top.

That is a pity. In our adventure, accepting the powerful message of Table 117 is one of the most awe-inspiring, touching and motivating moments. There is only one possible implication based on facts: the evidence implies that we are only a *tiny part* of the universe, but *linked* with all other aspects of it. Due to our small size and to all the connections with our environment, any imagined tiny change would make us disappear, like a water droplet is swept away by large wave. Our walk has repeatedly reminded us of this smallness and dependence, and overwhelmingly does so again at this point.

Having faced this powerful experience, everybody has to make up his own mind on whether to proceed with the adventure or not. Of course, there is no obligation to do so. Challenge 1620 s

What awaits us?

The shortness of the list of unexplained aspects of nature means that *no additional experimental data* are available as check of the final description of nature. Everything we need to arrive at the final description of motion will probably be deduced from the experimental data given in this list, and from nothing else. In other words, future experiments will *not* help us – except if they change something in the list, as supersymmetry might do with the gauge groups or astronomical experiments with the topology issue.

This lack of new experimental data means that to continue the walk is a *conceptual* adventure only. We have to walk into storms raging near the top of Motion Mountain, keeping our eyes open, without any other guidance except our reason: this is not an adventure of action, but an adventure of the mind. And it is an incredible one, as we shall soon find out. To provide a feeling of what awaits us, we rephrase the remaining issues in five simple challenges.

1 – What determines *colours*? In other words, what relations of nature fix the famous fine structure constant? Like the hero of Douglas Adams' books, physicists know the answer to the greatest of questions: it is 137.036. But they do not know the question.

2 – What fixes the contents of a *teapot*? It is given by its size to the third power. But why are there only three dimensions? Why is the tea content limited in this way?

3 – Was Democritus *right*? Our adventure has confirmed his statement up to this point; nature is indeed well described by the concepts of particles and of vacuum. At large scales, relativity has added a horizon, and at small scales, quantum theory added vacuum energy and pair creation. Nevertheless, both theories *assume* the existence of particles and the existence of space-time, and neither *predicts* them. Even worse, both theories completely fail to predict the existence of *any* of the properties either of space-time – such as its dimensionality – or of particles – such as their masses and other quantum numbers. A lot is missing.

4 – Was Democritus *wrong*? It is often said that the standard model has only about twenty unknown parameters; this common mistake negates about 10^{93} initial conditions! To get an idea of the problem, we simply estimate the number N of possible states of all particles in the universe by

$$N = n\, v\, d\, p\, f \tag{802}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

where n is the number of particles, v is the number of variables (position, momentum, spin), d is the number of different values each of them can take (limited by the maximum of 61 decimal digits), p is the number of visible space-time points (about 10^{183}) and f is a factor expressing how many of all these initial conditions are actually independent of each other. We thus have the following number of possibilities

$$N = 10^{92} \cdot 8 \cdot 10^{61} \cdot 10^{183} \cdot f = 10^{336} \cdot f \tag{803}$$

from which the 10^{93} actual initial conditions have to be explained. There is a small problem that we know nothing whatsoever about f. Its value could be 0, if all data were interdependent, or 1, if none were. Worse, above we noted that initial conditions cannot be defined for the universe at all; thus f should be undefined and not be a number at all! Whatever the case, we need to understand how all the visible particles get their 10^{93} states assigned from this range of options.

Page 1097

Page 317

5 – Were our efforts up to this point *in vain*? Quite at the beginning of our walk we noted that in classical physics, space and time are defined using matter, whereas matter is defined using space-time. Hundred years of general relativity and of quantum theory, including dozens of geniuses, have not solved this oldest paradox of all. The issue is still open at this point of our walk, as you might want to check by yourself.

Challenge 1621 e

The answers to these five questions define the top of Motion Mountain. Answering them means to know *everything* about motion. In summary, our quest for the unravelling of the essence of motion gets really interesting only from this point onwards!

> That is why Leucippus and Democritus, who say that the atoms move always in the void and the unlimited, must say what movement is, and in what their natural motion consists.
>
> Aristotle, *Treaty of the Heaven*

Ref. 1124



Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Appendix E

COMPOSITE PARTICLE PROPERTIES

The following table lists the most important composite particles. The list has not changed much recently, mainly because of the vast progress that was achieved in the middle of the twentieth century. In principle, using the standard model of particle physics, together with the fundamental constants, *all* properties of composite matter and radiation can be deduced. In particular, all properties of objects encountered in everyday life follow. (Can you explain how the size of an apple follows from the standard model?) The most important examples of composites are grouped in the following table.

Page 1290
Page 921
Challenge 1622 s

TABLE 118 Properties of selected composites

Composite	Mass m, quantum numbers	Lifetime τ, main decay modes	Size (diam.)
mesons (hadrons, bosons) (selected from over 130 known types)			
pion $\pi^0(u\bar{u} - d\bar{d})/\sqrt{2}$	134.976 4(6) MeV/c^2 $I^G(J^{PC}) = 1^-(0^{-+})$, $S = C = B = 0$	84(6) as, 2γ 98.798(32)%	~ 1 fm
pion $\pi^+(u\bar{d})$	139.569 95(35) MeV/c^2 $I^G(J^P) = 1^-(0^-)$, $S = C = B = 0$	26.030(5) ns, $\mu^+\nu_\mu$ 99.987 7(4)%	~ 1 fm
kaon K^0_S	$m_{K^0_S}$	89.27(9) ps	~ 1 fm
kaon K^0_L	$m_{K^0_S} + 3.491(9)\,\mu\text{eV}/c^2$	51.7(4) ns	~ 1 fm
kaon $K^\pm$ ($us\bar{}$, $\bar{u}s$)	493.677(16) MeV/c^2	12.386(24) ns, $\mu^+\nu_\mu$ 63.51(18)% $\pi^+\pi^0$ 21.16(14)%	~ 1 fm
kaon K^0 (d$\bar{s}$) (50 % K_S, 50 % K_L) all kaons $K^\pm, K^0, K^0_S, K^0_L$	497.672(31) MeV/c^2 $I(J^P) = \frac{1}{2}(0^-)$, $S = \pm 1$, $B = C = 0$	n.a.	~ 1 fm
baryons (hadrons, fermions) (selected from over 100 known types)			
proton p or N^+ (uud)	1.672 621 58(13) yg = 1.007 276 466 88(13) u = 938.271 998(38) MeV/c^2 $I(J^P) = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2}^+)$, $S = 0$ gyromagnetic ratio $\mu_p/\mu_N = 2.792\,847\,337(29)$	$\tau_{\text{total}} > 1.6 \cdot 10^{25}$ a, $\tau(p \to e^+\pi^0) > 5.5 \cdot 10^{32}$ a	0.89(1) fm Ref. 1166

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Composite	Mass m, quantum numbers	Lifetime τ, main decay modes	Size (diam.)
	electric dipole moment $d = (-4 \pm 6) \cdot 10^{-26} e$ m electric polarizability $\alpha_e = 12.1(0.9) \cdot 10^{-4}$ fm^3 magnetic polarizability $\alpha_m = 2.1(0.9) \cdot 10^{-4}$ fm^3		
neutron n or N^0 (udd)	1.674 927 16(13) yg = 1.008 664 915 78(55) u = 939.565 330(38) MeV/c^2 $I(J^P) = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2}^+)$, $S = 0$ gyromagnetic ratio $\mu_n/\mu_N = -1.913\,042\,72(45)$ electric dipole moment $d_n = (-3.3 \pm 4.3) \cdot 10^{-28} e$ m electric polarizability $\alpha = 0.98(23) \cdot 10^{-3}$ fm^3	887.0(2.0) s, $pe^-\bar{\nu}_e$ 100 %	~ 1 fm
omega Ω^- (sss)	1672.43(32) MeV/c^2 gyromagnetic ratio $\mu_\Omega/\mu_N = -1.94(22)$	82.2(1.2) ps, ΛK^- 67.8(7)%, $\Xi^0\pi^-$ 23.6(7)%	~ 1 fm
composite radiation: glueballs			
glueball $f_0(1500)$	1503(11) MeV $I^G(J^{PC}) = 0^+(0^{++})$	full width 120(19) MeV	~ 1 fm
atoms (selected from 114 known elements with over 2000 known nuclides) Ref. 1167			
hydrogen (^{1}H) [lightest]	1.007 825 032(1) u = 1.6735 yg		2 · 53 pm
antihydrogen	1.007 u = 1.67 yg		2 · 53 pm
helium (^{4}He) [smallest]	4.002 603250(1) u = 6.6465 yg		2 · 31 pm
carbon (^{12}C)	12 u = 19.926 482(12) yg		2 · 77 pm
bismuth (^{209}Bi*) [shortest living and rarest]	209 u	0.1 ps Ref. 1169	
tantalum (^{180m}Ta) [second longest living radioactive]	180 u	> 10^{15} a Ref. 1168	
bismuth (^{209}Bi) [longest living radioactive]	209 u	1.9(2)10^{19} a Ref. 1169	
francium (^{223}Fr) [largest]	223 u	22 min	2 · 0.28 nm
atom 116 (^{289}Uuh) [heaviest]	289 u	0.6 ms	
molecules (selected from over 10^7 known types)			
hydrogen (H_2)	~ 2 u	> 10^{25} a	
water (H_2O)	~ 18 u	> 10^{25} a	
ATP (adenosinetriphosphate)	507 u	> 10^{10} a	*c.* 3 nm
human Y chromosome	70 · 10^6 base pairs	> 10^6 a	*c.* 50 mm (uncoiled)
other composites			

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Composite	Mass m, quantum numbers	Lifetime τ, main decay modes	Size (diam.)
blue whale nerve cell	~ 1 kg	~ 50 a	20 m
cell (red blood)	0.1 ng	7 plus 120 days	~ 10 µm
cell (sperm)	10 pg	not fecundated: ~ 5 d	length 60 µm, head 3 µm×5 µm
cell (ovule)	1 µg	fecundated: over 4000 million years	~ 120 µm
cell (*E. coli*)	1 pg	4000 million years	body: 2 µm
adult human	35 kg < m < 350 kg	$\tau \approx 2.5 \cdot 10^9$ s Ref. 1170 ≈ 600 million breaths ≈ 2 500 million heartbeats < 122 a, 60 % H_2O and 40 % dust	~ 1.7 m
heaviest living thing: colony of aspen trees	$6.6 \cdot 10^6$ kg	> 130 a	> 4 km
larger composites	See the table on page 204.		

Page 1292 Notes (see also those of the previous table):

- G-parity is defined only for mesons and given by $G = (-1)^{L+S+I} = (-1)^I C$.
- Neutrons bound in nuclei have a lifetime of at least 10^{20} years.
- The $f_0(1500)$ resonance is a candidate for the glueball ground state and thus for a *radiation composite*.
- The $Y(3940)$ resonance is a candidate for a hybrid meson, a composite of a gluon and a quark–antiquark pair. This prediction of 1980 seems to have been confirmed in 2005.

Ref. 1171
- In 2002, the first evidence for the existence of tetra-neutrons was published by a French group. However, more recent investigations seem to have refuted the claim.
- The number of existing molecules is several orders of magnitude larger than the number of molecules that have been analysed and named.
- Some nuclei have not yet been observed; in 2006 the known nuclei ranged from 1 to 116, but 113 and 115 were still missing.
- The first *anti-atoms*, made of antielectrons and antiprotons, were made in January 1996 at CERN

Ref. 1172 in Geneva. All properties of antimatter checked so far are consistent with theoretical predictions.

- The charge parity C is defined only for certain neutral particles, namely those that are different from their antiparticles. For neutral mesons, the charge parity is given by $C = (-1)^{L+S}$, where L is the orbital angular momentum.
- P is the parity under space inversion $\boldsymbol{r} \to -\boldsymbol{r}$. For mesons, it is related to the orbital angular momentum L through $P = (-1)^{L+1}$.
- The electric polarizability, defined on page 704, is predicted to vanish for all elementary particles.

The most important matter composites are the *atoms*. Their size, structure and interactions determine the properties and colour of everyday objects. Atom types, also called *ele-*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

ments in chemistry, are most usefully set out in the so-called *periodic table*, which groups together atoms with similar properties in rows and columns. It is given in Table 119 and results from the various ways in which protons, neutrons and electrons can combine to form aggregates.

Comparable to the periodic table of the atoms, there are tables for the mesons (made of two quarks) and the baryons (made of three quarks). Neither the meson nor the baryon table is included here; they can both be found in the *Review of Particle Physics* at pdg.web.cern.ch. In fact, the baryon table still has a number of vacant spots. However, the missing particles are extremely heavy and short-lived (which means expensive to make and detect), and their discovery is not expected to yield deep new insights.

TABLE 119 The periodic table of the elements known in 2006, with their atomic numbers

Group	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
	I	II	IIIa	IVa	Va	VIa	VIIa		VIIIa		Ia	IIa	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
Period																		
1	1 H																	2 He
2	3 Li	4 Be											5 B	6 C	7 N	8 O	9 F	10 Ne
3	11 Na	12 Mg											13 Al	14 Si	15 P	16 S	17 Cl	18 Ar
4	19 K	20 Ca	21 Sc	22 Ti	23 V	24 Cr	25 Mn	26 Fe	27 Co	28 Ni	29 Cu	30 Zn	31 Ga	32 Ge	33 As	34 Se	35 Br	36 Kr
5	37 Rb	38 Sr	39 Y	40 Zr	41 Nb	42 Mo	43 Tc	44 Ru	45 Rh	46 Pd	47 Ag	48 Cd	49 In	50 Sn	51 Sb	52 Te	53 I	54 Xe
6	55 Cs	56 Ba	*	72 Hf	73 Ta	74 W	75 Re	76 Os	77 Ir	78 Pt	79 Au	80 Hg	81 Tl	82 Pb	83 Bi	84 Po	85 At	86 Rn
7	87 Fr	88 Ra	**	104 Rf	105 Db	106 Sg	107 Bh	108 Hs	109 Mt	110 Ds	111 Rg	112 Uub	113 Uut	114 Uuq	115 Uup	116 Uuh	117	118
Lanthanoids	*			57 La	58 Ce	59 Pr	60 Nd	61 Pm	62 Sm	63 Eu	64 Gd	65 Tb	66 Dy	67 Ho	68 Er	69 Tm	70 Yb	71 Lu
Actinoids	**			89 Ac	90 Th	91 Pa	92 U	93 Np	94 Pu	95 Am	96 Cm	97 Bk	98 Cf	99 Es	100 Fm	101 Md	102 No	103 Lr

The atomic number gives the number of protons (and electrons) found in an atom of a given element. This number determines the chemical behaviour of an element. Most

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 597 A modern table of the elements (© Theodore Gray, for sale at www.theodoregray.com)

– but not all – elements up to 92 are found on Earth; the others can be produced in laboratories. The highest element discovered is element 116. (In a famous case of research fraud, a scientist in the 1990s tricked two whole research groups into claiming to have made and observed elements 116 and 118. Element 116 was independently made and observed by another group later on.) Nowadays, extensive physical and chemical data are available for every element. Photographs of the pure elements are shown in Figure 597.

Ref. 1174

Elements in the same *group* behave similarly in chemical reactions. The *periods* define the repetition of these similarities. More elaborate periodic tables can be found on the chemlab.pc.maricopa.edu/periodic website. The most beautiful of them all can be found on page 1148 of this text.

Group 1 are the alkali metals (though hydrogen is a gas), group 2 the Earth-alkali metals. Actinoids, lanthanoids and groups 3 to 13 are metals; in particular, groups 3 to 12 are transition or heavy metals. The elements of group 16 are called *chalkogens*, i.e., ore-formers; group 17 are the *halogens*, i.e., the salt-formers, and group 18 are the inert *noble gases*, which form (almost) no chemical compounds. The groups 13, 14 and 15 contain metals, semimetals, a liquid and gases; they have no special name. Groups 1 and 13 to 17 are central for the chemistry of life; in fact, 96 % of living matter is made of C, O, N, H;* almost 4 % of P, S, Ca, K, Na, Cl; trace elements such as Mg, V, Cr, Mn, Fe, Co, Ni, Cu, Zn, Cd, Pb, Sn, Li, Mo, Se, Si, I, F, As, B form the rest. Over 30 elements are known to be essential for animal life. The full list is not yet known; candidate elements to extend this list are Al, Br, Ge and W.

Many elements exist in versions with different numbers of neutrons in their nucleus, and thus with different mass; these various *isotopes* – so called because they are found at the *same place* in the periodic table – behave identically in chemical reactions. There are over 2000 of them.

Ref. 1167, Ref. 1173

* The 'average formula' of life is approximately $C_5H_{40}O_{18}N$.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 120 The elements, with their atomic number, average mass, atomic radius and main properties

Name	Symbol	At. n.	Aver. mass[a] in u (error), longest lifetime	Atomic[e] radius in pm	Main properties, (naming)[h] discovery date and use
Actinium[b]	Ac	89	(227.0277(1)) 21.77(2) a	(188)	highly radioactive metallic rare Earth (Greek *aktis* ray) 1899, used as alpha-emitting source
Aluminium	Al	13	26.981 538 (8) stable	118c, 143m	light metal (Latin *alumen* alum) 1827, used in machine construction and living beings
Americium[b]	Am	95	(243.0614(1)) 7.37(2) ka	(184)	radioactive metal (Italian *America* from Amerigo) 1945, used in smoke detectors
Antimony	Sb	51	121.760(1)[f] stable	137c, 159m, 205v	toxic semimetal (via Arabic from Latin *stibium*, itself from Greek, Egyptian for one of its minerals) antiquity, colours rubber, used in medicines, constituent of enzymes
Argon	Ar	18	39.948(1)[f] stable	(71n)	noble gas (Greek *argos* inactive, from *anergos* without energy) 1894, third component of air, used for welding and in lasers
Arsenic	As	33	74.921 60(2) stable	120c, 185v	poisonous semimetal (Greek *arsenikon* tamer of males) antiquity, for poisoning pigeons and doping semiconductors
Astatine[b]	At	85	(209.9871(1)) 8.1(4) h	(140)	radioactive halogen (Greek *astatos* unstable) 1940, no use
Barium	Ba	56	137.327(7) stable	224m	Earth-alkali metal (Greek *bary* heavy) 1808, used in vacuum tubes, paint, oil industry, pyrotechnics and X-ray diagnosis
Berkelium[b]	Bk	97	(247.0703(1)) 1.4(3) ka	n.a.	made in lab, probably metallic (Berkeley, US town) 1949, no use because rare
Beryllium	Be	4	9.012 182(3) stable	106c, 113m	toxic Earth-alkali metal (Greek *beryllos*, a mineral) 1797, used in light alloys, in nuclear industry as moderator
Bismuth	Bi	83	208.980 40(1) stable	170m, 215v	diamagnetic metal (Latin via German *weisse Masse* white mass) 1753, used in magnets, alloys, fire safety, cosmetics, as catalyst, nuclear industry
Bohrium[b]	Bh	107	(264.12(1)) 0.44 s[g]	n.a.	made in lab, probably metallic (after Niels Bohr) 1981, found in nuclear reactions, no use
Boron	B	5	10.811(7)[f] stable	83c	semimetal, semiconductor (Latin *borax*, from Arabic and Persian for brilliant) 1808, used in glass, bleach, pyrotechnics, rocket fuel, medicine

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Name	Symbol	At. n.	Aver. mass[a] in u (error), longest lifetime	Atomic[e] radius in pm	Main properties, (naming)[h] discovery date and use
Bromine	Br	35	79.904(1) stable	120c, 185v	red-brown liquid (Greek *bromos* strong odour) 1826, fumigants, photography, water purification, dyes, medicines
Cadmium	Cd	48	112.411(8)[f] stable	157m	heavy metal, cuttable and screaming (Greek *kadmeia*, a zinc carbonate mineral where it was discovered) 1817, electroplating, solder, batteries, TV phosphors, dyes
Caesium	Cs	55	132.905 4519(2) stable	273m	alkali metal (Latin *caesius* sky blue) 1860, getter in vacuum tubes, photoelectric cells, ion propulsion, atomic clocks
Calcium	Ca	20	40.078(4)[f] stable	197m	Earth-alkali metal (Latin *calcis* chalk) antiquity, pure in 1880, found in stones and bones, reducing agent, alloying
Californium[b]	Cf	98	(251.0796(1)) 0.90(5) ka	n.a.	made in lab, probably metallic, strong neutron emitter (Latin *calor* heat and *fornicare* have sex, the land of hot sex :-) 1950, used as neutron source, for well logging
Carbon	C	6	12.0107(8)[f] stable	77c	makes up coal and diamond (Latin *carbo* coal) antiquity, used to build most life forms
Cerium	Ce	58	140.116(1)[f] stable	183m	rare Earth metal (after asteroid Ceres, Roman goddess) 1803, cigarette lighters, incandescent gas mantles, glass manufacturing, self-cleaning ovens, carbon-arc lighting in the motion picture industry, catalyst, metallurgy
Chlorine	Cl	17	35.453(2)[f] stable	102c, 175v	green gas (Greek *chloros* yellow-green) 1774, drinking water, polymers, paper, dyes, textiles, medicines, insecticides, solvents, paints, rubber
Chromium	Cr	24	51.9961(6) stable	128m	transition metal (Greek *chromos* colour) 1797, hardens steel, makes steel stainless, alloys, electroplating, green glass dye, catalyst
Cobalt	Co	27	58.933 195(5) stable	125m	ferromagnetic transition metal (German *Kobold* goblin) 1694, part of vitamin B_{12}, magnetic alloys, heavy-duty alloys, enamel dyes, ink, animal nutrition

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

NAME	SYMBOL	AT. N.	AVER. MASS[a] IN U (ERROR), LONGEST LIFETIME	ATOMIC[e] RADIUS IN PM	MAIN PROPERTIES, (NAMING)[h] DISCOVERY DATE AND USE
Copper	Cu	29	63.546(3)[f] stable	128m	red metal (Latin *cuprum* from Cyprus island) antiquity, part of many enzymes, electrical conductors, bronze, brass and other alloys, algicides, etc.
Curium[b]	Cm	96	(247.0704(1)) 15.6(5) Ma	n.a.	highly radioactive, silver-coloured (after Pierre and Marie Curie) 1944, used as radioactivity source
Darmstadtium[b]	Ds	110	(271) 1.6 min[g]	n.a.	(after the German city) 1994, no use
Dubnium[b]	Db	105	(262.1141(1)) 34(5) s	n.a.	made in lab in small quantities, radioactive (Dubna, Russian city) 1967, no use (once known as hahnium)
Dysprosium	Dy	66	162.500(1)[f] stable	177m	rare Earth metal (Greek *dysprositos* difficult to obtain) 1886, used in laser materials, as infrared source material, and in nuclear industry
Einsteinium[b]	Es	99	(252.0830(1)) 472(2) d	n.a.	made in lab, radioactive (after Albert Einstein) 1952, no use
Erbium	Er	68	167.259(3)[f] stable	176m	rare Earth metal (Ytterby, Swedish town) 1843, used in metallurgy and optical fibres
Europium	Eu	63	151.964(1)[f] stable	204m	rare Earth metal (named after the continent) 1901, used in red screen phosphor for TV tubes
Fermium[b]	Fm	100	(257.0901(1)) 100.5(2) d	n.a.	(after Enrico Fermi) 1952, no use
Fluorine	F	9	18.998 4032(5) stable	62c, 147v	gaseous halogen (from fluorine, a mineral, from Greek *fluo* flow) 1886, used in polymers and toothpaste
Francium[b]	Fr	87	(223.0197(1)) 22.0(1) min	(278)	radioactive metal (from France) 1939, no use
Gadolinium	Gd	64	157.25(3)[f] stable	180m	(after Johan Gadolin) 1880, used in lasers and phosphors
Gallium	Ga	31	69.723(1) stable	125c, 141m	almost liquid metal (Latin for both the discoverer's name and his nation, France) 1875, used in optoelectronics
Germanium	Ge	32	72.64(1) stable	122c, 195v	semiconductor (from Germania, as opposed to gallium) 1886, used in electronics
Gold	Au	79	196.966 569(4) stable	144m	heavy noble metal (Sanskrit *jval* to shine, Latin aurum) antiquity, electronics, jewels

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Name	Symbol	At. n.	Aver. mass[a] in u (error), longest lifetime	Atomic[e] radius in pm	Main properties, (naming)[h] discovery date and use
Hafnium	Hf	72	178.49(2)[c] stable	158m	metal (Latin for Copenhagen) 1923, alloys, incandescent wire
Hassium[b]	Hs	108	(277) 16.5 min[g]	n.a.	radioactive element (Latin form of German state Hessen) 1984, no use
Helium	He	2	4.002 602(2)[f] stable	(31n)	noble gas (Greek *helios* Sun) where it was discovered 1895, used in balloons, stars, diver's gas and cryogenics
Holmium	Ho	67	164.930 32(2) stable	177m	metal (Stockholm, Swedish capital) 1878, alloys
Hydrogen	H	1	1.007 94(7)[f] stable	30c	reactive gas (Greek for water-former) 1766, used in building stars and universe
Indium	In	49	114.818(3) stable	141c, 166m	soft metal (Greek *indikon* indigo) 1863, used in solders and photocells
Iodine	I	53	126.904 47(3) stable	140c, 198v	blue-black solid (Greek *iodes* violet) 1811, used in photography
Iridium	Ir	77	192.217(3) stable	136m	precious metal (Greek *iris* rainbow) 1804, electrical contact layers
Iron	Fe	26	55.845(2) stable	127m	metal (Indo-European *ayos* metal, Latin ferrum) antiquity, used in metallurgy
Krypton	Kr	36	83.798(2)[f] stable	(88n)	noble gas (Greek *kryptos* hidden) 1898, used in lasers
Lanthanum	La	57	138.905 47(7)[c,f] stable	188m	reactive rare Earth metal (Greek *lanthanein* to be hidden) 1839, used in lamps and in special glasses
Lawrencium[b]	Lr	103	(262.110 97(1)) 3.6(3) h	n.a.	appears in reactions (after Ernest Lawrence) 1961, no use
Lead	Pb	82	207.2(1)[c,f] stable	175m	poisonous, malleable heavy metal (Latin *plumbum*) antiquity, used in car batteries, radioactivity shields, paints
Lithium	Li	3	6.941(2)[f] stable	156m	light alkali metal with high specific heat (Greek *lithos* stone) 1817, used in batteries, anti-depressants, alloys and many chemicals
Lutetium	Lu	71	174.967(1)[f] stable	173m	rare Earth metal (Latin *Lutetia* for Paris) 1907, used as catalyst
Magnesium	Mg	12	24.3050(6) stable	160m	light common alkaline Earth metal (from Magnesia, a Greek district in Thessalia) 1755, used in alloys, pyrotechnics, chemical synthesis and medicine, found in chlorophyll

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Name	Symbol	At. n.	Aver. mass[a] in u (error), longest lifetime	Atomic[e] radius in pm	Main properties, (naming)[h] discovery date and use
Manganese	Mn	25	54.938 045(5) stable	126m	brittle metal (Italian *manganese*, a mineral) 1774, used in alloys, colours amethyst and permanganate
Meitnerium[b]	Mt	109	(268.1388(1)) 0.070 s[g]	n.a.	appears in nuclear reactions (after Lise Meitner) 1982, no use
Mendelevium[b]	Md	101	(258.0984(1)) 51.5(3) d	n.a.	appears in nuclear reactions (after Дмитрии Иванович Менделеев Dmitriy Ivanovich Mendeleyev) 1955, no use
Mercury	Hg	80	200.59(2) stable	157m	liquid heavy metal (Latin god Mercurius, Greek *hydrargyrum* liquid silver) antiquity, used in switches, batteries, lamps, amalgam alloys
Molybdenum	Mo	42	95.94(2)[f] stable	140m	metal (Greek *molybdos* lead) 1788, used in alloys, as catalyst, in enzymes and lubricants
Neodymium	Nd	60	144.242(3)[c,f] stable	182m	(Greek *neos* and *didymos* new twin) 1885
Neon	Ne	10	20.1797(6)[f] stable	(36n)	noble gas (Greek *neos* new) 1898, used in lamps, lasers and cryogenics
Neptunium[b]	Np	93	(237.0482(1)) 2.14(1) Ma	n.a.	radioactive metal (planet Neptune, after Uranus in the solar system) 1940, appears in nuclear reactors, used in neutron detection and by the military
Nickel	Ni	28	58.6934(2) stable	125m	metal (German *Nickel* goblin) 1751, used in coins, stainless steels, batteries, as catalyst
Niobium	Nb	41	92.906 38(2) stable	147m	ductile metal (Greek Niobe, mythical daughter of Tantalos) 1801, used in arc welding, alloys, jewellery, superconductors
Nitrogen	N	7	14.0067(2)[f] stable	70c, 155v	diatomic gas (Greek for nitre-former) 1772, found in air, in living organisms, Viagra, fertilizers, explosives
Nobelium[b]	No	102	(259.1010(1)) 58(5) min	n.a.	(after Alfred Nobel) 1958, no use
Osmium	Os	76	190.23(3)[f] stable	135m	heavy metal (from Greek *osme* odour) 1804, used for fingerprint detection and in very hard alloys

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Name	Symbol	At. n.	Aver. mass[a] in u (error), longest lifetime	Atomic[e] radius in pm	Main properties, (naming)[h] discovery date and use
Oxygen	O	8	15.9994(3)[f] stable	66c, 152v	transparent, diatomic gas (formed from Greek to mean 'acid former') 1774, used for combustion, blood regeneration, to make most rocks and stones, in countless compounds, colours auroras red
Palladium	Pd	46	106.42(1)[f] stable	138m	heavy metal (from asteroid Pallas, after the Greek goddess) 1802, used in alloys, white gold, catalysts, for hydride storage
Phosphorus	P	15	30.973 762(2) stable	109c, 180v	poisonous, waxy, white solid (Greek *phosphoros* light bearer) 1669, fertilizers, glasses, porcelain, steels and alloys, living organisms, bones
Platinum	Pt	78	195.084(9) stable	139m	silvery-white, ductile, noble heavy metal (Spanish *platina* little silver) pre-Columbian, again in 1735, used in corrosion-resistant alloys, magnets, furnaces, catalysts, fuel cells, cathodic protection systems for large ships and pipelines; being a catalyst, a fine platinum wire glows red hot when placed in vapour of methyl alcohol, an effect used in hand warmers
Plutonium	Pu	94	(244.0642(1)) 80.0(9) Ma	n.a.	extremely toxic alpha-emitting metal (after the planet) synthesized 1940, found in nature 1971, used as nuclear explosive, and to power space equipment, such as satellites and the measurement equipment brought to the Moon by the Apollo missions
Polonium	Po	84	(208.9824(1)) 102(5) a	(140)	alpha-emitting, volatile metal (from Poland) 1898, used as thermoelectric power source in space satellites, as neutron source when mixed with beryllium; used in the past to eliminate static charges in factories, and on brushes for removing dust from photographic films
Potassium	K	19	39.0983(1) stable	238m	reactive, cuttable light metal (German *Pottasche*, Latin *kalium* from Arabic *quilyi*, a plant used to produce potash) 1807, part of many salts and rocks, essential for life, used in fertilizers, essential to chemical industry

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

NAME	SYMBOL	AT. N.	AVER. MASS[a] IN U (ERROR), LONGEST LIFETIME	ATOMIC[e] RADIUS IN PM	MAIN PROPERTIES, (NAMING)[h] DISCOVERY DATE AND USE
Praeseodymium	Pr	59	140.907 65(2) stable	183m	white, malleable rare Earth metal (Greek *praesos didymos* green twin) 1885, used in cigarette lighters, material for carbon arcs used by the motion picture industry for studio lighting and projection, glass and enamel dye, darkens welder's goggles
Promethium[b]	Pm	61	(144.9127(1)) 17.7(4) a	181m	radioactive rare Earth metal (from the Greek mythical figure of Prometheus) 1945, used as beta source and to excite phosphors
Protactinium	Pa	91	(231.035 88(2)) 32.5(1) ka	n.a.	radioactive metal (Greek *protos* first, as it decays into actinium) 1917, found in nature, no use
Radium	Ra	88	(226.0254(1)) 1599(4) a	(223)	highly radioactive metal (Latin *radius* ray) 1898, no use any more; once used in luminous paints and as radioactive source and in medicine
Radon	Rn	86	(222.0176(1)) 3.823(4) d	(130n)	radioactive noble gas (from its old name 'radium emanation') 1900, no use (any more), found in soil, produces lung cancer
Rhenium	Re	75	186.207(1)[c] stable	138m	(Latin *rhenus* for Rhine river) 1925, used in filaments for mass spectrographs and ion gauges, superconductors, thermocouples, flash lamps, and as catalyst
Rhodium	Rh	45	102.905 50(2) stable	135m	white metal (Greek *rhodon* rose) 1803, used to harden platinum and palladium alloys, for electroplating, and as catalyst
Roentgenium[b]	Rg	111	(272.1535(1)) 1.5 ms[g]	n.a.	1994, no use
Rubidium	Rb	37	85.4678(3)[f] stable	255m	silvery-white, reactive alkali metal (Latin *rubidus* red) 1861, used in photocells, optical glasses, solid electrolytes
Ruthenium	Ru	44	101.107(2)[f] stable	134m	white metal (Latin *Rhuthenia* for Russia) 1844, used in platinum and palladium alloys, superconductors, as catalyst; the tetroxide is toxic and explosive
Rutherfordium[b]	Rf	104	(261.1088(1)) 1.3 min[g]	n.a.	radioactive transactinide (after Ernest Rutherford) 1964, no use

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Name	Symbol	At. n.	Aver. mass[a] in u (error), longest lifetime	Atomic[e] radius in pm	Main properties, (naming)[h] discovery date and use
Samarium	Sm	62	150.36(2)[c,f] stable	180m	silver-white rare Earth metal (from the mineral samarskite, after Wassily Samarski) 1879, used in magnets, optical glasses, as laser dopant, in phosphors, in high-power light sources
Scandium	Sc	21	44.955 912(6) stable	164m	silver-white metal (from Latin *Scansia* Sweden) 1879, the oxide is used in high-intensity mercury vapour lamps, a radioactive isotope is used as tracer
Seaborgium[b]	Sg	106	266.1219(1) 21 s[g]	n.a.	radioactive transurane (after Glenn Seaborg) 1974, no use
Selenium	Se	34	78.96(3)[f] stable	120c, 190v	red or black or grey semiconductor (Greek *selene* Moon) 1818, used in xerography, glass production, photographic toners, as enamel dye
Silicon	Si	14	28.0855(3)[f] stable	105c, 210v	grey, shiny semiconductor (Latin *silex* pebble) 1823, Earth's crust, electronics, sand, concrete, bricks, glass, polymers, solar cells, essential for life
Silver	Ag	47	107.8682(2)[f] stable	145m	white metal with highest thermal and electrical conductivity (Latin *argentum*, Greek *argyros*) antiquity, used in photography, alloys, to make rain
Sodium	Na	11	22.989 769 28(2) stable	191m	light, reactive metal (Arabic *souwad* soda, Egyptian and Arabic *natrium*) component of many salts, soap, paper, soda, salpeter, borax, and essential for life
Strontium	Sr	38	87.62(1)[f] stable	215m	silvery, spontaneously igniting light metal (Strontian, Scottish town) 1790, used in TV tube glass, in magnets, and in optical materials
Sulphur	S	16	32.065(5)[f] stable	105c, 180v	yellow solid (Latin) antiquity, used in gunpowder, in sulphuric acid, rubber vulcanization, as fungicide in wine production, and is essential for life; some bacteria use sulphur instead of oxygen in their chemistry
Tantalum	Ta	73	180.947 88(2) stable	147m	heavy metal (Greek Tantalos, a mythical figure) 1802, used for alloys, surgical instruments, capacitors, vacuum furnaces, glasses

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Name	Symbol	At. n.	Aver. mass[a] in u (error), longest lifetime	Atomic[e] radius in pm	Main properties, (naming)[h] discovery date and use
Technetium[b]	Tc	43	(97.9072(1)) 6.6(10) Ma	136m	radioactive (Greek *technetos* artificial) 1939, used as radioactive tracer and in nuclear technology
Tellurium	Te	52	127.60(3)[f] stable	139c, 206v	brittle, garlic-smelling semiconductor (Latin *tellus* Earth) 1783, used in alloys and as glass component
Terbium	Tb	65	158.925 35(2) stable	178m	malleable rare Earth metal (Ytterby, Swedish town) 1843, used as dopant in optical material
Thallium	Tl	81	204.3833(2) stable	172m	soft, poisonous heavy metal (Greek *thallos* branch) 1861, used as poison and for infrared detection
Thorium	Th	90	232.038 06(2)[d,f] 14.0(1) Ga	180m	radioactive (Nordic god Thor, as in 'Thursday') 1828, found in nature, heats Earth, used as oxide, in alloys and as coating
Thulium	Tm	69	168.934 21(2) stable	175m	rare Earth metal (Thule, mythical name for Scandinavia) 1879, found in monazite
Tin	Sn	50	118.710(7)[f] stable	139c, 210v, 162m	grey metal that, when bent, allows one to hear the 'tin cry' (Latin *stannum*) antiquity, used in paint, bronze and superconductors
Titanium	Ti	22	47.867(1) stable	146m	metal (Greek hero Titanos) 1791, alloys, fake diamonds
Tungsten	W	74	183.84(1) stable	141m	heavy, highest-melting metal (Swedish *tung sten* heavy stone, German name *Wolfram*) 1783, lightbulbs
Ununbium[b]	Uub	112	(285) 15.4 min[g]	n.a.	1996, no use
Ununtrium	Uut	113		n.a.	2004, no use
Ununquadium[b]	Uuq	114	(289) 30.4 s[g]	n.a.	1999, no use
Ununpentium	Uup	115		n.a.	2004, no use
Ununhexium[b]	Uuh	116	(289) 0.6 ms[g]	n.a.	2000 (earlier claim was false), no use
Ununseptium	Uus	117		n.a.	not yet observed
Ununoctium	Uuo	118		n.a.	not yet observed, but false claim in 1999
Uranium	U	92	238.028 91(3)[d,f] $4.468(3) \cdot 10^9$ a	156m	radioactive and of high density (planet Uranus, after the Greek sky god) 1789, found in pechblende and other minerals, used for nuclear energy
Vanadium	V	23	50.9415(1) stable	135m	metal (Vanadis, scandinavian goddess of beauty) 1830, used in steel

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Name	Symbol	At. n.	Aver. mass[a] in u (error), longest lifetime	Atomic[e] radius in pm	Main properties, (naming)[h] discovery date and use
Xenon	Xe	54	131.293(6)[f] stable	(103n) 200v	noble gas (Greek *xenos* foreign) 1898, used in lamps and lasers
Ytterbium	Yb	70	173.04(3)[f] stable	174m	malleable heavy metal (Ytterby, Swedish town) 1878, used in superconductors
Yttrium	Y	39	88.905 85(2) stable	180m	malleable light metal (Ytterby, Swedish town) 1794, used in lasers
Zinc	Zn	30	65.409(4) stable	139m	heavy metal (German *Zinke* protuberance) antiquity, iron rust protection
Zirconium	Zr	40	91.224(2)[f] stable	160m	heavy metal (from the mineral zircon, after Arabic *zargum* golden colour) 1789, chemical and surgical instruments, nuclear industry

a. The atomic mass unit is defined as $1\,\mathrm{u} = \frac{1}{12}m(^{12}\mathrm{C})$, making $1\,\mathrm{u} = 1.660\,5402(10)\,\mathrm{yg}$. For elements found on Earth, the *average* atomic mass for the naturally occurring isotope mixture is given, with the error in the last digit in brackets. For elements not found on Earth, the mass of the *longest living* isotope is given; as it is not an average, it is written in brackets, as is customary in this domain. Ref. 1173

b. The element is not found on Earth because of its short lifetime.

c. The element has at least one radioactive isotope.

d. The element has no stable isotopes.

e. Strictly speaking, the *atomic radius* does not exist. Because atoms are clouds, they have no boundary. Several approximate definitions of the 'size' of atoms are possible. Usually, the radius is defined in such a way as to be useful for the estimation of distances between atoms. This distance is different for different bond types. In the table, radii for metallic bonds are labelled m, radii for (single) covalent bonds with carbon c, and Van der Waals radii v. Noble gas radii are labelled n. Note that values found in the literature vary by about 10 %; values in brackets lack literature references. Ref. 1175 Ref. 1175

The covalent radius can be up to 0.1 nm smaller than the metallic radius for elements on the (lower) left of the periodic table; on the (whole) right side it is essentially equal to the metallic radius. In between, the difference between the two decreases towards the right. Can you explain why? By the way, ionic radii differ considerably from atomic ones, and depend both on the ionic charge and the element itself. Challenge 1623 s

All these values are for atoms in their ground state. Excited atoms can be hundreds of times larger than atoms in the ground state; however, excited atoms do not form solids or chemical compounds.

f. The isotopic composition, and thus the average atomic mass, of the element varies depending on the place where it was mined or on subsequent human treatment, and can lie outside the values given. For example, the atomic mass of commercial lithium ranges between 6.939 and 6.996 u. The masses of isotopes are known in atomic mass units to nine or more significant digits, and usually with one or two fewer digits in kilograms. The errors in the atomic mass are thus mainly due to the variations in isotopic composition. Ref. 1167 Ref. 1173

g. The lifetime errors are asymmetric or not well known.

h. Extensive details on element names can be found on elements.vanderkrogt.net.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

BIBLIOGRAPHY

> Gedanken sind nicht stets parat. Man schreibt
> auch, wenn man keine hat.*
> Wilhelm Busch, *Aphorismen und Reime*.

930 The use of radioactivity for breeding is described by ... Cited on page 1122.

931 The motorized screw used by viruses was described by A.A. Simpson & al., Structure of the bacteriophage phi29 DNA packaging motor, *Nature* **408**, pp. 745–750, 2000. Cited on page 1122.

932 S. M. Block, Real engines of creation, *Nature* **386**, pp. 217–219, 1997. Cited on page 1122.

933 Early results and ideas on molecular motors are summarised by Barbara Goss Levi, Measured steps advance the understanding of molecular motors, *Physics Today* pp. 17–19, April 1995. Newer results are described in R. D. Astumian, Making molecules into motors, *Scientific American* pp. 57–64, July 2001. Cited on page 1125.

934 R. Bartussek & P. Hänggi, Brownsche Motoren, *Physikalische Blätter* **51**, pp. 506–507, 1995. Cited on page 1125.

935 R. J. Cano & M. K. Borucki, Revival and identification of bacterial spores in 25- to 40-million-year-old Dominican amber, *Science* **26**, pp. 1060–1064, 1995. Cited on page 1127.

936 This is explained in ... Cited on page 1128.

937 Gabriele Walker, *Snowball Earth – The Story of the Great Global Catastrophe That Spawned Life as We Know It*, Crown Publishing, 2003. Cited on page 1128.

938 The table and the evolutionary tree are taken from J. O. McInerney, M. Mullarkey, M. E. Wernecke & R. Powell, Bacteria and Archaea: Molecular techniques reveal astonishing diversity, *Biodiversity* **3**, pp. 3–10, 2002. The tree might still change a little in the coming years. Cited on page 1128.

939 This is taken from the delightful children text Hans J. Press, *Spiel das Wissen schafft*, Ravensburger Buchverlag 1964, 2004. Cited on page 1132.

940 The discovery of a specific taste for fat was published by F. Laugerette, P. Passilly-Degrace, B. Patris, I. Niot, M. Febbraio, J. P. Montmayeur & P. Besnard, CD36 involvement in orosensory detection of dietary lipids, spontaneous fat preference, and digestive secretions, *Journal of Clinical Investigation* **115**, pp. 3177–3184, 2005. Cited on page 1133.

941 To learn to enjoy life to the maximum there is no standard way. A good foundation can be found in those books which teach the ability to those which have lost it. Cited on page 1133.

* 'Thoughts are not always available. Many write even without them.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The best experts are those who help others to overcome traumas. Peter A. Levine & Ann Frederick, *Waking the Tiger – Healing Trauma – The Innate Capacity to Transform Overwhelming Experiences*, North Atlantic Books, 1997. Geoff Graham, *How to Become the Parent You Never Had - a Treatment for Extremes of Fear, Anger and Guilt*, Real Options Press, 1986.

A good complement to these texts is the systemic approach, as presented by Bert Hellinger, *Zweierlei Glück*, Carl Auer Verlag, 1997. Some of his books are also available in English. The author explains how to achieve a life of contentness, living with the highest possible responsibility of one's actions, by reducing entaglements with one's past and with other people. He presents a simple and efficient technique for realising this disentanglement.

The next step, namely full mastery in the enjoyment of life, can be found in any book written by somebody who has achieved mastery in any one topic. The topic itself is not important, only the passion is.

de la Garanderie, *Le dialogue pédagogique avec l'élève*, Centurion, 1984, A. de la Garanderie/ *Pour une pédagogie de l'intelligence*, Centurion, 1990, A. de la Garanderie/ *Réussir ça s'apprend*, Bayard, 1994. De la Garanderie explains how the results of teaching and learning depend in particular on the importance of evocation, imagination and motivation.

Plato, *Phaedrus*, Athens, 380 bce.

Françoise Dolto, *La cause des enfants*, Laffont, 1985, and her other books. Dolto (1908–1988), a child psychiatrist, is one of the world experts on the growth of the child; her main theme was that growth is only possible by giving the highest possible responsibility to every child during its development.

In the domain of art, many had the passion to achieve full pleasure. A good piece of music, a beautiful painting, an expressive statue or a good film can show it. On a smaller scale, the art to typeset beautiful books, so different from what many computer programs do by default, the best introduction are the works by Jan Tschichold (1902–1974), the undisputed master of the field. Among the many books he designed are the beautiful Penguin books of the late 1940s; he also was a type designer, e.g. of the *Sabon* typeface. A beautiful summary of his views is the short but condensed text Jan Tschichold, *Ausgewählte Aufsätze über Fragen der Gestalt des Buches und der Typographie*, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1993. An extensive and beautiful textbook on the topic is Hans Peter Willberg & Friedrich Forssman, Lesetypographie, Verlag Hermann Schmidt, Mainz, 1997. See also Robert Bringhurst, *The Elements of Typographic Style*, Hartley & Marks, 2004.

Many scientists passionately enjoyed their occupation. Any biography of Charles Darwin will purvey his fascination for biology, of Friedrich Bessel for astronomy, of Albert Einstein for physics and of Linus Pauling for chemistry.

942 The group of John Wearden in Manchester has shown by experiments with humans that the accuracy of a few per cent is possible for any action with a duration between a tenth of a second and a minute. See J. McCrone, When a second lasts forever, *New Scientist* pp. 53–56, 1 November 1997. Cited on page 1134.

943 E. J. Zimmerman, The macroscopic nature of space-time, *American Journal of Physics* **30**, pp. 97–105, 1962. Cited on page 1137.

944 The possibilities for precision timing using single-ion clocks are explained in ... Cited on page 1137.

945 See P.D. Pešić, The smallest clock, *European Journal of Physics* **14**, pp. 90–92, 1993. Cited on page 1137.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

946 D.J Morré & al., Biochemical basis for the biological clock, *Biochemistry* **41**, pp. 11941–11945, 2002. Cited on page 1135.

947 The chemical clocks in our body are described in John D. Palmer, *The Living Clock*, Oxford University Press, 2002, or in A. Ahlgren & F. Halberg, *Cycles of Nature: An Introduction to Biological Rhythms*, National Science Teachers Association, 1990. See also the www.msi.umn.edu/~halberg/introd website. Cited on page 1135.

948 An introduction to the sense of time as result of clocks in the brain is found in R. B. Ivry & R. Spencer, The neural representation of time, *Current Opinion in Neurobiology* **14**, pp. 225–232, 2004. The interval timer is explain in simple words in K. Wright, Times in our lives, *Scientific American* pp. 40–47, September 2002. The MRI research used is S. M. Rao, A. R. Mayer & D. L. Harrington, The evolution of brain activation during temporal processing, *Nature Neuroscience* **4**, pp. 317–323, 2001. Cited on page 1135.

949 See for example ... Cited on page 1139.

950 A pretty example of a quantum mechanical system showing exponential behaviour at all times is given by H. Nakazato, M. Namiki & S. Pascazio, Exponential behaviour of a quantum system in a macroscopic medium, *Physical Review Letters* **73**, pp. 1063–1066, 1994. Cited on page 1139.

951 See the delightful book about the topic by Paolo Facchi & Saverio Pascazio, *La regola d'oro di Fermi*, Bibliopolis, 1999. An experiment observing deviations at short times is S. R. Wilkinson, C. F. Bharucha, M. C. Fischer, K. W. Madison, P. R. Morrow, Q. Niu, B. Sundaram & M. G. Raizen, *Nature* **387**, p. 575, 1997. Cited on page 1139.

952 See ... Cited on page 1140.

953 W. M. Itano, D. J. Heinzen, J. J. Bollinger & D. J. Wineland, Quantum Zeno effect, *Physical Review A* **41**, pp. 2295–2300, 1990. M. C. Fischer, B. Gutiérrez-Medina & M. G. Raizen, Observation of the Quantum Zeno and Anti-Zeno effects in an unstable system, *Physical Review Letters* **87**, p. 040402, 2001, also www-arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0104035. Cited on page 1141.

954 See P. Facchi, Z. Hradil, G. Krenn, S. Pascazio & J. Řeháček Quantum Zeno tomography, *Physical Review A* **66**, p. 012110, 2002. Cited on page 1141.

955 H. Kobayashi & S. Kohshima, Unique morphology of the human eye, *Nature* **387**, pp. 767–768, 1997. Cited on page 1143.

956 James W. Prescott, Body pleasure and the origins of violence, *The Futurist* Bethseda, 1975, also available at www.violence.de/prescott/bullettin/article.html. Cited on page 1143.

957 Felix Tretter & Margot Albus, *Einführung in die Psychopharmakotherapie – Grundlagen, Praxis, Anwendungen*, Thieme, 2004. Cited on page 1144.

958 See for example P. Pyykkö, Relativity, gold, closed-shell interactions, and CsAu.NH3, *Angewandte Chemie, International Edition* **41**, pp. 3573–3578, 2002, or L. J. Norrby, Why is mercury liquid? Or, why do relativistic effects not get into chemistry textbooks?, *Journal of Chemical Education* **68**, pp. 110–113, 1991. Cited on page 1147.

959 The switchable mirror effect was discovered by J. N. Huiberts, R. Griessen, J. H. Rector, R. J. Wijngarden, J. P. Dekker, D. G. de Groot & N. J. Koeman, Yttrium and lanthanum hydride films with switchable optical properties, *Nature* **380**, pp. 231–234, 1996. A good introduction is R. Griessen, Schaltbare Spiegel aus Metallhydriden, *Physikalische Blätter* **53**, pp. 1207–1209, 1997. Cited on page 1160.

960 H. -W. Fink & C. Escher, Zupfen am Lebensfaden – Experimente mit einzelnen DNS-Molekülen, *Physik in unserer Zeit* **38**, pp. 190–196, 2007. Cited on page 1149.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

961 The present attempts to build cheap THz wave sensors – which allow to see through clothes – is described by D. Clery, Brainstorming their way to an imaging revolution, *Science* **297**, pp. 761–763, 2002. Cited on page 1161.

962 V. F. Weisskopf, Of atoms, mountains and stars: a study in qualitative physics, *Science* **187**, p. 605, 1975. Cited on page 1171.

963 K. Autumn, Y. Liang, T. Hsich, W. Zwaxh, W. P. Chan, T. Kenny, R. Fearing & R. J. Full, Adhesive force of a single gecko foot-hair, *Nature* **405**, pp. 681–685, 2000. Cited on page 1172.

964 A. B. Kesel, A. Martin & T. Seidl, Getting a grip on spider attachment: an AFM approach to microstructure adhesion in arthropods, *Smart Materials and Structures* **13**, pp. 512–518, 2004. Cited on page 1172.

965 H. Inaba, T. Saitou, K. -I. Tozaki & H. Hayashi, Effect of the magnetic field on the melting transition of H2O and D2O measured by a high resolution and supersensitive differential scanning calorimeter, *Journal of Applied Physics* **96**, pp. 6127–6132, 2004. Cited on page 1172.

966 The graph for temperature is taken from J. Jouzel & al., Orbital and millennial Antarctic climate variability over the past 800,000 years, *Science* **317**, pp. 793–796, 2007. The graph for CO_2 is combined from six publications: D. M. Etheridge & al., Natural and anthropogenic changes in atmospheric CO_2 over the last 1000 years from air in Antarctic ice and firm, *Journal of Geophysical Research* **101**, pp. 4115–4128, 1996, J. R. Petit & al., Climate and atmospheric history of the past 420,000 years from the Vostok ice core, Antarctica, *Nature* **399**, pp. 429–436, 1999, A. Indermühle & al., Atmospheric CO_2 concentration from 60 to 20 kyr BP from the Taylor Dome ic cores, Antarctica, *Geophysical Research Letters* **27**, pp. 735–738, 2000, E. Monnin & al., Atmospheric CO_2 concentration over the last glacial termination, *Science* **291**, pp. 112–114, 2001, U. Siegenthaler & al., Stable carbon cycle-climate relationship during the late pleistocene, *Science* **310**, pp. 1313–1317, 2005, D. Lüthi & al., High-resolution carbon dioxide concentration record 650,000-800,000 years before present, *Nature* **453**, pp. 379–382, 2008. Cited on page 1173.

967 R. Hemley & al., presented these results at the International Conference on New Diamond Science in Tsukuba (Japan) 2005. See figures at www.carnegieinstitution.org/diamond-13may2005. Cited on page 1173.

968 The *photon hall effect* was discovered by Geert Rikken, Bart van Tiggelen & Anja Sparenberg, Lichtverstrooiing in een magneetveld, *Nederlands tijdschrift voor natuurkunde* **63**, pp. 67–70, maart 1998. Cited on page 1175.

969 C. Strohm, G. L. J. A. Rikken & P. Wyder, Phenomenological evidence for the phonon Hall effect, *Physical Review Letters* **95**, p. 155901, 2005. Cited on page 1175.

970 E. Chibowski, L. Hołysz, K. Terpiłowski, Effect of magnetic field on deposition and adhesion of calcium carbonate particles on different substrates, *Journal of Adhesion Science and Technology* **17**, pp. 2005–2021, 2003, and references therein. Cited on page 1175.

971 K. S. Novoselov, D. Jiang, F. Schedin, T. Booth, V. V. Khotkevich, S. V. Morozov & A. K. Geim, Two Dimensional Atomic Crystals, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **102**, pp. 10451–10453, 2005. See also the talk by Andre Geim, QED in a pencil trace, to be downloaded at online.kitp.ucsb.edu/online/graphene_m07/geim/ or A. C. Neto, F. Guinea & N. M. Peres, Drawing conclusions from graphene, *Physics World* November 2006. Cited on pages 1175 and 1391.

972 On the internet, the 'spherical' periodic table is credited to Timothy Stowe; but there is no

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

reference for that claim, except an obscure calendar from a small chemical company. The original table (containing a number errors) used to be found at the chemlab.pc.maricopa.edu/periodic/stowetable.html website; it is now best found by searching for images called 'stowetable' with any internet search engine. Cited on page 1146.

973 For good figures of atomic orbitals, take any modern chemistry text. See for example the text by ... Cited on page 1147.

974 For experimentally determined pictures of the orbitals of dangling bonds, see for example F. Giessibl & al., Subatomic features on the silicon (111)-(7x7) surface observed by atomic force microscopy, *Science* **289**, pp. 422–425, 2000. Cited on page 1148.

975 Two excellent reviews with numerous photographs are E. Grotewohl, The genetics and biochemistry of floral pigments, *Annual Reviews of Plant Biology* **57**, pp. 761–780, 2006, and Y. Tanaka, N. Sasaki & A. Ohmiya, Biosynthesis of plant pigments: anthocyanins, betalains and carotenoids, *The Plant Journal* **54**, pp. 733–749, 2008. Cited on page 1170.

976 L. Pérez-Rodriguez & J. Viñuda, Carotenoid-based bill and eye coloration as honest signals of condition: an experimental test in the red-legged partridge (Alectoris rufa), *Naturwissenschaften* **95**, pp. 821–830, 2008, Cited on page 1170.

977 Y. Ruiz-Morales & O. C. Mullins, Measured and Simulated Electronic Absorption and Emission Spectra of Asphaltenes, *Energy & Fuels* to be published. U. Bergmann, H. Groenzin, O. C. Mullins, P. Glatzel, J. Fetzer & S. P. Cramer, Carbon K-edge X-ray Raman spectroscopy supports simple, yet powerful description of aromatic hydrocarbons and asphaltenes, *Chemical Physics Letters* **369**, pp. 184–191, 2003. Cited on page 1170.

978 A. P. Finne, T. Araki, R. Blaauwgeers, V. B. Eltsov, N. B. Kopnin, M. Krusius, L. Skrbek, M. Tsubota & G. E. Volovik, An intrinsic velocity-independent criterion for superfluid turbulence, *Nature* **424**, pp. 1022–1025, 2003. Cited on page 1177.

979 The first experimental evidence is by V. J. Goldman & B. Su, Resonance tunnelling in the fractional quantum Hall regime: measurement of fractional charge, *Science* **267**, pp. 1010–1012, 1995. The first unambiguous measurements are by R. de Picciotto & al., Direct observation of a fractional charge, *Nature* **389**, pp. 162–164, 1997, and L. Saminadayar, D. C. Glattli, Y. Jin & B. Etienne, Observation of the e,3 fractionally charged Laughlin quasiparticle/ *Physical Review Letters* **79**, pp. 2526–2529, 1997. or arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat/9706307. Cited on page 1178.

980 The original prediction, which earned Laughlin a Nobel Prize in Physics, is in R. B. Laughlin, Anomalous quantum Hall effect: an incompressible quantum fluid with fractionally charged excitations, *Physical Review Letters* **50**, pp. 1395–1398, 1983. Cited on page 1178.

981 The fractional quantum Hall effect was discovered by D. C. Tsui, H. L. Stormer & A. C. Gossard, Two-dimensional magnetotransport in the extreme quantum limit, *Physical Review Letters* **48**, pp. 1559–1562, 1982. Tsui and Stormer won the Nobel Prize in Physics with this paper. Cited on page 1178.

982 K. S. Novoselov, Z. Jiang, Y. Zhang, S. V. Morozov, H. L. Stormer, U. Zeitler, J. C. Mann, G. S. Boebinger, P. Kim & A. K. Geim, Room-temperature quantum Hall effect in graphene, *Science* **315**, p. 1379, 2007. Cited on page 1179.

983 The discovery of the original quantum Hall effect, which earned von Klitzing the Nobel

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Prize in Physics, was published as VON KLITZING, G. DORDA & M. PEPPER, New method for high-accuracy determination of the fine-structure constant based on quantised Hall resistance, *Physical Review Letters* **45**, pp. 494–497, 1980. Cited on page 1178.

984 [3] The first paper was J. BARDEEN, L. N. COOPER & J. R. SCHRIEFFER, Microscopic Theory of Superconductivity, *Physical Review* **106**, pp. 162–164, 1957. The full, so-called BCS theory, is then given in the masterly paper J. BARDEEN, L. N. COOPER & J. R. SCHRIEFFER, Theory of Superconductivity, *Physical Review* **108**, pp. 1175–1204, 1957. Cited on page 1176.

985 W. GUO & H. MARIS, Observations of the Motion of Single Electrons in Liquid Helium, *Journal of Low Temperature Physics* **148**, pp. 199–206, 2007. Cited on page 1187.

986 The story is found on many places in the internet. Cited on page 1188.

987 H. B. G. CASIMIR, On the attraction between two perfectly conducting bodies, *Proceedings of the Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen* **51**, pp. 793–795, 1948. No citations.

988 H. B. G. CASIMIR & D. POLDER, The influence of retardation on the London-Van der Waals forces, *Physical Review* **73**, pp. 360–372, 1948. No citations.

989 S. L. BOERSMA, Aantrekkende kracht tussen schepen, *Nederlands tidschrift voor natuurkunde* **67**, pp. 244–246, Augustus 2001. See also his paper S. L. BOERSMA, A maritime analogy of the Casimir effect, *American Journal of Physics* **64**, pp. 539–541, 1996. Cited on page 1189.

990 A. LARRAZA & B. DENARDO, An acoustic Casimir effect, *Physics Letters A* **248**, pp. 151–155, 1998. See also A. LARRAZA, A demonstration apparatus for an acoustic analog of the Casimir effect, *American Journal of Physics* **67**, pp. 1028–1030, 1999. Cited on page 1190.

991 B. W. DERJAGUIN, I. I. ABRIKOSOVA & E. M. LIFSHITZ, Direct measurement of molecular attraction between solids separated by a narrow gap, *Quaterly Review of the Chemical Society* (London) **10**, pp. 295–329, 1956. Cited on page 1191.

992 M. J. SPARNAAY, *Nature* **180**, p. 334, 1957. M. J. SPARNAAY, Measurements of attractive forces between flat plates, *Physica (Utrecht)* **24**, pp. 751–764, 1958. Cited on page 1191.

993 S. K. LAMOREAUX, Demonstration of the Casimir force in the 0.6 to 6 μm range, *Physical Review Letters* **78**, pp. 5–8, 1997. U. MOHIDEEN & A. ROY, Precision measurement of the Casimir force from 0.1 to 0.9 μm, *Physical Review Letters* **81**, pp. 4549–4552, 1998. Cited on page 1191.

994 A. LAMBRECHT, Das Vakuum kommt zu Kräften, *Physik in unserer Zeit* **36**, pp. 85–91, 2005. Cited on page 1191.

995 T. H. BOYER, Van der Waals forces and zero-point energy for dielectric and permeable materials, *Physical Review A* **9**, pp. 2078–2084, 1974. This was taken up again in O. KENNETH, I. KLICH, A. MANN & M. REVZEN, Repulsive Casimir forces, *Physical Review Letters* **89**, p. 033001, 2002. However, none of these effects has been verified yet. Cited on page 1191.

996 The effect was discovered by K. SCHARNHORST, On propagation of light in the vacuum between plates, *Physics Letters B* **236**, pp. 354–359, 1990. See also G. BARTON, Faster-than-c light between parallel mirrors: the Scharnhorst effect rederived, *Physics Letters B* **237**, pp. 559–562, 1990, and P. W. MILONNI & K. SVOZIL, Impossibility of measuring faster-than-c signalling by the Scharnhorst effect, *Physics Letters B* **248**, pp. 437–438, 1990. The latter corrects an error in the first paper. Cited on page 1191.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

997 D.L. Burke & al., Positron production in multiphoton light-by-light scattering, *Physical Review Letters* **79**, pp. 1626–1629, 1997. A simple summary is given in Bertram Schwarzschild, Gamma rays create matter just by plowing into laser light, *Physics Today* **51**, pp. 17–18, February 1998. Cited on page 1193.

998 M. Kardar & R. Golestanian, The 'friction' of the vacuum, and other fluctuation-induced forces, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **71**, pp. 1233–1245, 1999. Cited on page 1194.

999 G. Gour & L. Sriramkumar, Will small particles exhibit Brownian motion in the quantum vacuum?, arxiv.org/abs/quant/phys/9808032 Cited on page 1194.

1000 P. A. M. Dirac, The requirements of fundamental physical theory, *European Journal of Physics* **5**, pp. 65–67, 1984. This article transcribes a speech by Paul Dirac just before his death. Disturbed by the infinities of quantum electrodynamics, he rejects as wrong the theory which he himself found, even though it correctly describes all experiments. The humility of a great man who is so dismissive of his main and great achievement was impressive when hearing him, and still is impressive when reading the talk. Cited on page 1195.

1001 See for example the overview by M. Born & T. Jüstel, Umweltfreundliche Lichtquellen, *Physik Journal* **2**, pp. 43–49, 2003. Cited on page 1183.

1002 J. Kasparian, Les lasers femtosecondes : applications atmosph ériques, *La Recherche* pp. RE14 1–7, February 2004/ See also the www.teramobile.org website. Cited on page 1184.

1003 See the famous, beautiful but difficult textbook P. A. M. Dirac, *The Principles of Quantum Mechanics*, Clarendon Press, 1930, page 9. Cited on page 1185.

1004 Misleading statements are given in the introduction and in the conclusion of the review by H. Paul, Interference between independent photons, *Review of Modern Physics* **58**, pp. 209–231, 1986. However, in the bulk of the article the author in practice retracts the statement, e.g. on page 221. Cited on page 1185.

1005 G. Magyar & L. Mandel, Interference fringes produced by superposition of two independent maser light beams, *Nature* **198**, pp. 255–256, 1963. No citations.

1006 L. Cser, Gy. Tæræk, G. Krexner, I. Sharkov & B. Faragó, Holographic imaging of atoms using thermal neutrons, *Physical Review Letters* **89**, p. 75504, 2002. Cited on page 1186.

1007 H. Euler & B. Kockel, *Naturwissenschaften* **23**, p. 246, 1935, H. Euler, *Annalen der Physik* **26**, p. 398, 1936, W. Heisenberg & H. Euler, Folgerung aus der Diracschen Theorie des Electrons, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **98**, pp. 714–722, 1936. Cited on page 1195.

1008 Thomas Stoehlker & al., *Physical Review Letters* 9 October 2000. Cited on page 1196.

1009 M. Roberts & al., Observation of an electric octupole transition in a single ion, *Physical Review Letters* **78**, pp. 1876–1879, 1997. A lifetime of 3700 days was determined. Cited on page 1196.

1010 K. An, J. J. Childs, R. R. Desari & M. S. Field, Microlaser: a laser with one atom in an optical resonator, *Physical Review Letters* **73**, pp. 3375–3378, 19 December 1994. Cited on page 1184.

1011 A. Takita, H. Yamamoto, Y. Hayasaki, N. Nishida & H. Misawa, Three-dimensional optical memory using a human fingernail, *Optics Express* **13**, pp. 4560–4567, 2005. They used a Ti:sapphire oscillator and a Ti:sapphire amplifier. Cited on page 1185.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

1012 See the website by Tom Hales on www.math.lsa.umich.edu/~hales/countdown. An earlier book on the issue is the delightful text by Max Leppmaier, *Kugelpackungen von Kepler bis heute*, Vieweg Verlag, 1997. Cited on page 1197.

1013 For a short overview, also covering binary systems, see C. Bechinger, von Grünberg & P. Leiderer, Entropische Kräfte - warum sich repulsiv wechselwirkende Teilchen anziehen können, *Physikalische Blätter* **55**, pp. 53–56, 1999. Cited on page 1197.

1014 H.-W. Fink & G. Ehrlich, Direct observation of three-body interactions in adsorbed layers: Re on W(110), *Physical Review Letters* **52**, pp. 1532–1534, 1984, and H.-W. Fink & G. Ehrlich, Pair and trio interactions between adatoms: Re on W(110), *Journal of Chemical Physics* **61**, pp. 4657–4665, 1984. Cited on page 1197.

1015 See for example the textbook by A. Pimpinelli & J. Villain, *Physics of Crystal Growth*, Cambridge University Press, 1998. Cited on page 1198.

1016 Y. Furukawa, Faszination der Schneekristalle - wie ihre bezaubernden Formen entstehen, *Chemie in unserer Zeit* **31**, pp. 58–65, 1997. His www.lowtem.hokudai.ac.jp/~frkw/index_e.html website gives more information. Cited on page 1198.

1017 de Gennes, Soft matter, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **63**, p. 645, 1992. Cited on page 1198.

1018 The fluid helium based quantum gyroscope was first used to measure the rotation of the Earth by the French research group O. Avenel & E. Varoquaux, Detection of the Earth rotation with a superfluid double-hole resonator, *Czechoslovak Journal of Physics (Supplement S6)* **48**, pp. 3319–3320, 1996. It was later repeated by the Berkeley group, K. Schwab, N. Bruckner & R. E. Packard, Detection of the Earth's rotation using superfluid phase coherence, *Nature* **386**, pp. 585–587, 1997. For an review, see O. Avenel, Yu. Mukharsky & E. Varoquaux, Superfluid gyrometers, *Journal of Low Temperature Physics* **135**, p. 745, 2004. Cited on page 1198.

1019 K. Schwab & al., *Nature* **404**, p. 974, 2000. For the optical analog, see Ref. 597. Cited on page 1199.

1020 J.P. Briand & al., Production of hollow atoms by the excitation of highly charged ions in interaction with a metallic surface, *Physical Review Letters* **65**, pp. 159–162, 1990. See also C. Rhodes, Hollow atoms, ..., and ...*Physikalische Blätter* Oktober 1996. Cited on page 1199.

1021 The present knowledge on how humans move is summarised by ... Cited on page 1202.

1022 See e.g. D. A. Bryant, Electron acceleration in the aurora, *Contemporary Physics* **35**, pp. 165–179, 1994. Cited on page 1202.

1023 The discharges above clouds are described e.g. by ... Cited on page 1202.

1024 See e.g. L. O'C. Drury, Acceleration of cosmic rays, *Contemporary Physics* **35**, pp. 231–242, 1994. Cited on page 1202.

1025 About Coulomb explosions, see ... Cited on page 1202.

1026 See Dirk Kreimer, New mathematical structures in renormalizable quantum field theories, arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0211136 or *Annals of Physics* **303**, pp. 179–202, 2003, and the erratum ibid., **305**, p. 79, 2003. Cited on page 1202.

1027 S. Fray, C. Alvarez Diez, T. W. Hänsch & Martin Weitz, Atomic interferometer with amplitude gratings of light and its applications to atom based tests of the equivalence principle, *Physical Review Letters* **93**, p. 240404, 2004. Cited on page 1204.

1028 R. Colella, A. W. Overhauser & S. A. Werner, Observation of gravitationally induced quantum mechanics, *Physical Review Letters* **34**, pp. 1472–1475, 1975. This experiment is usually called the COW experiment. Cited on page 1204.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

1029 G. C. Ghirardi, A. Rimini & T. Weber, Unified dynamics for microscopic and macroscopic systems, *Physical Review D* **34**, pp. 470–491, 1986. Cited on page 1216.

1030 Ch. J. Bordé & C. Lämmerzahl, Atominterferometrie und Gravitation, *Physikalische Blätter* **52**, pp. 238–240, 1996. See also A. Peters, K. Y. Chung & S. Chu, Observation of gravitational acceleration by dropping atoms, *Nature* **400**, pp. 849–852, 26 August 1999. Cited on page 1204.

1031 V. V. Nesvizhevsky & al., Quantum states of neutrons in the Earth's gravitational field, *Nature* **415**, p. 297, 17 January 2002. Cited on page 1204.

1032 J. D. Bekenstein, Black holes and entropy, *Physical Review D* **7**, pp. 2333–2346, 1973. Cited on page 1206.

1033 R. Bousso, The holographic principle, *Review of Modern Physics* **74**, pp. 825–874, 2002, also available as arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0203101. The paper is an excellent review; however, it has some argumentation errors, as explained on page 1207. Cited on page 1207.

1034 This is clearly argued by S. Carlip, Black hole entropy from horizon conformal field theory, *Nuclear Physics B* Proceedings Supplement **88**, pp. 10–16, 2000. Cited on page 1207.

1035 S. A. Fulling, Nonuniqueness of canonical field quantization in Riemannian spacetime, *Physical Review D* **7**, pp. 2850–2862, 1973, P. Davies/ Scalar particle production in Schwarzchild and Rindler metrics, *Journal of Physics A: General Physics* **8**, pp. 609–616, 1975, W. G. Unruh, Notes on black hole evaporation, *Physical Review D* **14**, pp. 870–892, 1976. Cited on page 1207.

1036 About the possibility to measure Fulling–Davies–Unruh radiation, see for example the paper by H. Rosu, On the estimates to measure Hawking effect und Unruh effect in the laboratory, *International Journal of Modern Physics D3* p. 545, 1994. arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9605032 or the paper P. Chen & T. Tajima, Testing Unruh radiation with ultra-intense lasers, *Physical Review Letters* **83**, pp. 256–259, 1999. Cited on page 1208.

1037 W. G. Unruh & R. M. Wald, Acceleration radiation and the generalised second law of thermodynamics, *Physical Review D* **25**, pp. 942–958 , 1982. Cited on page 1208.

1038 R. M. Wald, The thermodynamics of black holes, *Living Reviews of Relativity* 2001, www-livingreviews.org/lrr-2001-6. Cited on page 1210.

1039 For a delightful popular account from a black hole expert, see Igor Novikov, *Black Holes and the Universe*, Cambridge University Press 1990. Cited on pages 1210 and 1214.

1040 The original paper is W. G. Unruh, Experimental black hole evaporation?, *Physical Review Letters* **46**, pp. 1351–1353, 1981. A good explanation with good literature overview is the one by Matt Visser, Acoustical black holes: horizons, ergospheres and Hawking radiation, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9712010. Cited on page 1211.

1041 G. W. Gibbons & S. W. Hawking, Action integrals and partition functions in quantum gravity, *Physical Review D* **15**, pp. 2752–2756, 1977. No citations.

1042 Optical black holes ... Cited on page 1211.

1043 T. Damour & R. Ruffini, Quantum electrodynamical effects in Kerr–Newman geometries, *Physical Review Letters* **35**, pp. 463–466, 1975. Cited on page 1211.

1044 These were the Vela satellites; their existence and results were announced officially only in 1974, even though they were working already for many years. Cited on page 1211.

1045 The best general introduction into the topic of gamma ray bursts is S. Klose, J. Greiner & D. Hartmann, Kosmische Gammastrahlenausbrüche – Beobachtungen und Modelle, Teil I und II, *Sterne und Weltraum* March and April 2001. Cited on pages 1211 and 1212.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

1046 When the gamma ray burst encounters the matter around the black hole, it is broadened. The larger the amount of matter, the broader the pulse is. See G. Preparata, R. Ruffini & S.-S. Xue, The dyadosphere of black holes and gamma-ray bursts, *Astronomy and Astrophysics* **338**, pp. L87–L90, 1998, R. Ruffini, J.D. Salmonson, J.R. Wilson & S.-S. Xue, On the pair electromagnetic pulse of a black hole with electromagnetic structure, *Astronomy and Astrophysics* **350**, pp. 334–343, 1999, R. Ruffini, J.D. Salmonson, J.R. Wilson & S.-S. Xue, On the pair electromagnetic pulse from an electromagnetic black hole surrounded by a baryonic remnant, *Astronomy and Astrophysics* **359**, pp. 855–864, 2000, and C.L. Bianco, R. Ruffini & S.-S. Xue, The elementary spike produced by a pure e^+e^- pair-electromagnetic pulse from a black hole: the PEM pulse, *Astronomy and Astrophysics* **368**, pp. 377–390, 2001. For a very personal account by Ruffini on his involvement in gamma ray bursts, see his paper Black hole formation and gamma ray bursts, arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0001425. Cited on page 1212.

1047 About the membrane despription of black holes, see ... Cited on page 1214.

1048 arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0301262, arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0303539, D.W. Fox & al., Early optical emission from the γ-ray burst of 4 October 2002, *Nature* **422**, pp. 284–286, 2003. Cited on page 1213.

1049 Negative heat capacity has also been found in atom clusters and in nuclei. See e.g. M. Schmidt & al., Negative heat capacity for a cluster of 147 sodium atoms, *Physical Review Letters* **86**, pp. 1191–1194, 2001. Cited on page 1214.

1050 H.-P. Nollert, Quasinormal modes: the characteristic 'sound' of black holes and neutron stars, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **16**, pp. R159–R216, 1999. Cited on page 1214.

1051 He wrote a series of papers on the topic; a beautiful summary is Don N. Page, How fast does a black hole radiate information?, *International Journal of Modern Physics* **3**, pp. 93–106, 1994, based on his earlier papers, such as Information in black hole radiation, *Physical Review Letters* **71**, pp. 3743–3746, 1993. See also his electronic preprint at arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9305040. Cited on page 1215.

1052 See Don N. Page, Average entropy of a subsystem, *Physical Review Letters* **71**, pp. 1291–1294, 1993. The entropy formula of this paper, used above, was proven by S.K. Foong & S. Kanno, Proof of Page's conjecture on the average entropy of a subsystem, *Physical Review Letters* **72**, pp. 1148–1151, 1994. Cited on page 1215.

1053 The author speculates that this version of the coincidences could be original; he has not found it in the literature. Cited on page 1217.

1054 Steven Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology*, Wiley, 1972. See equation 16.4.3 on page 619 and also page 620. Cited on page 1217.

1055 It could be that knot theory provides a relation between a local knot invariant, related to particles, and a global one. Cited on page 1217.

1056 R. Lafrance & R.C. Myers, Gravity's rainbow: limits for the applicability of the equivalence principle, *Physical Review D* **51**, pp. 2584–2590, 1995, arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9411018. Cited on page 1216.

1057 M. Yu. Kuchiev & V.V. Flambaum, Scattering of scalar particles by a black hole, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0312065. See also M. Yu. Kuchiev & V.V. Flambaum, Reflection on event horizon and escape of particles from confinement inside black holes, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0407077. Cited on page 1216.

1058 E. Joos, Why do we observe a classical space-time?, *Physics Letters A* **116**, pp. 6–8, 1986. Cited on page 1219.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

1059 This point was made repeatedly by Steven Weinberg, namely in Derivation of gauge invariance and the equivalence principle from Lorentz invariance of the S-matrix , *Physics Letters* **9**, pp. 357–359, 1964, in Photons and gravitons in S-matrix theory: derivation of charge conservation and equality of gravitational and inertial mass, *Physical Review B* **135**, pp. 1049–1056, 1964, and in Photons and gravitons in perturbation theory: derivation of Maxwell's and Einstein's equations, *Physical Review B* **138**, pp. 988–1002, 1965. Cited on page 1218.

1060 L. H. Ford & T. A. Roman, Quantum field theory constrains traversable wormhole geometries, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9510071 or *Physical Review D* **53**, pp. 5496–5507, 1996. Cited on page 1219.

1061 M. J. Pfenning & L. H. Ford, The unphysical nature of 'warp drive', *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **14**, pp. 1743–1751, 1997. Cited on page 1220.

1062 B. S. Kay, M. Radzikowski & R. M. Wald, Quantum field theory on spacetimes with a compactly generated Cauchy horizon, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9603012 or *Communications in Mathematical Physics 183* pp. 533–556, 1997. Cited on page 1220.

1063 A excellent technical introduction to nuclear physics is Bogdan Povh, Klaus Rith, Christoph Scholz & Frank Zetsche, *Teilchen und Kerne*, Springer, 5th edition, 1999. It is also available in English translation. Cited on page 1222.

1064 W.C.M. Weijmar Schultz & al., Magnetic resonance imaging of male and female genitals during coitus and female sexual arousal, *British Medical Journal* **319**, pp. 1596–1600, December 18, 1999, available online as www.bmj.com/cgi/content/full/319/7225/1596. Cited on page 1223.

1065 M. Chantell, T. C. Weekes, X. Sarazin & M. Urban, Antimatter and the moon, *Nature* **367**, p. 25, 1994. M. Amenomori & al., Cosmic ray shadow by the moon observed with the Tibet air shower array, Proceedings of the 23rd International Cosmic Ray Conference, Calgary **4**, pp. 351–354, 1993. M. Urban & al., *Nuclear Physics, Proceedings Supplement* **14B**, pp. 223–236, 1990. Cited on page 1232.

1066 An excellent summary on radiometric dating is by R. Wiens, Radiometric dating – a christian perpective, www.asa3.org/ASA/resources/Wiens.html. The absurd title is due to the habit in many religious circles to put into question radiometric dating results. Putting apart the extremely few religious statements in the review, the content is well explained. Cited on pages 1236 and 1245.

1067 A good overview is given by A. N. Halliday, Radioactivity, the discovery of time and the earliest history of the Earth, *Contemporary Physics* **38**, pp. 103–114, 1997. Cited on page 1237.

1068 J. Dudek, A. God, N. Schunck & M. Mikiewicz, Nuclear tetrahedral symmetry: possibly present throughout the periodic table, *Physical Review Letters* **88**, p. 252502, 24 June 2002. Cited on page 1239.

1069 A good introduction is R. Clark & B. Wodsworth, A new spin on nuclei, *Physics World* pp. 25–28, July 1998. Cited on page 1239.

1070 John Horgan, *The End of Science – Facing the Limits of Knowledge in the Twilight of the Scientific Age*, Broadway Books, 1997, chapter 3, note 1. Cited on page 1241.

1071 An older but still fascinating summary of solar physics is R. Kippenhahn, *Hundert Milliarden Sonnen*, Piper, 1980. It was a famous bestseller and is available also in English translation. Cited on page 1248.

1072 H. Bethe, On the formation of deuterons by proton combination, *Physical Review* **54**, pp. 862–862, 1938, and H. Bethe, Energy production in stars, *Physical Review* **55**,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

pp. 434–456, 1939. Cited on page 1248.

1073 M. Nauenberg & V. F. Weisskopf, Why does the sun shine?, *American Journal of Physics* **46**, pp. 23–31, 1978. Cited on page 1249.

1074 M. Brunetti, S. Cecchini, M. Galli, G. Giovannini & A. Pagliarin, Gamma-ray bursts of atmospheric origin in the MeV energy range, *Geophysical Research Letters* **27**, p. 1599, 1 June 2000. Cited on page 1242.

1075 A book with nuclear explosion photographs is Michael Light, *100 Suns*, Jonathan Cape, 2003. Cited on page 1244.

1076 The slowness of the speed of light inside stars is due to the frequent scattering of photons by the star matter. The most common estimate for the Sun is an escape time of 40 000 to 1 million years, but estimates between 17 000 years and 50 million years can be found in the literature. Cited on page 1249.

1077 See the freely downloadable book by John Wesson, *The Science of JET - The Achievements of the Scientists and Engineers Who Worked on the Joint European Torus 1973-1999*, JET Joint Undertaking, 2000, available at www.jet.edfa.org/documents/wesson/wesson.html. Cited on page 1252.

1078 J. D. Lawson, Some criteria for a power producing thermonuclear reactor, *Proceedings of the Physical Society, London* **B 70**, pp. 6–10, 1957. The paper had been kept secret for two years. Cited on page 1253.

1079 R. A. Alpher, H. Bethe & G. Gamow, The Origin of Chemical Elements, *Physical Review* **73**, p. 803-804, 1948. Cited on page 1254.

1080 Kendall, Friedman and Taylor received the 1990 Nobel Prize for Physics for a series of experiments they conducted in the years 1967 to 1973. The story is told in the three Nobel lectures R. E. Taylor, Deep inelastic scattering: the early years, *Review of Modern Physics* **63**, pp. 573–596, 1991, H. W. Kendall, Deep inelastic scattering: Experiments on the proton and the observation of scaling, *Review of Modern Physics* **63**, pp. 597–614, 1991, and J. I. Friedman, Deep inelastic scattering: Comparisons with the quark model, *Review of Modern Physics* **63**, pp. 615–620, 1991. Cited on page 1257.

1081 About the strange genius of Gell-Mann, see the beautiful book by George Johnson, *Murray Gell-Mann and the Revolution in Twentieth-Century Physics*, Knopf, 1999. Cited on page 1257.

1082 The best introduction might be the wonderfully clear text by Donald H. Perkins, *Introduction to High Energy Physics*, Cambridge University Press, fourth edition, 2008. Also beautiful, with more emphasis on the history and more detail, is Kurt Gottfried & Victor F. Weisskopf, *Concepts of Particle Physics*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1984. Victor Weisskopf was one of the heroes of the field, both in theoretical research and in the management of CERN, the particle research organisation. Cited on pages 1258, 1267, and 1374.

1083 G. Zweig, An SU3 model for strong interaction symmetry and its breaking II, CERN Report No. 8419TH. 412, February 21, 1964. Cited on page 1257.

1084 H. Fritsch, M. Gell-Mann & H. Leutwyler, Advantages of the color octet picture, *Physics Letters B* **47**, pp. 365–368, 1973. Cited on page 1260.

1085 Quantum chromodynamics can be explored in books of several levels. The first, the popular one, is described most clearly by one of its founders, in the longseller Harald Fritzsch, *Quarks – Urstoff unserer Welt*, Piper Verlag, 2006, or, in English language, *Quarks: the stuff of matter*, Penguin Books, 1983. In the second level, the field can be explored in texts on high energy physics, as those of Ref. 1082. The third level contains books

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

like Kerson Huang, Quarks, Leptons and Gauge Fields, World Scientific, 1992, or Felix J. Ynduráin, The Theory of Quark and Gluon Interactions, Springer Verlag, 1992, or Walter Greiner & Andreas Schäfer, Quantum Chromodynamics, Springer Verlag, 1995, or the modern and detailed text by Stephan Narison, *QCD as a Theory of Hadrons*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. As always, a student has to discover by himself or herself which text he or she likes most. Cited on pages 1260, 1266, and 1268.

1086 The approximation of QCD with zero mass quarks is described by F. Wilczek, Getting its from bits, *Nature* **397**, pp. 303–306, 1999. It is also explained in F. Wilczek, Asymptotic freedom, *Nobel lecture* 2004. The proton's mass is set by the energy scale at which the strong coupling, coming from its value at Planck energy, becomes of order unity. Cited on pages 1270 and 1286.

1087 The official reference for all particle data, worth a look for every physicist, is the massive collection of information compiled by the Particle Data Group, with the website pdg.web.cern.ch containing the most recent information. A printed review is published about every two years in one of the major journals on elementary particle physics. See for example C. Amsler & al., The Review of Particle Physics, *Physics Letters B* **667**, p. 1, 2008. For some measured properties of these particles, the official reference is the set of so-called CODATA values, found at physics.nist.gov/cuu/Constants/. The most recent list was published on paper as P. J. Mohr, B. N. Taylor & D. B. Newell, CODATA recommended values of the fundamental physical constants: 2006, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **80**, pp. 633–730, 2008. It is available also on the NIST site. Cited on pages 1259, 1268, 1270, 1271, 1277, 1281, 1284, and 1291.

1088 For a pedagogical introduction to lattice QCD calculations, see R. Gupta, Introduction to Lattice QCD, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/hep-lat/9807028, or the clear introduction by Michael Creutz, *Quarks, Gluons and Lattices*, Cambridge University Press, 1983. Cited on page 1267.

1089 S. Bethke, Experimental tests of asymptotic freedom, *Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics* **58**, pp. 351–368, 2007, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/hep-ex/0606035. Cited on page 1268.

1090 A. J. Buchmann & E. M. Henley, Intrinsic quadrupole moment of the nucleon, *Physical Review C* **63**, p. 015202, 2000. Alfons Buchmann also predicts that the quadrupole moment of the other, strange $J = 1/2$ octet baryons is positive, and predicts a prolate structure for all of them (private communication). For the decuplet baryons, with $J = 3/2$, the quadrupole moment can often be measured spectroscopically, and is always negative. The four Δ baryons are thus predicted to have a negative intrinsic quadrupole moment and thus an oblate shape. This explained in A. J. Buchmann & E. M. Henley, Quadrupole moments of baryons, *Physical Review D* **65**, p. 073017, 2002. For recent updates, see A. J. Buchmann, Charge form factors and nucleon shape, pp. 110–125, in the Shape of Hadrons Workshop Conference, Athens Greece, 27-29 April 2006, AIP Conference Proceedings 904, Eds. C.N. Papanicolas, Aron Bernstein. For updates on other baryons, see A. J. Buchmann, Structure of strange baryons, Hyp 2006, International Conference on Hypernuclear and Strange Particle Physics, Oct.10-14, Mainz, Germany, to be published in European Physics Journal A 2007. The topic is an active field of research; for example, results on magnetic octupole moments are expected soon. Cited on page 1270.

1091 S. Strauch & al., Polarization transfer in the ^{4}He (e,e'p) ^{3}H reaction up to $Q^2 = 2.6(\mathrm{GeV/c})^2$, *Physical Review Letters* **91**, p. 052301, 2003. Cited on page 1270.

1092 S. Dürr & al., Ab initio determination of the light hadron masses, *Science* **322**, pp. 1224–

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

1227, 2008. Cited on page 1264.

1093 See for example C. Bernard & al., Light hadron spectrum with Kogut–Susskind quarks, *Nuclear Physics, Proceedings Supplement* **73**, p. 198, 1999, and references therein. Cited on page 1264.

1094 R. Brandelik & al., Evidence for planar events in e^+e^- annihilation at high energies, *Physics Letters B* **86**, pp. 243–249, 1979. Cited on page 1265.

1095 F. Abe & al., Measurement of dijet angular distributions by the collider detector at Fermilab, *Physical Review Letters* **77**, pp. 5336–5341, 1996. Cited on page 1269.

1096 F. Close, Glueballs and hybrids: new states of matter, *Contemporary Physics* **38**, pp. 1–12, 1997. See also the next reference. Cited on page 1272.

1097 A tetraquark is thought to be the best explanation for the $f_0(980)$ resonance at 980 MeV. The original proposal of this explanation is due to R. L. Jaffe, Multiquark hadrons I: phenomenology of $Q^2\overline{Q}^2$ mesons, *Physical Review D* **15**, pp. 267–280, 1977, R. L. Jaffe, Multiquark hadrons II: methods, *Physical Review D* **15**, pp. 281–289, 1977, and R. L. Jaffe, *Physical Review D* $Q^2\overline{Q}^2$ resonances in the baryon-antibaryon system,**17**, pp. 1444–1458, 1978. For a clear and detailed modern summary, see the excellent review by E. Klempt & A. Zaitsev, Glueballs, hybrids, multiquarks: experimental facts versus QCD inspired concepts, *Physics Reports* **454**, pp. 1–202, 2007, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/0708.4016. See also F. Giacosa, Light scalars as tetraquarks, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/0711.3126, and V. Crede & C. A. Meyer, The experimental status of glueballs, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/0812.0600. Cited on page 1272.

1098 Pentaquarks were first predicted by Maxim Polyakov, Dmitri Diakonov, and Victor Petrov in 1997. Two experimental groups in 2003 claimed to confirm their existence, with a mass of 1540 MeV; see K. Hicks, An experimental review of the Θ^+ pentaquark, arxiv.org/abs/hep-ex/0412048. Results from 2005, however, seem to rule out that the 1540 MeV particle is a pentaquark. Cited on page 1272.

1099 See, for example, Ya. B. Zel'dovich & V. S. Popov, Electronic structure of superheavy atoms, *Soviet Physics Uspekhi* **17**, pp. 673–694, 2004 in the English translation. Cited on page 1272.

1100 J. Tran Thanh Van, ed., *CP violation in Particle Physics and Astrophysics*, Proc. Conf. Chateau de Bois, France, May 1989, Editions Frontières, 1990. Cited on page 1277.

1101 M. A. Bouchiat & C. C. Bouchiat, Weak neutral currents in atomic physics, *Physics Letters B* **48**, pp. 111–114, 1974. U. Amaldi, A. Böhm, L. S. Durkin, P. Langacker, A. K. Mann, W. J. Marciano, A. Sirlin & H. H. Williams, Comprehensive analysis of data pertaining to the weak neutral current and the intermediate-vector-boson masses, *Physical Review D* **36**, pp. 1385–1407, 1987. Cited on page 1279.

1102 M. C. Noecker, B. P. Masterson & C. E. Wiemann, Precision measurement of parity nonconservation in atomic cesium: a low-energy test of electroweak theory, *Physical Review Letters* **61**, pp. 310–313, 1988. See also D. M. Meekhof & al., High-precision measurement of parity nonconserving optical rotation in atomic lead, *Physical Review Letters* **71**, pp. 3442–3445, 1993. Cited on page 1279.

1103 S. C. Bennet & C. E. Wiemann, Measurement of the 6S – 7S transition polarizability in atomic cesium and an improved test of the standard model, *Physical Review Letters* **82**, pp. 2484–2487, 1999. The group has also measured the spatial distribution of the weak charge, the so-called the *anapole moment*; see C.S. Wood & al., Measurement of parity nonconservation and an anapole moment in cesium, *Science* **275**, pp. 1759–1763, 1997. Cited on page 1279.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

1104 C. Jarlskog, Commutator of the quark mass matrices in the standard electroweak model and a measure of maximal CP nonconservation, *Physical Review Letters* **55**, pp. 1039–1042, 1985. Cited on page 1281.

1105 P. W. Higgs, Broken symmetries, massless particles and gauge fields, *Physics Letters* **12**, pp. 132–133, 1964. He then expanded the story in P. W. Higgs, Spontaneous symmetry breakdown without massless bosons, *Physical Review* **145**, p. 1156-1163, 1966. Higgs gives most credit to Anderson, instead of to himself; he also mentions Brout and Englert, Guralnik, Hagen, Kibble and 't Hooft. Cited on page 1285.

1106 K. Grotz & H. V. Klapdor, *Die schwache Wechselwirkung in Kern-, Teilchen- und Astrophysik*, Teubner Verlag, Stuttgart, 1989. Also available in English and in several other languages. Cited on page 1284.

1107 D. Treille, Particle physics from the Earth and from the sky: Part II, *Europhysics News* **35**, no. 4, 2004. Cited on page 1285.

1108 Rumination is studied in P. Jordan & de Laer Kronig, in *Nature* **120**, p. 807, 1927. Cited on page 1287.

1109 K.W.D. Ledingham & al., Photonuclear physics when a multiterawatt laser pulse interacts with solid targets, *Physical Review Letters* **84**, pp. 899–902, 2000. K.W.D. Ledingham & al., Laser-driven photo-transmutation of Iodine-129 – a long lived nuclear waste product, *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics* **36**, pp. L79–L82, 2003. R. P. Singhal, K. W. D. Ledingham & P. McKenna, Nuclear physics with ultra-intense lasers – present status and future prospects, *Recent Research Developments in Nuclear Physics* **1**, pp. 147–169, 2004. Cited on page 1288.

1110 For the bibliographic details of the latest print version of the *Review of Particle Physics*, see Appendix E. The online version can be found at pdg.web.cern.ch. The present status on grand unification can also be found in the respective section of the overview. Cited on page 1295.

1111 Slides of a very personal review talk by H. Georgi, The future of grand unification, can be found at www2.yukawa.kyoto-u.ac.jp/~yt100sym/files/yt100sym_georgi.pdf. A modern research approach is S. Raby, Grand unified theories, arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0608183. Cited on page 1295.

1112 H. Jeon & M. Longo, Search for magnetic monopoles trapped in matter, *Physical Review Letters* **75**, pp. 1443–1447, 1995. Cited on page 1296.

1113 On proton decay rates, see the data of the Particle Data Group, at pdg.web.cern.ch. Cited on page 1296.

1114 U. Amaldi, de Boer & H. Fürstenau, Comparison of grand unified theories with electroweak and strong coupling constants measured at LEP, *Physics Letters* **260**, pp. 447–455, 1991. This widely cited paper is the standard reference for this issue. An update is found in de Boer & C. Sander, Global electroweak fits and gauge coupling unification, *Physics Letters B 585* pp. 276–286, 2004, or preprint at arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0307049. The figure is taken with permission from the home page of Wim de Boer at www-ekp.physik.uni-karlsruhe.de/~deboer/html/Forschung/forschung.html. Cited on page 1297.

1115 Peter G. O. Freund, *Introduction to Supersymmetry*, Cambridge 1988. Julius Wess & Jonathan Bagger, *Supersymmetry and Supergravity*, Princeton University Press, 1992. This widely cited book contains a lot of mathematics but little physics. Cited on page 1298.

1116 P. C. Argyres, Dualities in supersymmetric field theories, *Nuclear Physics Proceedings Supplement* **61A**, pp. 149–157, 1998, preprint available at arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9705076.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Cited on page 1300.

1117 Michael Stone editor, *Bosonization*, World Scientific, 1994. R. Rajaraman, *Solitons and Instantons*, North Holland, 1987. Cited on page 1302.

1118 An informative account of the world of psychokinesis and the paranormal is given by the famous professional magician James Randi, *Flim-flam!*, Prometheus Books, Buffalo 1987, as well as in several of his other books. See also the www.randi.org website. Cited on page 1336.

1119 This way to look at things goes back to the text by Susan Hewitt & Edward Subitzky, A call for more scientific truth in product warning labels, *Journal of Irreproducible Results* **36**, nr. 1, 1991. Cited on page 1339.

1120 J. Malik, The yields of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki nuclear explosions, Technical Report LA-8819, Los Alamos National Laboratory, September 1985. Cited on page 1339.

1121 James Clerk Maxwell, *Scientific Papers*, **2**, p. 244, October 1871. Cited on page 1343.

1122 A good introduction is C. J. Hogan, Why the universe is just so, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **72**, pp. 1149–1161, 2000. Most of the material of Table 117 is from the mighty book by John D. Barrow & Frank J. Tipler, *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle*, Oxford University Press, 1986. Discarding unrealistic options is also an interesting pastime. See for example the reasons why life can only be carbon-based, as explained in the essay by I. Asimov, The one and only, in his book *The Tragedy of the Moon*, Doubleday, Garden City, New York, 1973. Cited on page 1343.

1123 L. Smolin, The fate of black hole singularities and the parameters of the standard models of particle physics and cosmology, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9404011. Cited on page 1345.

1124 Aristotle, Treaty of the heaven, III, II, 300 b 8. See Jean-Paul Dumont, *Les écoles présocratiques*, Folio Essais, Gallimard, p. 392, 1991. Cited on page 1347.

1125 In 1997, the smallest human-made flying object was the helicopter built by a group of the Institut für Mikrotechnik in Mainz, in Germany. A picture is available at their web page, to be found at www.imm-mainz.de/English/billboard/f_hubi.html. The helicopter is 24 mm long, weighs 400 mg and flies (though not freely) using two built-in electric motors driving two rotors, running at between 40 000 and 100 000 revolutions per minute. See also the helicopter from Stanford University at www-rpl.stanford.edu/RPL/htmls/mesoscopic/mesicopter/mesicopter.html, with an explanation of its battery problems. Cited on page 1304.

1126 Henk Tennekes, *De wetten van de vliegkunst – over stijgen, dalen, vliegen en zweven*, Aramith Uitgevers, 1992. This clear and interesting text is also available in English. Cited on page 1304.

1127 The most recent computational models of lift still describe only two-dimensional wing motion, e.g. Z. J. Wang, Two dimensional mechanism for insect hovering, *Physical Review Letters 85* pp. 2216–2219, 2000. A first example of a mechanical bird has been constructed by Wolfgang Send; it can be studied on the www.aniprop.de website. See also W. Send, Physik des Fliegens, *Physikalische Blätter* **57**, pp. 51–58, June 2001. Cited on page 1305.

1128 R. B. Srygley & A. L. R. Thomas, Unconventional lift-generating mechanisms in free-flying butterflies, *Nature* **420**, pp. 660–664, 2002. Cited on page 1305.

1129 The book by John Brackenbury, *Insects in Flight*, 1992. is a wonderful introduction into the biomechanics of insects, combining interesting science and beautiful photographs. Cited on page 1307.

1130 The simulation of insect flight using enlarged wing models flapping in oil instead of air is described for example in www.dickinson.caltech.edu/research_robofly.html. The higher

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

viscosity of oil allows to achieve the same Reynolds number with larger sizes and lower frequencies than in air. Cited on page 1307.

1131 E. Purcell, Life at low Reynolds number, *American Journal of Physics* **45**, p. 3, 1977. Cited on page 1308.

1132 Most bacteria are flattened, ellipsoidal sacks kept in shape by the membrane enclosing the cytoplasma. But there are exceptions; in salt water, quadratic and triangular bacteria have been found. More is told in the corresponding section in the interesting book by Bernard Dixon, *Power Unseen – How Microbes Rule the World*, W.H. Freeman, New York, 1994. Cited on page 1308.

1133 S. Pitnick, G. Spicer & T. A. Markow, How long is a giant sperm?, *Nature* **375**, p. 109, 1995. Cited on page 1309.

1134 M. Kawamura, A. Sugamoto & S. Nojiri, Swimming of microorganisms viewed from string and membrane theories, *Modern Journal of Physics Letters A* **9**, pp. 1159–1174, 1994. Also available as arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9312200. Cited on page 1309.

1135 W. Nutsch & U. Rüffer, Die Orientierung freibeweglicher Organismen zum Licht, dargestellt am Beispiel des Flagellaten Chlamydomonas reinhardtii, *Naturwissenschaften* **81**, pp. 164–174, 1994. Cited on page 1309.

1136 They are also called prokaryote flagella. See for example S. C. Schuster & S. Khan, The bacterial flagellar motor, *Annual Review of Biophysics and Biomolecular Structure* **23**, pp. 509–539, 1994, or S. R. Caplan & M. Kara-Ivanov, The bacterial flagellar motor, *International Review of Cytology* **147**, pp. 97–164, 1993. See also the information on the topic that can be found on the website www.id.ucsb.edu:16080/fscf/library/origins/graphics-captions/flagellum.html. Cited on page 1309.

1137 For an overview of the construction and the motion of coli bacteria, see H. C. Berg, Motile behavior of bacteria, *Physics Today* **53**, pp. 24–29, January 2000. Cited on page 1309.

1138 This is from the book by David Dusenbery, *Life at a Small Scale*, Scientific American Library, 1996. Cited on page 1309.

1139 F. Wilczek & A. Zee, Appearance of gauge structures in simple dynamical systems, *Physical Review Letters* **52**, pp. 2111–2114, 1984, A. Shapere & F. Wilczek, Self-propulsion at low Reynold number, *Physical Review Letters* **58**, pp. 2051–2054, 1987, A. Shapere & F. Wilczek, Gauge kinematics of deformable bodies, *American Journal of Physics* **57**, pp. 514–518, 1989, A. Shapere & F. Wilczek, Geometry of self-propulsion at low Reynolds number, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **198**, pp. 557–585, 1989, A. Shapere & F. Wilczek, Efficiencies of self-propulsion at low Reynolds number, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **198**, pp. 587–599, 1989. See also R. Montgomery, Gauge theory of the falling cat, *Field Institute Communications* **1**, pp. 75–111, 1993. Cited on page 1310.

1140 E. Putterman & O. Raz, The square cat, *American Journal of Physics* **76**, pp. 1040–1045, 2008. Cited on page 1310.

1141 J. Wisdom, Swimming in spacetime: motion by cyclic changes in body shape, *Science* **299**, pp. 1865–1869, 21st of March, 2003. Cited on page 1313.

1142 S. Smale, A classification of immersions of the two-sphere, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **90**, pp. 281–290, 1958. Cited on page 1314.

1143 G. K. Francis & B. Morin, Arnold Shapiro's Eversion of the Sphere, *Mathematical Intelligencer* pp. 200–203, 1979. See also the unique manual for drawing manifolds by

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

George Francis, *The Topological Picturebook*, Springer Verlag, 1987. It also contains a chapter on sphere eversion. Cited on page 1314.

1144 B. Morin & J.-P. Petit, Le retournement de la sphere, *Pour la Science* **15**, pp. 34–41, 1979. See also the clear article by A. Phillips, Turning a surface inside out, *Scientific American* pp. 112–120, May 1966. Cited on page 1314.

1145 S. Levy, D. Maxwell & T. Munzner, *Making Waves – a Guide to the Ideas Behind Outside In*, Peters, 1995. Cited on page 1314.

1146 George K. Batchelor, *An Introduction to Fluid Mechanics*, Cambridge University Press, 1967, and H. Hashimoto, A soliton on a vortex filament, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **51**, pp. 477–485, 1972. A summary is found in H. Zhou, On the motion of slender vortex filaments, *Physics of Fluids* **9**, p. 970-981, 1997. Cited on pages 1316 and 1317.

1147 V. P. Dmitriyev, Helical waves on a vortex filament, *American Journal of Physics* **73**, pp. 563–565, 2005, and V. P. Dmitriyev, Mechanical analogy for the wave-particle: helix on a vortex filament, arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0012008. Cited on page 1318.

1148 T. Jacobson, Thermodynamics of spacetime: the Einstein equation of state, *Physical Review Letters* **75**, pp. 1260–1263, 1995, or arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9504004. Cited on page 1319.

1149 J. Frenkel & T. Kontorowa, Über die Theorie der plastischen Verformung, *Physikalische Zeitschrift der Sowietunion* **13**, pp. 1–10, 1938. F. C. Frank, On the equations of motion of crystal dislocations, *Proceedings of the Physical Society A* **62**, pp. 131–134, 1949, J. Eshelby, Uniformly moving dislocations, *Proceedings of the Physical Society A* **62**, pp. 307–314, 1949. See also G. Leibfried & H. Dietze, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **126**, p. 790, 1949. A general introduction can be found in A. Seeger & P. Schiller, Kinks in dislocations lines and their effects in internal friction in crystals, *Physical Acoustics* **3A**, W. P. Mason, ed., Academic Press, 1966. See also the textbooks by Frank R. N. Nabarro, *Theory of Crystal Dislocations*, Oxford University Press, 1967, or J. P. Hirth & J. Lothe, *Theory of Dislocations*, McGraw Hills Book Company, 1968. Cited on page 1321.

1150 Enthousiastic introductions into the theoretical aspects of polymers are Alexander Yu. Grosberg & Alexei R. Khokhlov, *Statistical Physics of Macromolecules*, AIP, 1994, and Pierre-Gilles de Gennes, *Scaling Concepts in Polymer Physics*, Cornell University Press, 1979. Cited on page 1322.

1151 The master of combining research and enjoymnet in mathematics is Lou Kauffman. An example is his art is the beautiful text Louis H. Kauffman, *Knots and Physics*, World Scientific, third edition, 2001. It gives a clear introduction to the mathematics of knots and their applications. Cited on page 1324.

1152 A good introduction to knot tabulation is the paper by J. Hoste, M. Thistlethwaite & J. Weeks, The first 1,701,936 knots, *The Mathematical Intelligencer* **20**, pp. 33–47, 1998. Cited on page 1324.

1153 For some modern knot research, see P. Holdin, R. B. Kusner & A. Stasiak, Quantization of energy and writhe in self-repelling knots, *New Journal of Physics* **4**, pp. 20.1–20.11, 2002. No citations.

1154 I. Stewart, *Game, Set and Math*, Penguin Books, 1989, pp. 58–67. Cited on page 1324.

1155 P. Pieranski, S. Przybyl & A. Stasiak, Tight open knots, arxiv.org/abs/physics/0103016. Cited on page 1326.

1156 T. Ashton, J. Cantarella, M. Piatek & E. Rawdon, Self-contact sets for 50 tightly knotted and linked tubes, arxiv.org/abs/math/0508248. Cited on page 1326.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

1157 J. Cantarella, J. H. G. Fu, R. Kusner, J. M. Sullivan & N. C. Wrinkle, Criticality for the Gehring link problem, *Geometry and Topology* **10**, pp. 2055–2116, 2006, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/math/0402212. Cited on page 1327.

1158 W. R. Taylor, A deeply knotted protein structure and how it might fold, *Nature* **406**, pp. 916–919, 2000. Cited on page 1327.

1159 Alexei Sossinsky, *Nœuds – histoire d'une théorie mathématique*, Editions du Seuil, 1999. D. Jensen, Le poisson noué, *Pour la science*, dossier hors série, pp. 14–15, April 1997. Cited on page 1327.

1160 D. M. Raymer & D. E. Smith, Spontaneous knotting of an agitated string, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (USA)* **104**, pp. 16432–16437, 2007, or www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0611320104. This work won the humorous Ignobel Price in Physics in 2008; seeimprobable.com/ig. Cited on page 1328.

1161 A. C. Hirshfeld, Knots and physics: Old wine in new bottles, *American Journal of Physics* **66**, pp. 1060–1066, 1998. Cited on page 1328.

1162 H. R. Pruppacher & J. D. Klett, *Microphysics of Clouds and Precipitation*, Reidel, 1978, pp. 316–319. Falling drops are flattened and look like a pill, due to the interplay between surface tension and air flow. Cited on page 1329.

1163 J. J. Socha, Becoming airborne without legs: the kinematics of take-off in a flying snake, Chrysopelea paradisi, *Journal of Experimental Biology* **209**, pp. 3358–3369, 2006, J. J. Socha, T. O'Dempsey & M. LaBarbera, A three-dimensional kinematic analysis of gliding in a flying snake, Chrysopelea paradisi, *Journal of Experimental Biology* **208**, pp. 1817–1833, 2005, J. J. Socha & M. LaBarbera, Effects of size and behavior on aerial performance of two species of flying snakes (Chrysopelea), *Journal of Experimental Biology* **208**, pp. 1835–1847, 2005. A full literature list on flying snakes can be found on the website www.flyingsnake.org. Cited on page 1330.

1164 The electron radius limit is deduced from the $g - 2$ measurements, as explained in the Nobel Prize talk by Hans Dehmelt, Experiments with an isolated subatomic particle at rest, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **62**, pp. 525–530, 1990, or in Hans Dehmelt, Is the electron a composite particle?, *Hyperfine Interactions* **81**, pp. 1–3, 1993. Cited on page 1293.

1165 G. Gabrielse, H. Dehmelt & W. Kells, Observation of a relativistic, bistable hysteresis in the cyclotron motion of a single electron, *Physical Review Letters* **54**, pp. 537–540, 1985. Cited on page 1293.

1166 The proton charge radius was determined by measuring the frequency of light emitted by hydrogen atoms to high precision by T. Udem, A. Huber, B. Gross, J. Reichert, M. Prevedelli, M. Weitz & T. W. Hausch, Phase-coherent measurement of the hydrogen 1S–2S transition frequency with an optical frequency interval divider chain, *Physical Review Letters* **79**, pp. 2646–2649, 1997. Cited on page 1348.

1167 For a full list of isotopes, see R. B. Firestone, *Table of Isotopes, Eighth Edition, 1999 Update*, with CD-ROM, John Wiley & Sons, 1999. For a list of isotopes on the web, see the Korean website by J. Chang, atom.kaeri.re.kr. For a list of precise isotope masses, see the csnwww.in2p3.fr website. Cited on pages 1349, 1352, and 1362.

1168 For information on the long life of tantalum 180, see D. Belic & al., Photoactivation of $^{180}Ta^{m}$ and its implications for the nucleosynthesis of nature's rarest naturally occurring isotope, *Physical Review Letters* **83**, pp. 5242–5245, 20 December 1999. Cited on page 1349.

1169 The ground state of bismuth 209 was thought to be stable until early 2003. It was then discovered that it was radioactive, though with a record lifetime, as reported by de

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Marcillac, N. Coron, G. Dambier, J. Leblanc & J.-P. Moalic, Experimental detection of α-particles from the radioactive decay of natural bismuth, *Nature* **422**, pp. 876–878, 2003. By coincidence, the excited state 83 MeV above the ground state of the same bismuth 209 nucleus is the shortest known radioactive nuclear state. Cited on page 1349.

1170 Stephen J. Gould, *The Panda's thumb*, W.W. Norton & Co., 1980. This is one of several interesting and informative books on evolutionary biology by the best writer in the field. Cited on page 1350.

1171 F. Marques & al., Detection of neutron clusters, *Physical Review C* **65**, p. 044006, 2002. Opposite results have been obtained by B. M. Sherrill & C. A. Bertulani, Proton-tetraneutron elastic scattering, *Physical Review C* **69**, p. 027601, 2004, and D.V. Aleksandrov & al., Search for resonances in the three- and four-neutron systems in the 7Li(7Li, 11C)3n and 7Li(7Li, 10C)4n reactions, *JETP Letters* **81**, p. 43, 2005. Cited on page 1350.

1172 For a good review, see the article by P. T. Greenland, Antimatter, *Contemporary Physics* **38**, pp. 181–203, 1997. Cited on page 1350.

1173 The atomic masses, as given by IUPAC, can be found in *Pure and Applied Chemistry* **73**, pp. 667–683, 2001, or on the www.iupac.org website. For an isotope mass list, see the csnwww.in2p3.fr website. Cited on pages 1352 and 1362.

1174 Almost everything known about each element and its chemistry can be found in the encyclopaedic Gmelin, *Handbuch der anorganischen Chemie*, published from 1817 onwards. There are over 500 volumes, now all published in English under the title *Handbook of Inorganic and Organometallic Chemistry*, with at least one volume dedicated to each chemical element. On the same topic, an incredibly expensive book with an equally bad layout is Per Enhag, *Encyclopedia of the Elements*, Wiley–VCH, 2004. Cited on page 1352.

1175 The metallic, covalent and Van der Waals radii are from Nathaniel W. Alcock, *Bonding and Structure*, Ellis Horwood, 1999. This text also explains in detail how the radii are defined and measured. Cited on page 1362.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



CHALLENGE HINTS AND SOLUTIONS

Challenge 1462, page 1119: A virus is an example. It has no own metabolism. (By the way, the ability of some viruses to form crystals is not a proof that they are not living beings, in contrast to what is often said.)

Challenge 1463, page 1120: The navigation systems used by flies are an example.

Challenge 1464, page 1122: The thermal energy kT is about 4 zJ and a typical relaxation time is 0.1 ps.

Challenge 1465, page 1126: The argument is correct.

Challenge 1466, page 1127: This is not possible at present. If you know a way, publish it. It would help a sad single mother who has to live without financial help from the father, despite a lawsuit, as it was yet impossible to decide which of the two candidates is the right one.

Challenge 1467, page 1127: Also identical twins count as different persons and have different fates. Imprinting in the womb is different, so that their temperament will be different. The birth experience will be different; this is the most intense experience of every human, strongly determining his fears and thus his character. A person with an old father is also quite different from that with a young father. If the womb is not that of his biological mother, a further distinction of the earliest and most intensive experiences is given.

Challenge 1468, page 1127: Be sure to publish your results.

Challenge 1469, page 1127: Life's chemicals are synthesized inside the body; the asymmetry has been inherited along the generations. The common asymmetry thus shows that all life has a common origin.

Challenge 1470, page 1127: Well, men are more similar to chimpanzees than to women. More seriously, the above data, even though often quoted, are wrong. Newer measurements by Roy Britten in 2002 have shown that the difference in genome between humans and chimpanzees is about 5 % (See R. J. Britten, Divergence between samples of chimpanzee and human DNA sequences is 5 %, counting indels, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **99**, pp. 13633–13635, 15th of October, 2002.) In addition, though the difference between man and woman is smaller than one whole chromosome, the large size of the X chromosome, compared with the small size of the Y chromosome, implies that men have about 3 % less genetic material than women. However, all men have an X chromosome as well. That explains that still other measurements suggest that all humans share a pool of at least 99.9 % of common genes.

Challenge 1473, page 1130: Chemical processes, including diffusion and reaction rates, are strongly temperature dependent. They affect the speed of motion of the individual and thus its chance of survival. Keeping temperature in the correct range is thus important for evolved life forms.

Challenge 1474, page 1130: The first steps are not known at all.

Challenge 1475, page 1130: Since all the atoms we are made of originate from outer space, the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

answer is yes. But if one means that biological cells came to Earth from space, the answer is no, as most cells do not like vacuum. The same is true for DNA.

In fact, life and reproduction are properties of complex systems. In other words, asking whether life comes from outer space is like asking: 'Could car insurance have originated in outer space?'

Challenge 1476, page 1133: Haven't you tried yet? Physics is an experimental science.

Challenge 1486, page 1142: Radioactive dating methods can be said to be based on the nuclear interactions, even though the detection is again electromagnetic.

Challenge 1487, page 1143: All detectors of light can be called relativistic, as light moves with maximal speed. Touch sensors are not relativistic following the usual sense of the word, as the speeds involved are too small. The energies are small compared to the rest energies; this is the case even if the signal energies are attributed to electrons only.

Challenge 1488, page 1143: The noise is due to the photoacoustic effect; the periodic light periodically heats the air in the jam glass at the blackened surface and thus produces sound. See M. EULER, Kann man Licht hören?, *Physik in unserer Zeit* **32**, pp. 180–182, 2001.

Challenge 1494, page 1151: It implies that neither resurrection nor reincarnation nor eternal life are possible.

Challenge 1495, page 1152: You get an intense yellow colour due to the formation of lead iodide (PbI_2).

Challenge 1497, page 1160: With a combination of the methods of Table 98 it is possible; but whether there will ever be an organization willing to pay for this to happen is another question.

Challenge 1498, page 1170: If you find one, please send the author a mail.

Challenge 1500, page 1171: For example, a heavy mountain will push down the Earth's crust into the mantle, makes it melt on the bottom side, and thus lowers the position of the top.

Challenge 1501, page 1171: These developments are just starting; the results are still far from the original one is trying to copy, as they have to fulfil a second condition, in addition to being a 'copy' of original feathers or of latex: the copy has to be cheaper than the original. That is often a much tougher request than the first.

Challenge 1503, page 1171: Since the height of the potential is always finite, walls can always be overcome by tunnelling.

Challenge 1504, page 1171: The lid of a box can never be at rest, as is required for a tight closure, but is always in motion, due to the quantum of action.

Challenge 1507, page 1173: The concentrations and can be measured from polar ice caps, by measuring how the isotope concentration changes over depth. Both in evaporation and in condensation of water, the isotope ratio depends on the temperature. The measurements in Antarctica and in Greenland coincide, which is a good sign of their trustworthiness.

Challenge 1511, page 1184: The one somebody else has thrown away. Energy costs about 10 cents/kWh. For new lamps, the fluorescence lamp is the best for the environment, even though it is the least friendly to the eye and the brain, due to its flickering.

Challenge 1512, page 1187: This old dream depends on the precise conditions. How flexible does the display have to be? What lifetime should it have? The newspaper like display is many years away and maybe not even possible.

Challenge 1513, page 1187: The challenge here is to find a cheap way to deflect laser beams in a controlled way. Cheap lasers are already available.

Challenge 1514, page 1187: There is only speculation on the answer; the tendency of most researchers is to say no.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1515, page 1187: No, as it is impossible because of momentum conservation, because of the no-cloning theorem.

Challenge 1516, page 1188: There are companies trying to do sell systems based on quantum cryptology; but despite the technical interest, the commercial success is questionable.

Challenge 1517, page 1188: The author predicts that mass-produced goods using this technology (at least 1 million pieces sold) will not be available before 2025.

Challenge 1518, page 1188: Maybe, but for extremely high prices.

Challenge 1519, page 1191: For example, you could change gravity between two mirrors.

Challenge 1520, page 1191: As usual in such statements, either group or phase velocity is cited, but not the corresponding energy velocity, which is always below c.

Challenge 1521, page 1192: Echoes do not work once the speed of sound is reached and do not work well when it is approached. Both the speed of light and that of sound have a finite value. Moving with a mirror still gives a mirror image. This means that the speed of light cannot be reached. If it cannot be reached, it must be the same for all observers.

Challenge 1522, page 1193: Mirrors do not usually work for matter; in addition, if they did, matter would require much higher acceleration values.

Challenge 1525, page 1195: The overhang can have any value whatsoever. There is no limit. Taking the indeterminacy principle into account introduces a limit as the last brick or card must not allow the centre of gravity, through its indeterminacy, to be over the edge of the table.

Challenge 1526, page 1195: A larger charge would lead to a field that spontaneously generates electron positron pairs, the electron would fall into the nucleus and reduce its charge by one unit.

Challenge 1529, page 1196: The Hall effect results from the deviation of electrons in a metal due to an applied magnetic field. Therefore it depends on their speed. One gets values around 1 mm. Inside atoms, one can use Bohr's atomic model as approximation.

Challenge 1530, page 1197: The usual way to pack oranges on a table is the densest way to pack spheres.

Challenge 1531, page 1198: Just use a paper drawing. Draw a polygon and draw it again at latter times, taking into account how the sides grow over time. You will see by yourself how the faster growing sides disappear over time.

Challenge 1532, page 1199: The steps are due to the particle nature of electricity and all other moving entities.

Challenge 1533, page 1199: If we could apply the Banach–Tarksi paradox to vacuum, it seems
Page 60 that we could split, without any problem, one ball of vacuum into *two* balls of vacuum, each with the same volume as the original. In other words, one ball with vacuum energy E could not be distinguished from two balls of vacuum energy $2E$.

We used the Banach–Tarski paradox in this way to show that chocolate (or any other matter)
Page 250 possesses an intrinsic length. But it is *not* clear that we can now deduce that the vacuum has an intrinsic length. Indeed, the paradox cannot be applied to vacuum for *two* reasons. First, there indeed is a maximum energy and minimum length in nature. Secondly, there is no place in nature without vacuum energy; so there is no place were we could put the second ball. We thus do not know why the Banach–Tarski paradox for vacuum cannot be applied, and thus cannot use it to deduce the existence of a minimum length in vacuum.

It is better to argue in the following way for a minimum length in vacuum. If there were no intrinsic length cut-off, the vacuum energy would be infinite. Experiments however, show that it is finite.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1534, page 1199: Mud is a suspension of sand; sand is not transparent, even if made of clear quartz, because of the scattering of light at the irregular surface of its grains. A suspension cannot be transparent if the index of refraction of the liquid and the suspended particles is different. It is never transparent if the particles, as in most sand types, are themselves not transparent.

Challenge 1536, page 1199: No. Bound states of massless particles are always unstable.

Challenge 1537, page 1199: The first answer is probably no, as composed systems cannot be smaller than their own compton wavelength; only elementary systems can. However, the universe is not a system, as it has no environment. As such, its length is not a precisely defined concept, as an environment is needed to measure and to define it. (In addition, gravity must be taken into account in those domains.) Thus the answer is: in those domains, the question makes no sense.

Challenge 1538, page 1200: Methods to move on perfect ice from mechanics:

— if the ice is perfectly flat, rest is possible only in one point – otherwise you oscillate around that point, as shown in challenge 24;
— do nothing, just wait that the higher centrifugal acceleration at body height pulls you away;
— to rotate yourself, just rotate your arm above your head;
— throw a shoe or any other object away;
— breathe in vertically, breathing out (or talking) horizontally (or vice versa);
— wait to be moved by the centrifugal acceleration due to the rotation of the Earth (and its oblateness);
— jump vertically repeatedly: the Coriolis acceleration will lead to horizontal motion;
— wait to be moved by the Sun or the Moon, like the tides are;
— 'swim' in the air using hands and feet;
— wait to be hit by a bird, a flying wasp, inclined rain, wind, lava, earthquake, plate tectonics, or any other macroscopic object (all objects pushing count only as one solution);
— wait to be moved by the change in gravity due to convection in Earth's mantle;
— wait to be moved by the gravitation of some comet passing by;
— counts only for kids: spit, sneeze, cough, fart, pee; or move your ears and use them as wings.

Note that gluing your tongue is not possible on perfect ice.

Challenge 1539, page 1200: Methods to move on perfect ice using thermodynamics and electrodynamics:

— use the radio/TV stations nearby to push you around;
— use your portable phone and a mirror;
— switch on a pocket lam, letting the light push you;
— wait to be pushed around by Brownian motion in air;
— heat up one side of your body: black body radiation will push you;
— heat up one side of your body, e.g. by muscle work: the changing airflow or the evaporation will push you;
— wait for one part of the body to be cooler than the other and for the corresponding black body radiation effects;
— wait for the magnetic field of the Earth to pull on some ferromagnetic or paramagnetic metal piece in your clothing or in your body;
— wait to be pushed by the light pressure, i.e. by the photons, from the Sun or from the stars, maybe using a pocket mirror to increase the efficiency;
— rub some polymer object to charge it electrically and then move it in circles, thus creating a magnetic field that interacts with the one of the Earth.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Note that perfect frictionless surfaces do not melt.

Challenge 1540, page 1200: Methods to move on perfect ice using quantum effects:

— wait for your wave function to spread out and collapse at the end of the ice surface;
— wait for the pieces of metal in the clothing to attract to the metal in the surrounding through the Casimir effect;
— wait to be pushed around by radioactive decays in your body.

Challenge 1541, page 1200: Methods to move on perfect ice using general relativity:

— move an arm to emit gravitational radiation;
— deviate the cosmic background radiation with a pocket mirror;
— wait to be pushed by gravitational radiation from star collapses;
— wait for the universe to contract.

Challenge 1542, page 1200: Methods to move on perfect ice using materials science, geophysics, astrophysics:

— be pushed by the radio waves emitted by thunderstorms and absorbed in painful human joints;
— wait to be pushed around by cosmic rays;
— wait to be pushed around by the solar wind;
— wait to be pushed around by solar neutrinos;
— wait to be pushed by the transformation of the Sun into a red giant;
— wait to be hit by a meteorite.

Challenge 1543, page 1200: A method to move on perfect ice using self-organization, chaos theory, and biophysics:

— wait that the currents in the brain interact with the magnetic field of the Earth by controlling your thoughts.

Challenge 1544, page 1200: Methods to move on perfect ice using quantum gravity, supersymmetry, and string theory:

— accelerate your pocket mirror with your hand;
— deviate the Unruh radiation of the Earth with a pocket mirror;
— wait for proton decay to push you through the recoil.

Challenge 1549, page 1207: This is easy only if the black hole size is inserted into the entropy bound by Bekenstein. A simple deduction of the black hole entropy that includes the factor 1/4 is not yet at hand.

Challenge 1550, page 1207: An entropy limit implies an information limit; only a given information can be present in a given region of nature. This results in a memory limit.

Challenge 1551, page 1207: In natural units, the expression for entropy is $S = A/4 = 0.25A$. If each Planck area carried one bit (degree of freedom), the entropy would be $S = \ln W = \ln(2^A) = A \ln 2 = 0.693A$. This quite near the exact value.

Challenge 1555, page 1212: The universe has about 10^{22} stars; the Sun has a luminosity of about 10^{26} W; the total luminosity of the visible matter in the universe is thus about 10^{48} W. A gamma ray burster emits up to $3 \cdot 10^{47}$ W.

Challenge 1561, page 1214: They are carried away by the gravitational radiation.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1567, page 1218: No system is known in nature which emits or absorbs only one graviton at a time. This is another point speaking against the existence of gravitons.

Challenge 1571, page 1226: Two stacked foils show the same effect as one foil of the same total thickness. Thus the surface plays no role.

Challenge 1573, page 1228: The electron is held back by the positive charge of the nucleus, if the number of protons in the nucleus is sufficient, as is the case for those nuclei we are made of.

Challenge 1575, page 1236: The number is small compared with the number of cells. However, it is possible that the decays are related to human ageing.

Challenge 1576, page 1236: There is way to conserve both energy and momentum in such a decay.

Challenge 1578, page 1237: The radioactivity necessary to keep the Earth warm is low; lava is only slightly more radioactive than usual soil.

Challenge 1580, page 1245: By counting decays and counting atoms to sufficient precision.

Challenge 1581, page 1250: The nuclei of nitrogen and carbon have a high electric charge which strongly repels the protons.

Challenge 1583, page 1258: Touching something requires getting near it; getting near means a small time and position indeterminacy; this implies a small wavelength of the probe that is used for touching; this implies a large energy.

Challenge 1585, page 1264: The processes are electromagnetic in nature, thus electric charges give the frequency with which they occur.

Challenge 1586, page 1273: Designing a nuclear weapon is not difficult. University students can do it, and even have done so a few times. The first students who did so were two physics graduates in 1964, as told on http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2003/jun/24/usa.science. It is not hard to conceive a design and even to build it. By far the hardest problem is getting or making the nuclear material. That requires either an extensive criminal activity or a vast technical effort, with numerous large factories, extensive development, and coordination of many technological activities. Most importantly, such a project requires a large financial investment, which poor countries cannot afford without great sacrifices for all the population. The problems are thus not technical, but financial.

Challenge 1582, page 1256: See the paper by C. J. Hogan, Why the universe is just so, *Reviews of Modern Physics* 72, pp. 1149–1161, 2000.

Challenge 1591, page 1295: In 2008 an estimated 98% of all physicists agreed. Time will tell whether they are right.

Challenge 1593, page 1305: A mass of 100 kg and a speed of 8 m/s require 43 m^2 of wing surface.

Challenge 1596, page 1312: The largest rotation angle $\Delta\varphi$ that can be achieved in one stroke C is found by maximizing the integral

$$\Delta\varphi = -\int_C \frac{a^2}{a^2+b^2}\mathrm{d}\theta \tag{804}$$

Since the path C in shape space is closed, we can use Stokes' theorem to transform the line integral to a surface integral over the surface S enclosed by C in shape space:

$$\Delta\varphi = \int_S \frac{2ab^2}{(a^2+b^2)^2}\mathrm{d}a\,\mathrm{d}\theta\ . \tag{805}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The maximum angle is found by noting that θ can vary at most between 0 and π, and that a can vary at most between 0 and ∞. This yields

$$\Delta\varphi_{\max} = \int_{\theta=0}^{\pi} \int_{a=0}^{\infty} \frac{2ab^2}{(a^2+b^2)^2} \mathrm{d}a \, \mathrm{d}\theta = \pi \,. \tag{806}$$

Challenge 1605, page 1324: The infinite sum is not defined for numbers; however, it is defined for a knotted string.

Challenge 1607, page 1329: This is a simple but hard question. Find out.

Challenge 1603, page 1321: Lattices are not isotropic, lattices are not Lorentz invariant.

Challenge 1609, page 1329: Large raindrops are pancakes with a massive border bulge. When the size increases, e.g. when a large drop falls through vapour, the drop splits, as the central membrane is then torn apart.

Challenge 1610, page 1330: It is a drawing; if it is interpreted as an image of a three-dimensional object, it either does not exist, or is not closed, or is an optical illusion of a torus.

Challenge 1611, page 1330: See T. Fink & Y. Mao, *The 85 Ways to Tie a Tie*, Broadway Books, 2000.

Challenge 1612, page 1330: See T. Clarke, Laces high, *Nature Science Update* 5th of December, 2002, or http://www.nature.com/nsu/021202/021202-4.html.

Challenge 1616, page 1334: Most macroscopic matter properties fall in this class, such as the change of water density with temperature.

Challenge 1619, page 1345: Before the speculation can be fully tested, the relation between particles and black holes has to be clarified first.

Challenge 1620, page 1346: Never expect a correct solution for personal choices. Do what you yourself think and feel is correct.

Challenge 1622, page 1348: The gauge coupling constants, via the Planck length, determine the size of atoms, the strength of chemical bonds and thus the size of all things.

Challenge 1623, page 1362: Covalent bonds tend to produce full shells; this is a smaller change on the right side of the periodic table.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



CREDITS

Since May 2007, the production and distribution of this text is generously supported by the Klaus Tschira Foundation.

Film credits

The animation of the actin–myosin system on page 1124 is copyright and courtesy by San Diego State University, Jeff Sale and Roger Sabbadini. It can be found on the website www.sci.sdsu.edu/movies/actin_myosin.html. The film on page 1187, showing single electrons moving through liquid helium, is copyright and courtesy of Humphrey Maris; it can be found on his website physics.brown.edu/physics/researchpages/cme/bubble. The film of the solar flare on page 1255 was taken by NASA's TRACE satellite, whose website is trace.lmsal.com. The film of a flying snake on page 1330 is copyright and courtesy by Jake Socha. It can be found on his website http://www.flyingsnake.org.

Image credits

The photograph of a soap bubble on page 1115 is courtesy and copyright of Jason Tozer for Creative Review/Sony; its making is described on creativereview.co.uk/crblog. The picture of the orchid on page 1121 is courtesy and copyright of Elmar Bartel. The sea urchin photograph on page 1124 was taken by Kristina Yu, and is copyright and courtesy of the Exploratorium, found at www.exploratorium.edu. The illustrations of DNA on page 1150 are copyright and courtesy by David Deerfield and dedicated to his memory. They are taken from his website www.psc.edu/~deerfiel/Nucleic_Acid-SciVis.html. The images of DNA molecules on page 1151 are copyright and courtesy by Hans-Werner Fink and used with permission of Wiley VCH. The mineral photographs on page 1155 onwards are copyright and courtesy of Rob Lavinsky at irocks.com, and taken from his large and beautiful collection there and at www.mindat.org/photo-49529.html. The corundum photograph on page 1155, the malachite photograph on page 1164 and the magnetite photograph on page page 1166 are copyright and courtesy of Stephan Wolfsried and taken from his beautiful collection of microcrystals at www.mindat.org/user-1664.html. The photograph of Paraiba tourmalines on page page 1156 is copyright and courtesy of Manfred Fuchs and found on his website at www.tourmalinavitalis.de. The synthetic crystals photographs on page 1157 and page 1157 are copyright of Northrop Grumman and courtesy of Scott Griffin. The alexandrite photographs on page 1157 are copyright and courtesy of John Veevaert, Trinity Mineral Co., trinityminerals.com. The shark teeth photograph on page 1159 is courtesy and copyright of Peter Doe and found at www.flickr.com/photos/peteredin. The molten metal photograph on page 1163 is courtesy and copyright of Graela and found at flickr.com/photos/alaig. The sparkler photograph on page 1163 is courtesy and copyright of Sarah Domingos and found at her flickr.com website. The discharge lamp photographs on page 1163 are courtesy and copyright of Pslaw-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

inski and found at www.wikimedia.org. The aurora photograph on page 1163 is courtesy and copyright of Jan Curtis and found at his climate.gi.alaska.edu/Curtis/curtis.html website. The coloured flames photograph on page 1163 is courtesy and copyright of Philip Evans and found at his community.webshots.com/user/hydrogen01 website. The iceberg photograph on page 1164 is courtesy and copyright of Marc Shandro and found at his flickr.com/photos/mshandro website. The shadow mask photograph on page 1164 is courtesy and copyright of Planemad and found at the www.wikimedia.org website. The narcissus photograph on page 1165 is courtesy and copyright of Thomas Lüthi and found at his website www.tiptom.ch/album/blumen/. The rare photograph of a living angler fish on page 1165 is courtesy and copyright of Steve Haddock and found at his website www.lifesci.uscb.edu/~biolum/. The tenor saxophone photograph on page 1166 is courtesy and copyright of Selmer at www.selmer.fr. The fluorescing quandum dot photograph on page 1166 is courtesy and copyright of Andrey Rogach, Center for Nanoscience, München. The zirconia photograph on page 1167 is courtesy and copyright of Gregory Phillips and found at the commons.wikimedia.org website. The Tokyo sunset on page 1167 is courtesy and copyright of Altus Plunkett and found at his www.flickr.com/photos/altus website. The blue quartz photograph on page 1167 is courtesy and copyright of Andreas Kostner and found at his www.thulescientific.com website. The snowman photograph on page 1168 is courtesy and copyright of Altus Plunkett and found at his www.flickr.com/photos/bytesinmotion website. The endangered blue poison frog photograph on page 1168 is courtesy and copyright of Lee Hancock and found at the www.treewalkers.org website. The ruby glass photograph on page 1168 is courtesy and copyright of the Murano Glass Shop and is found at their murano-glass-shop.it website. The photograph of a ring laser with second harmonic generation on page 1168 is courtesy and copyright of Jeff Sherman and found at his flickr.com/photos/fatllama website. The abalone photograph on page 1168 is courtesy and copyright of Anne Elliot and found at her flickr.com/photos/annkelliot website. The mallard duck photograph on page 1169 is courtesy and copyright of Simon Griffith and found at his www.pbase.com/simon2005 website. The opal photograph on page 1169 is courtesy and copyright of Opalsnopals and found at his www.flickr.com website. The airplane condensation photograph on page 1169 is courtesy and copyright of Franz Kerschbaum and found at the epod.usra.edu website. The CD photograph on page 1169 is courtesy and copyright of Alfons Reichert and found at his www.chemiephysikskripte.de/artikel/cd.htm website. The climate graph on page 1173 is copyright and courtesy of Dieter Lüthi. The collection of images of single atom sheets on page 1175 is taken from Ref. 971, copyright of the National Academy of Sciences, and are courtesy of the authors and of Tiffany Millerd. The rhenium photographs on page 1197 are copyright and courtesy of Hans-Werner Fink, APS and AIP and reprinted with permission from teh cited references. The pictures of snow flakes on page 1198 are courtesy and copyright of Furukawa Yoshinori. The map with the gamma ray bursts on page 1212 is courtesy of NASA and taken from the BATSE website at www.batse.msfc.nasa.gov/batse. The MRI images of the head and the spine on page 1223 are courtesy and copyright of Joseph Hornak and taken from his website www.cis.rit.edu/htbooks/mri. The MRI image on page 1225 of humans making love is courtesy and copyright of Willibrord Weijmar Schultz.IndexWeijmar Schultz, Willibrord The nuclide chart on page 1229 is used with permission of Alejandro Sonzogni of the National Nuclear Data Centre, using data extracted from the NuDat database. The electroscope photograph on page 1230 is courtesy and copyright of Harald Chmela and taken from his website www.hcrs.at. The photograph of an aurora on page 1233 is courtesy and copyright of Jan Curtis and taken from his website climate.gi.alaska.edu/Curtis/curtis.html. The photograph of the Geigerpod on page 1232 is courtesy and copyright of Joseph Reinhardt, and found on his website flickr.com/photos/javamoose. The figure of the Erta Ale volcano on page 1237 is courtesy and copyright of Marco Fulle and part of the wonderful photograph collection at www.stromboli.net. The drawing of the JET reactor on page 1252 is courtesy and copyright of EFDA-JET. The drawing of the strong

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

coupling constant on page page 1268 is courtesy and copyright of Siegfried Bethke. The photograph of the watch on page 1276 is courtesy and copyright of Traser, found at www.traser.com. The unification graph on page 1297 is courtesy and copyright of Wim de Boer and taken from his home page at www-ekp.physik.uni-karlsruhe.de/~deboer. The picture of the butterfly in a wind tunnel on page 1304 is courtesy and copyright of Robert Srygley and Adrian Thomas. The picture of the vulture on page 1305 is courtesy and copyright of S.L. Brown from the website http://SLBrownPhoto.com. The picture of the hummingbird on page 1305 is courtesy and copyright of the Pennsylvania Game Comission and Joe Kosack and taken from the website http://www.pgc.state.pa.us. The picture of the dragonfly on page 1305 is courtesy and copyright of nobodythere and found on his website http://xavier.favre2.free.fr/coppermine. The pictures of feathers insects on page 1307 are material used with kind permission of HortNET, a product of The Horticulture and Food Research Institute of New Zealand. The picture of the scallop on page 1308 is courtesy and copyright of Dave Colwell. The picture of cliff diver Artem Silchenko on page 1311 is copyright of the World High Diving Federation, found at the web site www.whdf.com, and courtesy of Frederic Weill. The picture of the eversion of the sphere on page 1314 is courtesy and copyright of John Sullivan and found on his *Optiverse* website on http://new.math.uiuc.edu/optiverse. The knot and link diagrams on pages 1323 and 1326 are courtesy and copyright of Robert Scharein and taken from his website on http://www.knotplot.com. The clasp images on page 1326 is courtesy and copyright of Jason Cantarella. The photograph of a hagfish on page 1328 is courtesy and copyright of Christine Ortlepp; it is also found on the web page http://www.lemonodor.com/scruz-2003-01-24/17m.shtml. The photograph of a waterspout on page 1316 is copyright and courtesy of Zé Nogueira and found on his website at www.flickr.com/photos/zenog. The photograph of a vortex lattice on page 1316 is copyright of Andre Schirotzek, courtesy of Wolfgang Ketterle, and found on their research website at cua.mit.edu/ketterle_group. The drawing of a mixed dislocation on page 1320 has been produced especially for this text and is copyright and courtesy of Ulrich Kolberg. The poster of the elements on page 1352 is copyright and courtesy by Theodore Gray and found on his website www.theodoregray.com, where paper prints can be ordered. The historical portraits of physicists in the text do not have copyright, except where mentioned. All drawings not explicitly mentioned are copyright © 1997 – 2009 by Christoph Schiller. If you suspect that a copyright is not correctly given or obtained, this has not done on purpose, and you are kindly asked to contact the author.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Sixth Part

Motion Without Motion: What Are Space, Time and Particles?

Where through the combination of
quantum mechanics and general relativity,
the top of Motion Mountain is reached,
and it is discovered
that vacuum is indistinguishable from matter,
that space, time and mass are easily confused,
that there is no difference between the very large and the very small,
and that a complete description of motion is possible.
(Well, wait a few more years for the last line.)

Contents

1396 52 General relativity versus quantum theory

The contradictions 1396

1398 **Does matter differ from vacuum?**

Planck scales 1399 • Farewell to instants of time 1401 • Farewell to points in space 1403 • Farewell to the space-time manifold 1405 • Farewell to observables and measurements 1408 • Can space-time be a lattice? – A glimpse of quantum geometry 1409 • Farewell to particles 1410 • Farewell to mass 1413 • Curiosities and fun challenges on Planck scales 1416 • Farewell to the big bang 1419 • The baggage left behind 1420

1420 **Some experimental predictions**

Additional predictions 1421

1425 53 Nature at large scales – Is the universe something or nothing?

Cosmological scales 1425 • Maximum time 1426 • Does the universe have a definite age? 1427 • How precise can age measurements be? 1427 • Does time exist? 1429 • What is the error in the measurement of the age of the universe? 1429 • Maximum length 1433 • Is the universe really a big place? 1433 • The boundary of space-time – is the sky a surface? 1435 • Does the universe have initial conditions? 1435 • Does the universe contain particles and stars? 1436 • Does the universe contain masses and objects? 1437 • Do symmetries exist in nature? 1438 • Does the universe have a boundary? 1439 • Is the universe a set? – Again 1440 • Curiosities and fun challenges about the universe 1441 • Hilbert's sixth problem settled 1442 • Does the universe make sense? 1443 • Abandoning sets and discreteness eliminates contradictions 1444 • Extremal scales and open questions in physics 1445 • Is extremal identity a principle of nature? 1445

1447 54 The physics of love – a summary of the first five-and-a-half parts

Summary on love and physics 1457

1458 55 Maximum force and minimum distance – physics in limit statements

1458 **Fundamental limits to all observables**

Special relativity in one statement 1459 • Quantum theory in one statement 1460 • General relativity in one statement 1461 • Deducing general relativity 1462 • Deducing universal gravitation 1465 • The size of physical systems in general relativity 1465 • A mechanical analogy for the maximum force 1466

1466 **Units and limit values for all physical observables**

Limits to space and time 1468 • Mass and energy limits 1469 • Virtual particles – a new definition 1469 • Limits in thermodynamics 1470 • Electromagnetic limits and units 1470 • Vacuum and mass–energy – two sides of the same coin 1471 • Curiosities and fun challenges about Planck limits 1472

1475 **Upper and lower limits to observables**

Size and energy dependence 1475 • Angular momentum, action and speed 1475 • Force, power and luminosity 1477 • Acceleration 1477 • Momentum 1478 • Lifetime, distance and curvature 1478 • Mass change 1478 • Mass and density 1479 • The strange charm of the entropy bound 1479 • Temperature 1481 • Electromagnetic observables 1481 • Curiosities and fun challenges about limits to observ-

ables 1482
1483 **Limits to measurement precision and their challenge to thought**
Measurement precision and the existence of sets 1484 • Why are observers needed? 1485 • A solution to Hilbert's sixth problem 1485 • Summary 1486
1487 56 The shape of points – extension in nature
The starting point – vacuum and particles 1488 • How else can we show that matter and vacuum cannot be distinguished? 1489
1490 **The size and shape of elementary particles**
Do boxes exist? 1491 • Can the Greeks help? – The limits of knives 1491 • Are cross sections finite? 1492 • Can one take a photograph of a point? 1492 • What is the shape of an electron? 1494 • Is the shape of an electron fixed? 1495 • Summary of the first argument for extension 1496
1496 **The shape of points in vacuum**
Measuring the void 1497 • What is the maximum number of particles that fit inside a piece of vacuum? 1497 • Summary of the second argument for extension 1498
1498 **The large, the small and their connection**
Is small large? 1499 • Unification and total symmetry 1499 • Summary of the third argument for extension 1501
1501 **Does nature have parts?**
Does the universe contain anything? 1503 • An amoeba 1503 • Summary of the fourth argument for extension 1504
1504 **The entropy of black holes**
Summary of the fifth argument for extension 1506
1506 **Exchanging space points or particles at Planck scales**
Summary of the sixth argument for extension 1507
1507 **The meaning of spin**
Summary of the seventh argument for extension 1509
1509 **Current research**
Conceptual checks of extension 1510 • Experimental falsification of models based on extended entities 1510 • Possibilities for confirmation of extension models 1511 • Curiosities and fun challenges about extension 1511 • An intermediate status report 1513 • Sexual preferences in physics 1513 • A physical aphorism 1514
1514 **String theory – extensioin and a web of dualities**
Strings and membranes – why string theory is so difficult 1515 • Masses and couplings 1516 • Outlook 1517
1518 57 Unification (not yet available)
1519 58 The top of the mountain (not yet available)
1520 Postface
1521 Bibliography
1534 Challenge hints and solutions
1537 Credits
Image credits 1537

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 52

GENERAL RELATIVITY VERSUS QUANTUM THEORY

> Man muß die Denkgewohnheiten durch Denknotwendigkeiten ersetzen.*
>
> Albert Einstein

The two stories told in the two parts of the path we have followed up to now, namely hat of general relativity and that of quantum field theory, are both beautiful and horoughly successful. Both are confirmed by experiments to the precision that is possible at present. We have thus reached a considerable height in our mountain ascent. The precision we have achieved in the description of nature is impressive, and we are now able to describe all known examples of motion. So far we have encountered no exceptions.

On the other hand, the most important aspects of any type of motion, the masses of the particles involved and the strength of their coupling, are still unexplained. Furthermore, the origin of all the particles in the universe,** their initial conditions, and the dimensionality of space-time remain hidden from us. Obviously, our adventure is not yet complete.***

This last part of our hike will be the most demanding. In the ascent of any high mountain, the head gets dizzy because of the lack of oxygen. The finite amount of energy at our disposal requires that we leave behind all unnecessary baggage and everything that slows us down. In order to determine what is unnecessary, we need to focus on what we want to achieve. Our aim is the precise description of motion. But even though general relativity and quantum theory are extremely precise, we carry a burden: the two theories and their concepts *contradict* each other. We first list these contradictions.

The contradictions

In classical physics and in general relativity, the vacuum, or empty space-time, is a region with no mass, no energy and no momentum. If matter or gravitational fields are present, space-time is curved. The best way to measure the mass or energy content of space-time is to measure the average curvature of the universe. Cosmology tells us how we can do this. Cosmological measurements reveal an average energy density of the 'vacuum' of

Ref. 1176
Page 587

* 'One needs to replace habits of thought by necessities of thought.'

** The photograph on page 1393 shows an extremely distant, thus extremely young, part of the universe, with its large number of galaxies (NASA).

*** Nevertheless, nothing of what follows if of interest for biology, chemistry, medicine, geology, or engineering, neither for their work nor for their examinations.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

$$E/V \approx 1\,\mathrm{nJ/m^3}\ . \tag{807}$$

Ref. 1177 However, quantum field theory tells a different story. A vacuum is a region with zero-point fluctuations. The energy content of a vacuum is the sum of the zero-point energies Page 1189 of all the fields it contains. Indeed, the Casimir effect 'proves' the reality of these zero-Page 1192 point energies. Their energy density is given, within one order of magnitude, by

$$\frac{E}{V} = \frac{4\pi h}{c^3}\int_0^{\nu_{\max}} \nu^3 \mathrm{d}\nu = \frac{\pi\, h}{c^3}\nu_{\max}^4\ . \tag{808}$$

The approximation is valid for the case in which the cut-off frequency $\nu_{\max}$ is much larger than the rest mass m of the particles corresponding to the field under consideration. Particle physicists argue that the cut-off energy has to be at least the energy of grand unification, about 10^{16} GeV= 1.6 MJ. That would give a vacuum energy density of

$$\frac{E}{V} \approx 10^{99}\,\mathrm{J/m^3}\ , \tag{809}$$

which is about 10^{108} times higher than the experimental limit deduced from spatial curvature using general relativity estimates. In other words, something is slightly wrong here.

General relativity and quantum theory contradict each other in other ways. Gravity Ref. 1178 is curved space-time. Extensive research has shown that quantum field theory, which describes electrodynamics and nuclear forces, fails for situations with strongly curved space-times. In these cases the concept of 'particle' is not precisely defined. Quantum field theory cannot be extended to include gravity consistently, and thus to include general relativity. Without the concept of the particle as a discrete entity, we also lose the ability to perform perturbation calculations – and these are the only calculations possible in quantum field theory. In short, quantum theory only works because it assumes that gravity does not exist. Indeed, the gravitational constant does not appear in any consistent quantum field theory.

On the other hand, general relativity neglects the commutation rules between physical quantities discovered in experiments on a microscopic scale. General relativity assumes that the classical notions of position and momentum of material objects are meaningful. It thus ignores Planck's constant $\hbar$, and only works by neglecting quantum effects.

Measurements also lead to problems. In general relativity, as in classical physics, it is assumed that arbitrary precision of measurement is possible – for example, by using Page 831 finer and finer ruler marks. In quantum mechanics, on the other hand, the precision of measurement is limited. The indeterminacy principle yields limits that result from the Page 1136 mass M of the apparatus.

The contradictions are most evident in relation to *time*. According to relativity, time is what is read from clocks. But quantum theory says that precise clocks do not exist, especially if gravitation is taken into account. What does 'waiting 10 minutes' mean, if the clock goes into a quantum-mechanical superposition as a result of its coupling to space-time geometry?

In addition, quantum theory associates mass with an inverse length via the Compton wavelength; general relativity associates mass with length via the Schwarzschild radius.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Similarly, general relativity implies that space and time cannot be distinguished, whereas quantum theory implies that matter does make a distinction between them. Quantum theory is a theory of – admittedly weird – local observables. In general relativity, there are no local observables, as Einstein's hole argument shows.

Page 622

The contradiction between the two theories is shown most dramatically by the failure of general relativity to describe the pair creation of particles with spin 1/2, a typical and essential quantum process. John Wheeler and others have shown that, in such a case, the topology of space necessarily has to *change*; in general relativity, however, the topology of space is fixed. In short, quantum theory says that matter is made of *fermions*, which cannot be incorporated into general relativity.

Ref. 1179, Ref. 1180 Ref. 1181, Ref. 1182

No description of nature that contains contradictions can lead to a unified description or to a completely correct description. In order to proceed, let us take the shortest and fastest path: let us investigate the contradictions in more detail.

DOES MATTER DIFFER FROM VACUUM?

There is a simple way to state the origin of *all* contradictions between general relativity and quantum mechanics.* Both theories describe motion in terms of objects, made up of particles, and space-time, made up of events. Let us see how these two concepts are defined.

Ref. 1183

A *particle* – and in general any object – is defined as a conserved entity which has a position and which can move. (The etymology of the word *object* is connected to the latter property.) In other words, a particle is a small entity with conserved mass, charge and so on, whose position can vary with time.

In every physics text, *time* is defined with the help of moving objects, usually called 'clocks', or moving particles, such as those emitted by light sources. Similarly, *length* is defined in terms of objects, either with an old-fashioned ruler or in terms of the motion of light, which is itself motion of particles.

Ref. 1184

Modern physics has sharpened our definitions of particles and space-time. Quantum mechanics assumes that space-time is given (as a symmetry of the Hamiltonian), and studies the properties of particles and their motion, both for matter and for radiation. General relativity, and especially cosmology, takes the opposite approach: it assumes that the properties of matter and radiation are given (for example, via their equations of state), and describes in detail the space-time that follows from them, in particular its curvature.

However, one fact remains unchanged throughout all these advances in physics: these two concepts, of particles and of space-time, are *each defined with the help of the other*. To eliminate the contradiction between quantum mechanics and general relativity, and to create a more complete theory, we must eliminate this circular definition. As we will discover below, this necessitates a radical change in our description of nature, and in particular of the continuity of space-time.

For a long time, the contradictions between these two descriptions of nature were ac-

* The main results of this section are standard knowledge among specialists of unification; they are given here using simple arguments. For another derivation, see the summary section on limit statements in nature, on page 1458.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 598 'Tekenen' by Maurits Escher, 1948 – a metaphor for the way in which 'particles' and 'space-time' are usually defined: each with the help of the other (© M.C. Escher Heirs)

commodated by keeping the two theories separate. One often hears the statement that quantum mechanics is valid at small scales and general relativity is valid at large scales. But this separation is artificial; worse, it prevents us from solving the problem. The situation resembles the well-known drawing (Figure 598) by Maurits Escher (1898–1972) in which two hands, each holding a pencil, seem to be drawing each other. If one hand is taken as a symbol of space-time and the other as a symbol of particles, with the act of drawing taken as the act of defining, the picture gives a description of standard twentieth-century physics. The apparent contradiction is solved by recognizing that the two concepts (the two hands) both originate from a third, hidden concept. In the picture, this third entity is the hand of the artist.

Ref. 1185, Ref. 1186 Ref. 1187, Ref. 1188

In the case of space-time and matter, the search for the underlying common concept is making renewed progress. The conceptual changes required for this are so striking that they should interest anybody who has an interest in physics. The most effective way to deduce the new concepts is to focus on that domain where the contradiction between the two standard theories is most dramatic, and where both theories are necessary at the same time.

Planck scales

Both general relativity and quantum mechanics are successful theories for the description of nature. Each provides a criterion for determining when classical Galilean physics is no longer applicable. (In the following, we use the terms 'vacuum' and 'empty space-time' interchangeably.)

General relativity shows that it is necessary to take into account the curvature of space-time whenever we approach an object of mass m to within a distance of the order of the Schwarzschild radius r_S, given by

$$r_S = 2Gm/c^2 \,. \tag{810}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 121 The size, Schwarzschild radius and Compton wavelength of some objects appearing in nature. The lengths in quotation marks make no physical sense, as explained in the text.

Object	Diameter d	Mass m	Schwarzschild radius r_S	Ratio d/r_S	Compton wavelength λ_C	Ratio d/λ_C
galaxy	≈ 1 Zm	$\approx 5 \cdot 10^{40}$ kg	≈ 70 Tm	$\approx 10^7$	'$\approx 10^{-83}$ m'	$\approx 10^{104}$
neutron star	10 km	$2.8 \cdot 10^{30}$ kg	4.2 km	2.4	'$1.3 \cdot 10^{-73}$ m'	$8.0 \cdot 10^{76}$
Sun	1.4 Gm	$2.0 \cdot 10^{30}$ kg	3.0 km	$4.8 \cdot 10^5$	'$1.0 \cdot 10^{-73}$ m'	$8.0 \cdot 10^{81}$
Earth	13 Mm	$6.0 \cdot 10^{24}$ kg	8.9 mm	$1.4 \cdot 10^9$	'$5.8 \cdot 10^{-68}$ m'	$2.2 \cdot 10^{74}$
human	1.8 m	75 kg	0.11 ym	$1.6 \cdot 10^{25}$	'$4.7 \cdot 10^{-45}$ m'	$3.8 \cdot 10^{44}$
molecule	10 nm	0.57 zg	'$8.5 \cdot 10^{-52}$ m'	$1.2 \cdot 10^{43}$	$6.2 \cdot 10^{-19}$ m	$1.6 \cdot 10^{10}$
atom (^{12}C)	0.6 nm	20 yg	'$3.0 \cdot 10^{-53}$ m'	$2.0 \cdot 10^{43}$	$1.8 \cdot 10^{-17}$ m	$3.2 \cdot 10^7$
proton p	2 fm	1.7 yg	'$2.5 \cdot 10^{-54}$ m'	$8.0 \cdot 10^{38}$	$2.0 \cdot 10^{-16}$ m	9.6
pion π	2 fm	0.24 yg	'$3.6 \cdot 10^{-55}$ m'	$5.6 \cdot 10^{39}$	$1.5 \cdot 10^{-15}$ m	1.4
up-quark u	< 0.1 fm	0.6 yg	'$9.0 \cdot 10^{-55}$ m'	$< 1.1 \cdot 10^{38}$	$5.5 \cdot 10^{-16}$ m	< 0.18
electron e	< 4 am	$9.1 \cdot 10^{-31}$ kg	'$1.4 \cdot 10^{-57}$ m'	$3.0 \cdot 10^{39}$	$3.8 \cdot 10^{-13}$ m	$< 1.0 \cdot 10^{-5}$
neutrino ν_e	< 4 am	$< 3.0 \cdot 10^{-35}$ kg	'$< 4.5 \cdot 10^{-62}$ m'	n.a.	$> 1.1 \cdot 10^{-8}$ m	$< 3.4 \cdot 10^{-10}$

The gravitational constant G and the speed of light c act as conversion constants. Indeed, as the Schwarzschild radius of an object is approached, the difference between general relativity and the classical $1/r^2$ description of gravity becomes larger and larger. For example, the barely measurable gravitational deflection of light by the Sun is due to the light approaching the Sun to within $2.4 \cdot 10^5$ times its Schwarzschild radius. Usually, we are forced to stay away from objects at a distance that is an even larger multiple of the Schwarzschild radius, as shown in Table 121. For this reason, general relativity is unnecessary in everyday life. (An object smaller than its own Schwarzschild radius is called a *black hole*, because according to general relativity, no signals from inside the Schwarzschild radius can reach the outside world.)

Ref. 1179, Ref. 1189

Ref. 1190

Similarly, quantum mechanics shows that Galilean physics must be abandoned and quantum effects must be taken into account whenever an object is approached to within distances of the order of the (reduced) Compton wavelength λ_C, given by

$$\lambda_C = \frac{\hbar}{m\,c} \,. \tag{811}$$

In this case, Planck's constant $\hbar$ and the speed of light c act as conversion factors to transform the mass m into a length scale. Of course, this length is only relevant if the object is smaller than its own Compton wavelength. At these scales we get relativistic quantum effects, such as particle–antiparticle creation or annihilation. Table 121 shows that the approach distance is near to or smaller than the Compton wavelength only in the microscopic world, so that such effects are not observed in everyday life. We do not therefore need quantum field theory to describe common observations.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The *combined* concepts of quantum field theory and general relativity are required in situations where both conditions are satisfied simultaneously. The necessary approach distance for such situations is calculated by setting $r_S = 2\lambda_C$ (the factor 2 is introduced for simplicity). We find that this is the case when lengths or times are (of the order of)

$$\begin{aligned} l_{Pl} = \sqrt{\hbar G/c^3} &= 1.6 \cdot 10^{-35}\,\text{m, the } \textit{Planck length}, \\ t_{Pl} = \sqrt{\hbar G/c^5} &= 5.4 \cdot 10^{-44}\,\text{s , the } \textit{Planck time}. \end{aligned} \tag{812}$$

Whenever we approach objects at these scales, both general relativity and quantum mechanics play a role, and effects of *quantum gravity* appear. Because the values of the Planck dimensions are extremely small, this level of sophistication is unnecessary in everyday life, in astronomy and even in particle physics.

However, to answer the questions posed at the beginning of the book – why do we live in three dimensions, and why is the proton 1836.15 times heavier than the electron? – we require a precise and complete description of nature. The contradictions between quantum mechanics and general relativity appear to make the search for answers impossible. However, although the unified theory of quantum gravity is not yet complete, we can already get a few glimpses of its implications.

Challenge 1624 s
Ref. 1191

Note that the Planck scales specify one of only two domains of nature where quantum mechanics and general relativity apply simultaneously. (What is the other?) As Planck scales are the easier of the two to study, they provide the best starting point for the following discussion. When Max Planck discovered the existence of those scales, he was interested in them mainly as *natural units of measurement*. However, their importance in nature is much greater. As we will discover, they determine what is called *quantum geometry*.

Farewell to instants of time

> Time is composed of time atoms ... which in fact are indivisible.
>
> Moses Maimonides, twelfth century

The appearance of the quantum of action in the description of motion leads to quantum limits to all measurements. These limits have important consequences at Planck scales. Measurement limits appear most clearly when we investigate the properties of clocks and metre rules. Is it possible to construct a clock that is able to measure time intervals shorter than the Planck time? Surprisingly, the answer is no, even though the time–energy indeterminacy relation $\Delta E \Delta t \geqslant \hbar$ seems to indicate that by making ΔE large enough, we can make Δt arbitrary small.

Ref. 1192, Ref. 1193

Every clock is a device with some moving parts. Parts can be mechanical wheels, particles of matter in motion, changing electrodynamic fields (i.e., photons), or decaying radioactive particles. For each moving component of a clock the indeterminacy principle applies. As explained most clearly by Michael Raymer, the indeterminacy relation for two non-commuting variables describes two different, but related, situations: it makes a statement about standard *deviations* of *separate* measurements on *many* identical systems; and it describes the measurement *precision* for a *joint* measurement on a *single*

Ref. 1194, Ref. 1195
Ref. 1196

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

system. In what follows, we will consider only the second situation.

For a clock to be useful, we need to know both the time and the energy of each hand. Otherwise it would not be a recording device. More generally, a clock must be a classical system. We need the combined knowledge of the non-commuting variables for each moving component of the clock. Let us focus on the component with the largest time indeterminacy Δt. It is evident that the smallest time interval δt that can be measured by a clock is always larger than the quantum limit, i.e., larger than the time indeterminacy Δt for the most 'uncertain' component. Thus we have

$$\delta t \geqslant \Delta t \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{\Delta E} \,, \tag{813}$$

where ΔE is the energy indeterminacy of the moving component, and ΔE must be smaller than the total energy $E = mc^2$ of the component itself.* Furthermore, a clock provides information, so signals have to be able to leave it. Therefore the clock must not be a black hole: its mass m must be smaller than the Schwarzschild mass for its size, i.e., $m \leqslant c^2 l/G$, where l is the size of the clock (neglecting factors of order unity). Finally, for a sensible measurement of the time interval δt, the size l of the clock must be smaller than $c\,\delta t$, because otherwise different parts of the clock could not work together to produce the same time display.** If we combine all these conditions, we get

$$\delta t \geqslant \frac{\hbar G}{c^5 \delta t} \tag{814}$$

or

$$\delta t \geqslant \sqrt{\frac{\hbar G}{c^5}} = t_{\mathrm{Pl}} \,. \tag{815}$$

In summary, from three simple properties of any clock – namely, that it is only a single clock, that we can read its dial, and that it gives sensible read-outs – we conclude that *clocks cannot measure time intervals shorter than the Planck time*. Note that this argument is independent of the nature of the clock mechanism. Whether the clock operates by gravitational, electrical, mechanical or even nuclear means, the limit still applies.***

Ref. 1200 The same conclusion can be reached in other ways. For example, any clock small enough to measure small time intervals necessarily has a certain energy indeterminacy due to the indeterminacy relation. Meanwhile, on the basis of general relativity, any en-

* Physically, this condition means being sure that there is only *one* clock: if $\Delta E > E$, it would be impossible to distinguish between a single clock and a clock–anticlock pair created from the vacuum, or a component together with two such pairs, and so on.

** It is amusing to explore how a clock larger than $c\,\delta t$ would stop working, as a result of the loss of rigidity in its components. Challenge 1625 s

*** Note that gravitation is essential here. The present argument differs from the well-known study on the limitations of clocks due to their mass and their measuring time which was published by Salecker and Wigner and summarized in pedagogical form by Zimmerman. Here, both quantum mechanics and gravity are included, and therefore a different, lower, and more fundamental limit is found. Note also that the discovery of black hole radiation does not change the argument: black hole radiation notwithstanding, measurement devices cannot exist inside black holes. Ref. 1198 Ref. 1199

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

ergy density induces a deformation of space-time, and signals from the deformed region
Page 535 arrive with a certain delay due to that deformation. The energy indeterminacy of the source leads to an indeterminacy in the deformation, and thus in the delay. The expres-
Ref. 1189 sion from general relativity for the deformation of the time part of the line element due to a mass m is $\delta t = mG/lc^3$. From the mass–energy relation, we see that an energy spread ΔE produces an indeterminacy Δt in the delay:

$$\Delta t = \frac{\Delta E\, G}{l\, c^5} \,. \tag{816}$$

This determines the precision of the clock. Furthermore, the energy indeterminacy of the clock is fixed by the indeterminacy relation for time and energy $\Delta E \geqslant \hbar/\Delta t$, which is in turn fixed by the precision of the clock. Combining all this, we again find the relation $\delta t \geqslant t_{\mathrm{Pl}}$ for the minimum measurable time.

We are forced to conclude that *in nature there is a minimum time interval.* In other words, *at Planck scales the term 'instant of time' has no theoretical or experimental basis.*

Farewell to points in space

In a similar way, we can deduce that it is impossible to make a metre rule, or any other
Ref. 1201 length-measuring device, that is able to measure lengths shorter than the Planck length. Obviously, we can already deduce this from $l_{\mathrm{Pl}} = c\, t_{\mathrm{Pl}}$, but an independent proof is also possible.

For any length measurement, joint measurements of position and momentum are necessary. The most straightforward way to measure the distance between two points is to put an object at rest at each position. Now, the minimal length δl that can be measured must be larger than the position indeterminacy of the two objects. From the indeterminacy principle it is known that neither object's position can be determined with a precision Δl better than that given by the indeterminacy relation $\Delta l\, \Delta p = \hbar$, where Δp is the momentum indeterminacy. The requirement that there be only one object at each end (avoiding pair production from the vacuum) means that $\Delta p < mc$: together, these requirements give

$$\delta l \geqslant \Delta l \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{mc} \,. \tag{817}$$

Furthermore, the measurement cannot be performed if signals cannot leave the objects; thus, they cannot be black holes. Therefore their masses must be small enough for their Schwarzschild radius $r_{\mathrm{S}} = 2Gm/c^2$ to be less than the distance δl separating them. Again omitting the factor of 2, we get

$$\delta l \geqslant \sqrt{\frac{\hbar G}{c^3}} = l_{\mathrm{Pl}} \,. \tag{818}$$

Another way to deduce this limit reverses the roles of general relativity and quantum theory. To measure the distance between two objects, we have to localize the first object with respect to the other within a certain interval Δx. The corresponding energy indeter-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

minacy obeys $\Delta E = c(c^2m^2 + (\Delta p)^2)^{1/2} \geqslant c\hbar/\Delta x$. However, general relativity shows that a small volume filled with energy changes the curvature of space-time, and thus changes the metric of the surrounding space. For the resulting distance change Δl, compared with empty space, we find the expression $\Delta l \approx G\Delta E/c^4$.

Ref. 1179, Ref. 1189 Ref. 1201, Ref. 1202 Ref. 1203

In short, if we localize the first particle in space with a precision Δx, the distance to a second particle is known only with precision Δl. The minimum length δl that can be measured is obviously larger than either of these quantities; inserting the expression for ΔE, we find again that the minimum measurable length δl is given by the Planck length.

Ref. 1204, Ref. 1205 Ref. 1206

We note that every length measurement requires a joint measurement of position and momentum. This is particularly obvious if we approach a metre ruler to an object, but it is equally true for any other length measurement.

We note that, since the Planck length is the shortest possible length, there can be no observations of quantum-mechanical effects for a situation where the corresponding de Broglie or Compton wavelength is smaller than the Planck length. In proton–proton collisions we observe both pair production and interference effects. In contrast, the Planck limit implies that in everyday, macroscopic situations, such as car–car collisions, we cannot observe embryo–antiembryo pair production and quantum interference effects.

In summary, from two simple properties common to all length-measuring devices, namely that they are discrete and that they can be read, we arrive at the conclusion that *lengths smaller than the Planck length cannot be measured*. Whatever method is used, be it a metre rule or time-of-flight measurement, we cannot overcome this fundamental limit. It follows that *the concept of a 'point in space' has no experimental basis*. In the same way, the concept of an 'event', being a combination of a 'point in space' and an 'instant of time', also loses its meaning for the description of nature.

A simple way to deduce the minimum length using the limit statements which structure this ascent is the following. General relativity is based on a maximum force in nature, or alternatively, on a maximum mass change per time, whose value is given by $\mathrm{d}m/\mathrm{d}t = c^3/4G$. Quantum theory is based on a minimum action in nature, given by $L = \hbar/2$. Since a distance d can be expressed as

Page 471

$$d^2 = \frac{L}{\mathrm{d}m/\mathrm{d}t}\,, \tag{819}$$

one sees directly that a minimum action and a maximum rate of change of mass imply a minimum distance. In other words, quantum theory and general relativity, when put together, imply a minimum distance.

These results are often expressed by the so-called *generalized indeterminacy principle*

Ref. 1207

$$\Delta p \Delta x \geqslant \hbar/2 + f\frac{G}{c^3}(\Delta p)^2 \tag{820}$$

or

$$\Delta p \Delta x \geqslant \hbar/2 + f\frac{l_{\mathrm{Pl}}^2}{\hbar}(\Delta p)^2\,, \tag{821}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

where f is a numerical factor of order unity. A similar expression holds for the time–energy indeterminacy relation. The first term on the right-hand side is the usual quantum-mechanical indeterminacy. The second term is negligible for everyday energies, and is significant only near Planck energies; it is due to the changes in space-time induced by gravity at these high energies. You should be able to show that the generalized principle (820) implies that Δx can never be smaller than $f^{1/2} l_{\mathrm{Pl}}$.

Challenge 1626 e

The generalized indeterminacy principle is derived in exactly the same way in which Heisenberg derived the original indeterminacy principle $\Delta p \Delta x \geqslant \hbar/2$, namely by studying the deflection of light by an object under a microscope. A careful re-evaluation of the process, this time including gravity, yields equation (820). For this reason, *all* attempts to unify quantum mechanics and gravity must yield this relation. Indeed, it appears in the theory of canonical quantum gravity, in superstring theory, and in the quantum group approach.

Ref. 1207 Ref. 1208 Ref. 1209 Ref. 1210, Ref. 1211 Ref. 1212

Remember that quantum mechanics begins with the realization that the classical concept of action makes no sense below the value of $\hbar/2$; similarly, unified theories begin with the realization that the classical concepts of time and length make no sense below Planck scales. However, the usual description of space-time does contain such small values: it involves intervals smaller than the smallest measurable one. Therefore, *the continuum description of space-time has to be abandoned* in favour of a more appropriate description.

Ref. 1213

The new indeterminacy relation appearing at Planck scales shows that space-time is not well described as a continuum. Inserting $c\Delta p \geqslant \Delta E \geqslant \hbar/\Delta t$ into equation (820), we get

$$\Delta x \Delta t \geqslant \hbar G/c^4 = t_{\mathrm{Pl}} l_{\mathrm{Pl}} \,, \tag{822}$$

which of course has no counterpart in standard quantum mechanics. This shows that space-time events do not exist. A final way to convince oneself that points have no meaning is to observe that a point is an entity with vanishing volume; however, the minimum volume possible in nature is the Planck volume $V_{\mathrm{Pl}} = l_{\mathrm{Pl}}^3$.

Space-time points are idealizations of events – but this idealization is inadequate. The use of the concept of 'point' is similar to the use of the concept of 'ether' a century ago: it is impossible to detect, and it is only useful as a convenient notion until a way to describe nature without it has been found. Like the 'aether', 'points' also lead reason astray.

In other words, the Planck units not only provide natural units; they also provide – within a factor of order one – the *limit* values of space and time intervals.

Farewell to the space-time manifold

The consequences of the Planck limits for measurements of time and space can be taken much further. It is often said that given any two points in space or any two instants of time, there is always a third in between. Physicists sloppily call this property continuity, while mathematicians call it denseness. However, at Planck scales this property cannot hold, since there are no intervals smaller than the Planck time. Thus points and instants are not dense, and *between two points there is not always a third.* This means that *space and time are not continuous.* Of course, at large scales they are – approximately – continuous, in the same way that a piece of rubber or a liquid seems continuous at everyday scales,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

even though it is not at a small scale.

All paradoxes resulting from the infinite divisibility of space and time, such as Zeno's argument on the impossibility of distinguishing motion from rest, or the Banach–Tarski paradox, are now avoided. We can dismiss them straight away because of their incorrect premises concerning the nature of space and time.

But let us go on. Special relativity, quantum mechanics and general relativity all rely on the idea that time can be defined for all points of a given reference frame. However, two clocks a distance l apart cannot be synchronized with arbitrary precision. Since the distance between two clocks cannot be measured with an error smaller than the Planck length l_{Pl}, and transmission of signals is necessary for synchronization, it is not possible to synchronize two clocks with a better precision than $l_{\mathrm{Pl}}/c = t_{\mathrm{Pl}}$, the Planck time. So use of a single time coordinate for a whole reference frame is only an approximation, and cannot be maintained in any precise description of nature.

Moreover, since the time difference between events can only be measured within a Planck time, for two events distant in time by this order of magnitude, it is not possible to say with complete certainty which of the two precedes the other. This is an important fact. If events cannot be ordered, then the very concept of time, which was introduced into physics to describe sequences, makes no sense at Planck scales. In other words, after dropping the idea of a common time coordinate for a complete frame of reference, we are forced to drop the idea of time at a single 'point' as well. The concept of 'proper time' loses its meaning at Planck scales.

Ref. 1214

Similar arguments show that limitations on length measurements imply that we cannot speak of continuous space, except in an approximate sense. As a result of the lack of measurement precision at Planck scales, the concepts of spatial order, translation invariance, isotropy of the vacuum and global coordinate systems have no experimental basis.

But there is more to come. The very existence of a minimum length contradicts the theory of special relativity, in which it is shown that lengths undergo Lorentz contraction when the frame of reference is changed. There is only one conclusion: special relativity cannot be correct at very small distances. Thus, *space-time is neither Lorentz-invariant nor diffeomorphism-invariant nor dilatation-invariant*. All the symmetries that are at the basis of special and general relativity are only approximately valid at Planck scales.

The imprecision of measurement implies that most familiar concepts used to describe spatial relations become useless. For example, the concept of a *metric* loses its usefulness at Planck scales, since distances cannot be measured with precision. So it is impossible to say whether space is flat or curved. The impossibility of measuring lengths exactly is equivalent to fluctuations of the curvature, and thus of gravity.

Ref. 1201, Ref. 1215

Even the number of spatial dimensions makes no sense at Planck scales. Let us remind ourselves how to determine this number experimentally. One possible way is to determine how many points we can choose in space such that all the distances between them are equal. If we can find at most n such points, the space has $n-1$ dimensions. But if reliable length measurement at Planck scales is not possible, there is no way to determine reliably the number of dimensions of space with this method.

Another way to check for three spatial dimensions is to make a knot in a shoe string and glue the ends together: since it stays knotted, we know that space has three dimensions, because there is a mathematical theorem that in spaces with greater or fewer than

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

three dimensions, knots do not exist. Again, at Planck scales, we cannot say whether a string is knotted or not, because measurement limits at crossings make it impossible to say which strand lies above the other.

There are many other methods for determining the dimensionality of space.* In all cases, the definition of dimensionality is based on a precise definition of the concept of neighbourhood. At Planck scales, however, length measurements do not allow us to say whether a given point is inside or outside a given region. In short, whatever method we use, the lack of precise length measurements means that *at Planck scales, the dimensionality of physical space is not defined.* It should not, therefore, come as a surprise that when we *approach* these scales, we may get a scale-dependent answer for the number of dimensions, which may be different from three.

The reasons for the problems with space-time become most evident when we remember Euclid's well-known definition: 'A point is that which has no part.' As Euclid clearly understood, a *physical* point, as an idealization of position, cannot be defined without some measurement method. *Mathematical* points, however, can be defined without reference to a metric. They are just elements of a set, usually called a 'space'. (A 'measurable' or 'metric' space is a set of points equipped with a measure or a metric.)

Ref. 1216

In the case of physical space-time, the concepts of measure and of metric are more fundamental than that of a point. Confusion between physical and mathematical space and points arises from the failure to distinguish a mathematical metric from a physical length measurement.**

Perhaps the most beautiful way to make this point is the Banach–Tarski theorem, which clearly shows the limits of the concept of volume. The theorem states that a sphere made up of *mathematical points* can be cut into five pieces in such a way that the pieces can be put together to form two spheres, each of the same volume as the original one. However, the necessary 'cuts' are infinitely curved and detailed: the pieces are wildly disconnected. For physical matter such as gold, unfortunately – or fortunately – the existence of a minimum length, namely the atomic distance, makes it impossible to perform such a cut. For vacuum, the puzzle reappears. For example, the energy of zero-point fluctuations is given by the density times the volume; following the Banach–Tarski theorem, the zero-point energy content of a single sphere should be equal to the zero-point energy of two similar spheres each of the same volume as the original one. The paradox is

Page 60
Ref. 1217

* For example, we can determine the dimension using only the topological properties of space. If we draw a so-called *covering* of a topological space with open sets, there are always points that are elements of several sets of the covering. Let p be the maximal number of sets of which a point can be an element in a given covering. The minimum value of p over all possible coverings, minus one, gives the dimension of the space.

In fact, if physical space is not a manifold, the various methods for determining the dimensionality may give different answers. Indeed, for linear spaces without norm, the dimensionality cannot be defined in a unique way. Different definitions (fractal dimension, Lyapunov dimension, etc.) are possible.

** Where does the incorrect idea of continuous space-time have its roots? In everyday life, as well as in physics, space-time is a book-keeping device introduced to describe observations. Its properties are extracted from the properties of observables. Since observables can be added and multiplied, like numbers, we infer that they can take continuous values, and, in particular, arbitrarily small values. It is then possible to define points and sets of points. A special field of mathematics, topology, shows how to start from a set of points and construct, with the help of neighbourhood relations and separation properties, first a *topological space*, then, with the help of a metric, a *metric space*. With the appropriate compactness and connectedness relations, a *manifold*, characterized by its dimension, metric and topology, can be constructed.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

resolved by the Planck length, which provides a fundamental length scale even for vacuum, thus making infinitely complex cuts impossible. Therefore, the concept of volume is only well defined at Planck scales if a minimum length is introduced.

To sum up, *physical space-time cannot be a set of mathematical points.* But there are more surprises. At Planck scales, since both temporal and spatial order break down, there is no way to say if the distance between two nearby space-time regions is space-like or time-like. *At Planck scales, time and space cannot be distinguished from each other.*

In addition, we cannot state that the topology of space-time is fixed, as general relativity implies. The topology changes mentioned above that are required for particle reactions do become possible. In this way another of the contradictions between general relativity and quantum theory is resolved.

In summary, space-time at Planck scales is not continuous, not ordered, not endowed with a metric, not four-dimensional, and not made up of points. It satisfies none of the defining properties of a manifold.* We conclude that *the concept of a space-time manifold has no justification at Planck scales.* This is a strong result. Even though both general relativity and quantum mechanics use continuous space-time, the combined theory does not.

> There is nothing in the world but matter in motion, and matter in motion cannot move otherwise than in space and time.
>
> Lenin

Farewell to observables and measurements

If space and time are not continuous, no quantities defined as derivatives with respect to space or time are precisely defined. Velocity, acceleration, momentum, energy and so on are only well defined under the assumption of continuity. That important tool, the evolution equation, is based on derivatives and can thus no longer be used. Therefore the Schrödinger and Dirac equations lose their basis. Concepts such as 'derivative', 'divergence-free' and 'source free' lose their meaning at Planck scales.

In fact, all physical observables are defined using length and time measurements. Each physical unit is a product of powers of length and time (and mass) units. (In the SI system, electrical quantities have a separate base quantity, the ampere, but the argument still holds: the ampere is itself defined in terms of a force, which is measured using the three base units of length, time and mass.) Since time and length are not continuous, *at Planck scales, observables cannot be described by real numbers.*

In addition, if time and space are not continuous, the usual expression for an observable field, $A(t, x)$, does not make sense: we have to find a more appropriate description. *Physical fields cannot exist at Planck scales.*

The consequences for quantum mechanics are severe. It makes no sense to define multiplication of observables by real numbers, but only by a discrete set of numbers. Among other implications, this means that observables do not form a linear algebra. *Observables are not described by operators at Planck scales.*

But quantum mechanics is based on the superposition principle. Without it, everything comes crumbling down. In particular, the most important observables are the

* A manifold is what looks *locally* like a Euclidean space. The exact definition can be found in Appendix B.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

gauge potentials. Since they do not form an algebra, *gauge symmetry is not valid at Planck scales*. Even innocuous-looking expressions such as $[x_i, x_j] = 0$ for $x_i \neq x_j$, which are at the root of quantum field theory, become meaningless at Planck scales. Since at those scales the superposition principle cannot be backed up by experiment, even the famous Wheeler–DeWitt equation, often assumed to describe quantum gravity, cannot be valid.

Similarly, permutation symmetry is based on the premise that we can distinguish two points by their coordinates, and then exchange particles between those locations. As we have just seen, this is not possible if the distance between the two particles is very small. We conclude that *permutation symmetry has no experimental basis at Planck scales*.

Even discrete symmetries, like charge conjugation, space inversion and time reversal, cannot be correct in this domain, because there is no way to verify them exactly by measurement. *CPT symmetry is not valid at Planck scales.*

Finally we note that all types of scaling relations break down at small scales. As a result, *renormalization symmetry is also lost at Planck scales.*

All these results are consistent: if there are no symmetries at Planck scales, there are also no observables, since physical observables are representations of symmetry groups. In fact, the limitations on time and length measurements imply that *the concept of measurement has no significance at Planck scales*.

Can space-time be a lattice? – A glimpse of quantum geometry

Ref. 1218 Ref. 1219 Ref. 1220 Ref. 1221 Ref. 1222

Discrete models of space-time have been studied since the 1940s. Recently, the idea that space-time could be described as a lattice – like a crystal – has been explored most notably by David Finkelstein and by Gerard 't Hooft. The idea of space-time as a lattice is based on the idea that, if there is a minimum distance, then all distances are multiples of this minimum. It is generally agreed that, in order to get an isotropic and homogeneous situation for large, everyday scales, the structure of space-time cannot be periodic, but must be random. In fact, any fixed structure to space-time would violate the result that there are no lengths smaller than the Planck length: as a result of the Lorentz contraction, any moving observer would find lattice distances smaller than the Planck value. Worse still, the lattice idea conflicts with general relativity, in particular with the diffeomorphism-invariance of the vacuum. Finally, where would a particle be during the jump from one lattice point to the next?

Thus, in summary, space-time cannot be a lattice. A minimum distance does exist in nature; however, we cannot hope that all other distances are simple multiples of it. We will discover more evidence for this negative conclusion later on.

If space-time is not a set of points or events, it must be something else. We have three hints at this stage. The first step necessary to improve our description of motion is the recognition that abandoning 'points' means abandoning the *local* description of nature. Both quantum mechanics and general relativity assume that the phrase 'observable at a point' has a precise meaning. Because it is impossible to describe space as a manifold, this expression is no longer useful. The unification of general relativity and quantum physics forces the adoption of a *non-local* description of nature at Planck scales.

The existence of a minimum length implies that there is no way to physically distinguish between locations that are even closer together. We are tempted to conclude that *no* pair of locations can be distinguished, even if they are one metre apart, since on any

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

path joining two points, no two locations that are close together can be distinguished. The problem is similar to the question about the size of a cloud or of an atom. If we measure water density or electron density, we find non-vanishing values at any distance from the centre of the cloud or the atom; however, an effective size can still be defined, because it is very unlikely that the effects of the presence of a cloud or of an atom can be seen at distances much larger than this effective size. Similarly, we can guess that two points in space-time at a macroscopic distance from each other can be distinguished because the probability that they will be confused drops rapidly with increasing distance. In short, we are thus led to a *probabilistic* description of space-time. Space-time becomes a macroscopic observable, a *statistical* or *thermodynamic limit* of some microscopic entities.

We note that a fluctuating structure for space-time would also avoid the problems of fixed structures with Lorentz invariance. This property is of course compatible with a statistical description. In summary, the experimental observations of special relativity – Lorentz invariance, isotropy and homogeneity – together with the notion of a minimum distance, point towards a description of space-time as *fluctuating*. Research efforts in quantum gravity, superstring theory and quantum groups have independently confirmed that a probabilistic and non-local description of space-time at Planck scales, resolves the contradictions between general relativity and quantum theory. This is our first result on quantum geometry. To clarify the issue, we have to turn to the concept of the particle.

Ref. 1223

Farewell to particles

In every example of motion, some object is involved. One of the important discoveries of the natural sciences was that all objects are composed of small constituents, called *elementary particles*. Quantum theory shows that all composite, non-elementary objects have a finite, non-vanishing size. This property allows us to determine whether a particle is elementary or not. If it behaves like a point particle, it is elementary. At present, only the leptons (electron, muon, tau and the neutrinos), the quarks and the radiation quanta of the electromagnetic, weak and strong nuclear interactions (the photon, the W and Z bosons, and the gluons) have been found to be elementary. A few more elementary particles are predicted by various refinements of the standard model. Protons, atoms, molecules, cheese, people, galaxies and so on are all composite, as shown in Table 121. Elementary particles have vanishing size and are characterized by their spin and their mass.

Page 1290

Page 1400

Although the definition of 'elementary particle' as point particle is all we need in the following argument, it is not complete. It seems to leave open the possibility that future experiments could show that electrons or quarks are not elementary. This is not so! In fact, any particle smaller than its own Compton wavelength is elementary. If it were composite, there would be a lighter particle inside it, which would have a larger Compton wavelength than the composite particle. This is impossible, since the size of a composite particle must be larger than the Compton wavelength of its components. (The alternative possibility that all components are heavier than the composite does not lead to satisfying physical properties: for example, it leads to intrinsically unstable components.)

Ref. 1224

The *size* of an object, such as those given in Table 121, is defined as the length at which differences from point-like behaviour are observed. The size d of an object is determined by measuring how it scatters a beam of probe particles. For example, the radius of the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

FIGURE 599 Andrei Sakharov (1921–1989)

atomic nucleus was determined for the first time in Rutherford's experiment using alpha particle scattering. In daily life as well, when we look at objects, we make use of scattered photons. In general, in order for scattering to be useful, the effective wavelength $\lambda = \hbar/mv$ of the probe must be smaller than the object size d to be determined. We thus need $d > \lambda = \hbar/mv \geqslant \hbar/mc$. In addition, in order for a scattering experiment to be possible, the object must not be a black hole, since, if it were, it would simply swallow the approaching particle. This means that its mass m must be smaller than that of a black hole of the same size; in other words, from equation (810) we must have $m < dc^2/G$. Combining this with the previous condition we get

$$d > \sqrt{\frac{\hbar G}{c^3}} = l_{\mathrm{Pl}} \,. \tag{823}$$

In other words, there is no way to observe that an object is smaller than the Planck length. Thus, in principle *there is thus no way to deduce from observations that a particle is point-like*. In fact, the term 'point particle' makes no sense at all! Of course, there is a relation between the existence of a minimum length for empty space and the existence of a minimum length for objects. If the term 'point of space' is meaningless, then the term 'point particle' is also meaningless. As in the case of time, the lower limit on length results from the combination of quantum theory and general relativity.*

The size d of any elementary particle must by definition be smaller than its own (reduced) Compton wavelength $\hbar/mc$. Moreover, the size of a particle is always larger than the Planck length: $d > l_{\mathrm{Pl}}$. Combining these two requirements and eliminating the size d, we get a constraint on the mass m of any elementary particle, namely

$$m < \frac{\hbar}{c\, l_{\mathrm{Pl}}} = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{G}} = m_{\mathrm{Pl}} = 2.2 \cdot 10^{-8}\,\mathrm{kg} = 1.2 \cdot 10^{19}\,\mathrm{GeV/c^2} \,. \tag{824}$$

The limit m_{Pl}, the so-called *Planck mass*, corresponds roughly to the mass of a human embryo that is ten days old, or equivalently, to that of a small flea. In short, *the mass of any elementary particle must be smaller than the Planck mass.* This fact was already

* The existence of a minimum size for a particle has nothing to do with the impossibility, in quantum theory, of localizing a particle to within less than its Compton wavelength.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Ref. 1225 noted as 'well known' by Andrei Sakharov* in 1968; he explains that these hypothetical particles are sometimes called 'maximons'. And indeed, the known elementary particles all have masses well below the Planck mass. (In fact, the question why their masses are so very much smaller than the Planck mass is one of the most important questions of high-energy physics. We will come back to it.)

There are many other ways to arrive at the mass limit for particles. For example, in order to measure mass by scattering – and that is the only way for very small objects – the Compton wavelength of the scatterer must be larger than the Schwarzschild radius; otherwise the probe will be swallowed. Inserting the definitions of the two quantities and neglecting the factor 2, we again get the limit $m < m_{\mathrm{Pl}}$. (In fact it is a general property of descriptions of nature that a minimum space-time interval leads to an upper limit for
Ref. 1226 masses of elementary particles.) The importance of the Planck mass will become even clearer shortly.

Another property connected with the size of a particle is its electric dipole moment. This describes the deviation of its charge distribution from spherical. Some predictions from the standard model of elementary particles give as an *upper* limit for the electron
Ref. 1227 dipole moment d_e a value of

$$\frac{|d_e|}{e} < 10^{-39}\,\mathrm{m}\,, \tag{825}$$

where e is the charge of the electron. This value is ten thousand times smaller than the Planck length l_{Pl}. Since the Planck length is the smallest possible length, we seem to
Ref. 1228 have a contradiction here. However, a more careful, recent prediction from the standard model only states

$$\frac{|d_e|}{e} < 3 \cdot 10^{-21}\,\mathrm{m}\,, \tag{826}$$

which is not in contradiction with our minimal length. The issue is still not settled. We will see below that these predictions are expected to be experimentally testable in the foreseeable future.

Planck scales have other strange consequences. In quantum field theory, the difference between a virtual particle and a real particle is that a real particle is 'on shell', obeying $E^2 = m^2c^4 + p^2c^2$, whereas a virtual particle is 'off shell'. Because of the fundamental limits of measurement precision, *at Planck scales we cannot determine whether a particle is real or virtual.*

That is not all. Antimatter can be described as matter moving backwards in time. Since the difference between backwards and forwards cannot be determined at Planck scales, *matter and antimatter cannot be distinguished at Planck scales.*

Particles are also characterized by their spin. Spin describes two properties of a particle: its behaviour under rotations (and if the particle is charged, its behaviour in magnetic fields) and its behaviour under particle exchange. The wave function of a particle with

* Andrei Dmitrievich Sakharov, Soviet nuclear physicist (1921–1989). One of the keenest thinkers in physics, Sakharov, among others, invented the Tokamak, directed the construction of nuclear bombs, and explained the matter–antimatter asymmetry of nature. Like many others, he later campaigned against nuclear weapons, a cause for which he was put into jail and exile, together with his wife, Yelena Bonner. He received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1975.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

spin 1 remains invariant under a rotation of 2π, whereas that of a particle with spin 1/2 changes sign. Similarly, the combined wave function of two particles with spin 1 does not change sign under exchange of particles, whereas for two particles with spin 1/2 it does.

We see directly that both transformations are impossible to study at Planck scales. Given the limit on position measurements, the position of a rotation axis cannot be well defined, and rotations become impossible to distinguish from translations. Similarly, positional imprecision makes it impossible to determine of precise separate positions for exchange experiments. In short, *at Planck scales, spin cannot be defined, and fermions cannot be distinguished from bosons*, or, phrased differently, *matter cannot be distinguished from radiation*. We can thus easily see that supersymmetry, a unifying symmetry between bosons and fermions, somehow becomes natural at Planck scales.

But let us now move on to the main property of elementary particles.

Farewell to mass

The Planck mass divided by the Planck volume, i.e., the Planck density, is given by

$$\rho_{\text{Pl}} = \frac{c^5}{G^2\hbar} = 5.2 \cdot 10^{96}\,\text{kg/m}^3 \tag{827}$$

and is a useful concept in the following. One way to measure the (gravitational) mass M enclosed in a sphere of size R, and thus (roughly) of volume R^3, is to put a test particle in orbit around it at that same distance R. Universal gravitation then gives for the mass M the expression $M = Rv^2/G$, where v is the speed of the orbiting test particle. From $v < c$, we deduce that $M < c^2R/G$; since the minimum value for R is the Planck distance, we get (again neglecting factors of order unity) a limit for the mass density ρ, namely

Challenge 1627 e

$$\rho < \rho_{\text{Pl}} \,. \tag{828}$$

In other words, *the Planck density is the maximum possible value for mass density*.

Interesting things happen when we try to determine the error ΔM of a mass measurement in a Planck volume. Let us return to the mass measurement by an orbiting probe. From the relation $GM = rv^2$ we deduce by differentiation that $G\Delta M = v^2\Delta r + 2vr\Delta v > 2vr\Delta v = 2GM\Delta v/v$. For the error Δv in the velocity measurement we have the indeterminacy relation $\Delta v \geqslant \hbar/m\Delta r + \hbar/MR \geqslant \hbar/MR$. Inserting this in the previous inequality, and again forgetting the factor of 2, we find that the mass measurement error ΔM of a mass M enclosed in a volume of size R is subject to the condition

$$\Delta M \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{cR} \,. \tag{829}$$

Note that for everyday situations, this error is extremely small, and other errors, such as the technical limits of the balance, are much larger.

To check this result, we can explore another situation. We even use relativistic expressions, in order to show that the result does not depend on the details of the situation or the approximations. Imagine having a mass M in a box of size R, and weighing the box

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 600 A *Gedanken experiment* showing that at Planck scales, matter and vacuum cannot be distinguished

with a scale. (It is assumed that either the box is massless or that its mass is subtracted by the scale.) The mass error is given by $\Delta M = \Delta E/c^2$, where ΔE is due to the indeterminacy in the kinetic energy of the mass inside the box. Using the expression $E^2 = m^2c^4 + p^2c^2$, we get that $\Delta M \geqslant \Delta p/c$, which again reduces to equation (829). Now that we are sure of the result, let us continue.

From equation (829) we deduce that for a box of Planck dimensions, the mass measurement *error* is given by the Planck mass. But from above we also know that the mass that can be put inside such a box must not be larger than the Planck mass. Therefore, for a box of Planck dimensions, the mass measurement *error* is larger than (or at best equal to) the mass contained in it: $\Delta M \geqslant M_{\text{Pl}}$. In other words, if we build a balance with two boxes of Planck size, one empty and the other full, as shown in Figure 600, nature cannot decide which way the balance should hang! Note that even a repeated or a continuous measurement will not resolve the situation: the balance will change inclination at random, staying horizontal on average.

The argument can be rephrased as follows. The largest mass that we can put in a box of size R is a black hole with a Schwarzschild radius of the same value; the smallest mass present in such a box – corresponding to what we call a vacuum – is due to the indeterminacy relation and is given by the mass with a Compton wavelength that matches the size of the box. In other words, inside any box of size R we have a mass m, the limits of which are given by:

$$\text{(full box)}\ \frac{c^2R}{G} > m > \frac{\hbar}{cR}\ \text{(empty box)}\ . \tag{830}$$

We see directly that for sizes R of the order of the Planck scale, the two limits coincide; in other words, we cannot distinguish a full box from an empty box in that case.

To be sure of this strange result, we check whether it also occurs if, instead of measuring the gravitational mass, as we have just done, we measure the inertial mass. The inertial mass for a small object is determined by touching it: physically speaking, by performing a scattering experiment. To determine the inertial mass inside a region of size R, a probe must have a wavelength smaller than R, and a correspondingly high energy. A high energy means that the probe also attracts the particle through gravity. (We thus

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

find the intermediate result that *at Planck scales, inertial and gravitational mass cannot be distinguished.* Even the balance experiment shown in Figure 600 illustrates this: at Planck scales, the two types of mass are always inextricably linked.) Now, in any scattering experiment, for example in a Compton-type experiment, the mass measurement is performed by measuring the wavelength change $\delta\lambda$ of the probe before and after the scattering. The mass indeterminacy is given by

$$\frac{\Delta M}{M} = \frac{\Delta\delta\lambda}{\delta\lambda} \,. \tag{831}$$

In order to determine the mass in a Planck volume, the probe has to have a wavelength of the Planck length. But we know from above that there is always a minimum wavelength indeterminacy, given by the Planck length l_{Pl}. In other words, for a Planck volume the mass error is always as large as the Planck mass itself: $\Delta M \geqslant M_{\mathrm{Pl}}$. Again, this limit is a direct consequence of the limit on length and space measurements.

This result has an astonishing consequence. In these examples, the measurement error is independent of the mass of the scatterer: it is the same whether or not we start with a situation in which there is a particle in the original volume. We thus find that in a volume of Planck size, it is impossible to say whether or not there is something there when we probe it with a beam!

In short, all arguments lead to the same conclusion: *vacuum, i.e., empty space-time, cannot be distinguished from matter at Planck scales.* Another common way to express this state of affairs is to say that when a particle of Planck energy travels through space it will be scattered by the fluctuations of space-time itself, as well as by matter, and the two cases are indistinguishable. These surprising results rely on a simple fact: whatever definition of mass we use, it is always measured via combined length and time measurements. (This is even the case for normal weighing scales: mass is measured by the displacement of some part of the machine.) The error in these measurements makes it *impossible to distinguish vacuum from matter.*

We can put this result in another way. On the one hand, if we measure the mass of a piece of vacuum of size R, the result is always at least $\hbar/cR$: there is no possible way to find a perfect vacuum in an experiment. On the other hand, if we measure the mass of a particle, we find that the result is size-dependent: at Planck scales it approaches the Planck mass for every type of particle, be it matter or radiation.

To use another image, when two particles approach each other to a separation of the order of the Planck length, the indeterminacy in the length measurements makes it impossible to say whether there is something or nothing between the two objects. In short, *matter and vacuum are interchangeable at Planck scales*. This is an important result: since mass and empty space-time cannot be differentiated, we have confirmed that they are made of the same 'fabric'. This idea, already suggested above, is now common to all attempts to find a unified description of nature.

This approach is corroborated by attempts to apply quantum mechanics in highly curved space-time, where a clear distinction between vacuum and particles is impossible, as shown by Fulling–Davies–Unruh radiation. Any accelerated observer, and any observer in a gravitational field, detects particles hitting him, even if he is in a vacuum. The effect shows that for curved space-time the idea of vacuum as particle-free space does not work. Since at Planck scales it is impossible to say whether or not space is flat,

Ref. 1229
Page 1192

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

it is impossible to say whether it contains particles or not.

Curiosities and fun challenges on Planck scales

Observers are made of matter. They are thus biased, because they take a specific standpoint. But at Planck scale, vacuum, radiation and matter cannot be distinguished. Two results follow: first, only at those scales would a description be free of any bias in favour of matter; but secondly, observers do not exist at all at Planck energy.

* *

By the standards of particle physics, the Planck energy is rather large. Suppose we wanted to impart this amount of energy to protons using a particle accelerator. How large would that accelerator have to be? But by the standards of everyday life, the Planck energy is rather small. Measured in litres of gasoline, how much fuel does it correspond to?

Challenge 1628 s
Challenge 1629 s

* *

The usual concepts of matter and of radiation are not applicable at Planck scales. Usually, it is assumed that matter and radiation are made up of interacting elementary particles. The concept of an elementary particle implies an entity that is discrete, point-like, real and not virtual, has a definite mass and a definite spin, is distinct from its antiparticle, and, most of all, is distinct from vacuum, which is assumed to have zero mass. All these properties are lost at Planck scales. *At Planck scales, the concepts of 'mass', 'vacuum', 'elementary particle', 'radiation' and 'matter' do not make sense.*

* *

Do the large errors in mass measurements imply that mass can be negative at Planck energy?

Challenge 1630 s

* *

We now have a new answer to the old question: why is there something rather than nothing? At Planck scales, there is *no difference* between something and nothing. We can now honestly say about ourselves that we are made of nothing.

* *

If vacuum cannot be distinguished from matter or radiation, then it is incorrect to claim that the universe appeared from nothing. Thus, the naive idea of creation is a logical impossibility, resulting from a lack of imagination.

* *

Special relativity implies that no length or energy can be invariant. Since we have come to the conclusion that the Planck energy and the Planck length are invariant, there must be deviations from Lorentz invariance at high energy. Can you imagine what the effects would be? What kind of experiment could measure them? If you find an answer, publish it! Numerous attempts are being explored. We will return to the issue later on, with some interesting insights.

Challenge 1631 r
Ref. 1230

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

Quantum mechanics alone gives, via the Heisenberg indeterminacy relation, a lower limit to the *spread* of measurements, but, strangely enough, not on their *precision*, i.e., not on the number of significant digits. Jauch gives an example: atomic lattice constants are known to a much higher precision than the positional indeterminacy of single atoms inside the crystal.

Ref. 1231

Ref. 1211

It is sometimes claimed that measurement indeterminacies smaller than the Planck values are possible for large enough numbers of particles. Can you show why this is incorrect, at least for space and time?

Challenge 1632 ny

* *

Of course, the idea that vacuum is not empty is not new. More than two thousand years ago, Aristotle argued for a filled vacuum, although his arguments were incorrect as seen from today's perspective. In the fourteenth century there was much discussion on whether empty space was composed of indivisible entities, but the debate died down again later.

* *

A Planck-energy particle falling in a gravitational field would gain energy. But the Planck energy is the highest energy in nature. What does this apparent contradiction imply?

Challenge 1633 s

* *

One way to generalize the results presented here is to assume that, at Planck energy, nature is *event-symmetric*, i.e., symmetric under exchange of any two events. This idea, developed by Phil Gibbs, provides an additional formulation of the strange behaviour of nature at extreme scales.

Ref. 1200

* *

Because there is a minimum length in nature, so-called naked singularities do not exist. The issue, hotly debated for decades in the twentieth century, thus becomes uninteresting.

Page 617

* *

Since mass density, and thus energy density, are limited, any object of finite volume has only a finite number of degrees of freedom. Calculation of the entropy of black holes has already shown us that entropy values are always finite. This implies that perfect baths do not exist. Baths play an important role in thermodynamics (which must therefore be viewed as only an approximation), and also in recording and measuring devices: when a device measures, it switches from a neutral state to a state in which it shows the result of the measurement. In order not to return to the neutral state, the device must be coupled to a bath. Without a bath, a reliable measuring device cannot exist. In short, perfect clocks and length-measuring devices do not exist, because nature puts a limit on their storage ability.

Page 1206

Ref. 1232

* *

If vacuum and matter cannot be distinguished, we cannot distinguish between objects

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Page 32 and their environment. However, this was one the starting points of our journey. Some interesting adventures still await us!

* *

We have seen earlier that characterizing nature as made up of particles and vacuum creates problems when interactions are included, since on the one hand interactions are the difference between the parts and the whole, while on the other hand, according to quan-
Page 855 tum theory, interactions are exchanges of particles. This apparent contradiction can be used to show either that vacuum and particles are not the only components of nature, or that something is counted twice. However, since matter and space-time are both made of the same 'stuff,' the contradiction is resolved.

* *

Challenge 1634 d Is there a smallest possible momentum? And a smallest momentum error?

* *

There is a maximum acceleration in nature. Can you deduce the value of this so-called
Challenge 1635 s Planck acceleration? Does it require quantum theory?

* *

Given that time becomes an approximation at Planck scales, can we still ask whether nature is deterministic?

Let us go back to the beginning. We can define time, because in nature change is not random, but gradual. What is the situation now that we know that time is only approximate? Is non-gradual change possible? Is energy conserved? In other words, are surprises possible?

It is correct to say that time is not defined at Planck scales, and that therefore that determinism is an undefinable concept, but it is not a satisfying answer. What happens at 'everyday' scales? One answer is that at our everyday scales, the probability of surprises is so small that the world indeed is effectively deterministic. Another answer is that nature is not deterministic, but that the departure from determinism is not measurable, since every measurement and observation, by definition, *implies* a deterministic world. The lack of surprises would be due to the limitations of our human nature – more precisely, of our senses and brain. A third answer is that the lack of surprises is only apparent, and that we have just not experienced them yet.

Challenge 1636 s Can you imagine any other possibility? In truth, it is not possible to give an answer at this point. But we need to keep the alternatives in mind. We have to continue searching, considering carefully every step we take.

* *

If matter and vacuum cannot be distinguished, then each has the properties of the other. For example, since space-time is an extended entity, matter and radiation are also extended entities. Furthermore, as space-time is an entity that reaches the borders of the system under scrutiny, particles must also do so. This is our first hint at the *extension of matter*; we will examine this argument in more detail later.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

Vacuum has zero mass density at large scales, but Planck mass density at Planck scales. Cosmological measurements show that the universe is flat or almost flat at large scales: in other words, its energy density is low. In contrast, quantum field theory maintains that vacuum has a high energy density (or mass density) at small scales. Since mass is scale-dependent, both viewpoints are right. This hints at a solution to what is usually called the cosmological constant problem. The contradiction is only apparent. We will have more to say about this issue later on.

Ref. 1233

* *

Challenge 1637 s When *can* matter and vacuum be distinguished? At what energy?

* *

If matter and vacuum cannot be distinguished, there is a lack of information, which implies an intrinsic basic entropy associated with any part of the universe. We will come back to this topic shortly, when we discuss the entropy of black holes.

* *

Can we distinguish between a liquid and a gas by looking at a single atom? No, only by looking at many. Similarly, we cannot distinguish between matter and vacuum by looking at one point, but only by looking at many. We must always *average*. However, even averaging is not completely successful. Distinguishing matter from vacuum is like distinguishing clouds from the clear sky: like clouds, matter has no precise boundary.

* *

We have found that space and time are neither continuous nor made up of points. Indeed, the combination of relativity and quantum theory makes this impossible. In order to proceed in our ascent of Motion Mountain, we need to leave behind the usual concept of space-time. *At Planck scales, the concepts of 'space-time point' and 'mass point' are not applicable.*

Farewell to the big bang

A minimum length, or equivalently,* a minimum action, both imply that there is a maximum curvature for space-time. Curvature can be measured in several ways: for example, surface curvature is an inverse area. Within a factor of order one, we find

$$K < \frac{c^3}{G\hbar} = 0.39 \cdot 10^{70}\,\mathrm{m}^{-2} \tag{832}$$

as a limit for the surface curvature K in nature. In other words, the universe has never been a point, never had zero age, never had infinite density, and never had infinite curvature. It is not difficult to get a similar limit for temperature or any other physical quantity.

Challenge 1638 s

In short, since events do not exist, the big bang cannot have been an event. There never was an initial singularity or a beginning of the universe.

* The big bang section was added in summer 2002.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The baggage left behind

In this rapid journey, we have destroyed all the experimental pillars of quantum theory: the superposition principle, space-time symmetry, gauge symmetry, renormalization symmetry and permutation symmetry. We also have destroyed the foundations of general relativity, namely the concepts of the space-time manifold, fields, particles and mass. We have even seen that matter and space-time cannot be distinguished. All these conclusions can be drawn in a simpler manner, by using the minimum action of quantum theory and the maximum force of general relativity.

Page 1458

It seems that we have lost every concept used for the description of motion, and thus made its description impossible. We naturally ask whether we can save the situation.

First of all, since matter and radiation are not distinguishable from vacuum, the quest for unification in the description of elementary particles is correct and necessary.

Moreover, since the concepts of 'mass', 'time' and 'space' cannot be distinguished from each other, a new, *single* entity is necessary to define both particles and space-time. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, three approaches are being pursued to find out more about this new entity. The first, quantum gravity – especially the use of the loop representation and Ashtekar's new variables – starts by generalizing *space-time symmetry*. The second, string theory, starts by generalizing *gauge symmetries* and interactions. The third, using algebraic quantum groups, looks for generalized *permutation symmetries*. We will describe these approaches in more detail later on.

Ref. 1185 Ref. 1186 Ref. 1187

Before we go on, however, we should check what we have deduced so far against experiment.

SOME EXPERIMENTAL PREDICTIONS

At present, there is a race going on both in experimental and in theoretical physics, to devise an experiment to detect quantum gravity effects, i.e., effects sensitive to the Planck energy. (If you can find one, publish it!)

One might think that the fluctuations of space and time could make images from faraway galaxies blurred, or destroy the phase relation between the photons. However, this effect has been shown to be unmeasurable in all possible cases.

Ref. 1234

A better idea is to measure the speed of light at different frequencies in faraway light flashes. There are natural flashes, called gamma ray bursts, which have an extremely broad spectrum, from 100 GeV down to visible light at about 1 eV. These flashes often originate at cosmological distances d. From the difference in arrival time Δt between two frequencies, we can define a characteristic energy by setting

$$E_{\text{char}} = \frac{\hbar(\omega_1 - \omega_2)d}{c\Delta t} \,. \tag{833}$$

This energy value is $8 \cdot 10^{16}$ GeV for the best measurement to date. This is not far from the Planck energy; in fact, it is even closer when the missing factors of order unity are included. It is expected that the Planck scale will be reached in a few years, so that it will become possible to test whether the quantum nature of space-time influences the

Ref. 1235

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Ref. 1236, Ref. 1237 dispersion of light signals. Planck-scale effects should produce a dispersion. Detecting it would confirm that Lorentz symmetry breaks down at Planck scales.

Another candidate experiment is the direct detection of distance fluctuations between Ref. 1238, Ref. 1237 bodies. Gravitational wave detectors are sensitive to extremely small noise signals in length measurements. There should be a noise signal due to the distance fluctuations induced near Planck energies. The indeterminacy in measurement of a length l is pre- Ref. 1239 dicted to be

$$\frac{\delta l}{l} \geqslant \left(\frac{l_{\mathrm{Pl}}}{l}\right)^{2/3} . \tag{834}$$

This expression is deduced simply by combining the measurement limit of a ruler, from quantum theory, with the requirement that the ruler not be a black hole. We will discuss Page 1429 this result in more detail in the next section. The sensitivity of the detectors to noise might reach the required level in the early twenty-first century. The noise induced by Ref. 1240 quantum gravity effects is also predicted to lead to detectable quantum decoherence and vacuum fluctuations.

A third candidate experiment for measuring quantum gravity is the detection of the loss of CPT symmetry at high energies. Especially in the case of the decay of certain ele- Ref. 1237 mentary particles, such as neutral kaons, the precision of experimental measurement is approaching the detection of Planck-scale effects.

A fourth possibility is that quantum gravity effects may change the threshold energy Ref. 1241 at which certain particle reactions become possible. It may be that extremely high-energy photons or cosmic rays will make it possible to prove that Lorentz invariance is indeed broken near the Planck scale.

A fifth possibility is that the phase of light that travels over long distances might get washed out. However, the first tests seem to show that this is not the case: light from extremely distant galaxies still interferes. The precise prediction of the phase washing Ref. 1242 effect is still being worked out; most probably, the effect is too small to be measured.

In the domain of atomic physics, it has also been predicted that quantum gravity effects will induce a gravitational Stark effect and a gravitational Lamb shift in atomic Ref. 1240 transitions. Either of these effects could be measurable.

Additional predictions

A few candidates for quantum gravity effects have also been predicted by the author. Let us summarize and clarify the results found so far.* Special relativity starts with the discovery that observable speeds are limited by the speed of light c. Quantum theory starts with the result that observable actions are limited by $\hbar/2$. The theory of gravitation shows that for every system with length L and mass M, the observable ratio L/M is limited by the constant $4G/c^2$. Combining these results, we deduce that all physical observables are *bound*, by what are usually called the Planck values – modified by one or several factors of $\sqrt{2}$. We need to replace $\hbar$ by $\hbar/2$ and G by $4G$ in all the defining expressions for Planck quantities, in order to find the corresponding measurement limits. In particular, the limit for lengths and times is $\sqrt{2}$ times the Planck value, and the limit for energy is the Planck

* This subsection, in contrast to the ones so far, is speculative; it was added in February 2001.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

value divided by $\sqrt{8}$.* Interestingly, the existence of bounds on all observables makes it possible to make several testable predictions for the unification of quantum theory and general relativity. These predictions do not depend on the details of the final theory.

However, first we need to refine the argument that we have just presented. The (corrected) Planck values do not seem to be the actual limits to measurements. The actual measurement limits are stricter.

First of all, for any measurement, we need certain fundamental conditions to be realized. Take the length measurement of an object. We need to be able to distinguish between matter and radiation, since the object to be measured is made up of matter, and since radiation is the measurement tool that is used to read distances from the ruler. For a measurement process, we need an interaction, which implies the use of radiation. Note that this is so even with the use of particle scattering to determine lengths.

In addition, for the measurement of wavelengths we need to distinguish between matter and radiation, because matter is necessary if we wish to compare two wavelengths.
Page 1490 In fact, all length measurements require the distinction between matter and radiation.** However, this distinction is impossible at the energy of grand unification, where the electroweak and the strong nuclear interactions are unified. At and above this energy, particles of matter and particles of radiation transform into each other; in practice they cannot be distinguished.

If all matter and radiation particles were the same, or mixtures of each other, mass could not be defined. Nor could spin, charge or any other quantum numbers. To sum up, no measurement can be performed at energies above the GUT unification energy.

In other words, it is not at the Planck scale that the particle concept (and thus the matter concept) first runs into trouble: it has already done so at the unification scale. It is only below the unification scale that our standard particle and space-time concepts apply, and particles and vacuum can be effectively distinguished.

As a result, the smallest measurable length in nature is $\sqrt{2}$ times the Planck length reduced by the ratio between the maximal energy $E_{\text{Pl}}/\sqrt{8}$ and the unification energy E_{GUT}.
Ref. 1243 Present estimates give $E_{\text{GUT}} \approx 10^{16}$ GeV, implying that the smallest accessible length is at least

$$L_{\text{min}} = \sqrt{2}\, l_{\text{Pl}} \frac{E_{\text{Pl}}}{\sqrt{8}\, E_{\text{GUT}}} \approx 10^{-32}\,\text{m} \approx 800\, l_{\text{Pl}} \,. \tag{835}$$

It is unlikely that measurements at these scales will ever be possible.

So the smallest *measurable* length is significantly larger than the Planck length. The Planck length is that at which particles and vacuum cannot be distinguished, whereas the minimal measurable length is that at which particles of matter and particles of radiation cannot be distinguished. The latter happens at lower energy than the former.

The experimentally determined factor of about 800 is one of the great riddles of physics. It is the high-energy equivalent of the quest to understand why the electromagnetic coupling constant is about 1/137, or more simply, why things have the colours they have. Only the final theory of motion will provide the answer.

* The entropy of a black hole is thus given by the ratio between its horizon and *half* the minimum area. Of course, a detailed investigation also shows that the Planck mass (divided by $\sqrt{8}$) is the limit for elementary particles from *below* and for black holes from *above*. For everyday systems, there is no limit.

** In the modern language of high-energy physics: all measurements require broken supersymmetry.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

In particular, the minimum length puts a bound on the electric dipole moment d of elementary particles, i.e., particles without constituents. We get the limit

$$d > d_{\text{min}} = e\, L_{\text{min}} = e\, 10^{-32}\,\text{m} = 1.5 \cdot 10^{-51}\,\text{Cm}\ . \tag{836}$$

Page 1412 This result is in contradiction with one of the predictions of the standard model, but Ref. 1244 not with others. More interestingly, it is within the reach of future experiments. This improved limit may be the simplest possible measurement of yet-unpredicted quantum gravity effects. Measuring the dipole moment could thus be a way to determine the unification energy (the factor 800) independently of high-energy physics experiments, and possibly to a higher precision.

Interestingly, the bound on the measurability of observables also puts a bound on the measurement *precision* for each observable. This bound is of no importance in everyday life, but it is important at high energy. What is the precision with which a coupling constant can be measured? Let us take the electromagnetic coupling constant as an example. This constant α, also called the fine structure constant, is related to the charge q by

$$q = \sqrt{4\pi\varepsilon_0 \hbar c \alpha}\ . \tag{837}$$

Now, any electrical charge is defined and measured by comparing, in an electrical field, the acceleration to which the charged object is subjected with the acceleration of some unit charge q_{unit}. In other words, we have

$$\frac{q}{q_{\text{unit}}} = \frac{ma}{m_{\text{unit}} a_{\text{unit}}}\ . \tag{838}$$

Therefore any error in mass and acceleration measurements implies errors in measurements of charge and the coupling constant.

Page 1194 We found in the part on quantum theory that the electromagnetic, weak and strong interactions are characterized by coupling constants, the inverses of which depend linearly on the logarithm of the energy. It is usually assumed that these three lines meet at Ref. 1243 the unification energy. Measurements put the unification coupling value at about 1/26.

We know from the above discussions that the minimum error for any energy measurement at high energies is given by the ratio between the energy to be measured and the limit energy. If we plot a graph of the coupling constants against energy, we get the result shown in Figure 601. The search for consequences of this *fan-out effect* is delightful. One way to express the result is to say that coupling constants are by definition subject to an error. However, all measurement devices, be they clocks, metre rules, scales or any other devices, use electromagnetic effects at energies of around 1 eV plus the electron rest energy. This is about 10^{-16} times the GUT energy. As a consequence, the measurement precision of any observable should be limited to about 19 digits. The maximum precision currently achieved is 15 digits, and, for the electromagnetic coupling constant, about 9 digits. It will thus be quite some time before this prediction can be tested.

The challenge is to find a system in which the spreading coupling constant value appears more clearly in the measurements. For example, it may be that high-precision mea-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 601 Coupling constants and their predicted spread as a function of energy

surements of the g-factor of elementary particles or of high-energy cosmic ray reactions will show some effects of the fan-out. The lifetimes of elementary particles could also be affected. Can you find another effect? Challenge 1639 s

In summary, the experimental detection of quantum gravity effects should be possible, despite their weakness, at some time during the twenty-first century. The successful detection of such an effect would be one of the highlights of physics, as it would challenge the usual description of space and time even more than general relativity did.

We now know that the fundamental entity describing space-time and matter that we are looking for is not point-like. What does it look like? To get to the top of Motion Mountain as rapidly as possible, we will make use of some explosive to blast away a few obstacles.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 53

NATURE AT LARGE SCALES – IS THE UNIVERSE SOMETHING OR NOTHING?

> Die Grenze ist der eigentlich fruchtbare Ort der Erkenntnis.*
>
> Paul Tillich, *Auf der Grenze*.

This strange question is the topic of the current leg of our mountain ascent. In the last section we explored nature in the vicinity of Planck scales; but the other limit, namely the description of motion at large, cosmological scales, is equally fascinating. As we proceed, many incredible results will appear, and at the end we will discover a surprising answer to the question in the title.

This section is not standard textbook material; a large part of it is original** and thus speculative and open to question. It aims to explain in simple terms the ongoing research in the domains of quantum gravity and superstring theory. But be warned: with almost every sentence you could find at least one physicist who disagrees.

We have discussed the universe as a whole several times already. In relation to classical physics we enquired about the initial conditions of the universe and whether it is isolated. Page 860 In an earlier chapter we asked whether the universe is a set or a concept, and indeed, whether it exists at all. In relation to general relativity, we gave the classical definition of the term 'universe', as the sum of all matter and space-time; we studied the expansion of the universe and we asked about its size and topology. In the context of quantum theory, we asked whether the universe has a wave function, whether it is born from a quantum fluctuation, and whether the number of particles in it can be defined.

Here we will settle all these issues by combining general relativity and quantum theory at cosmological scales. This will lead us to some of the strangest results we will encounter in our journey.

Cosmological scales

> Hic sunt leones.***
>
> Antiquity

* 'The frontier is the really productive place of understanding'. Paul Tillich (1886–1965), German theologian, socialist and philosopher.

** Written between June and December 2000.

*** 'Here are lions.' Written across unknown and dangerous regions on ancient maps.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The description of motion requires the application of general relativity whenever the scale d of the situation is of the order of the Schwarzschild radius, i.e., whenever

$$d \approx r_S = 2Gm/c^2 \,. \tag{839}$$

Challenge 1640 s

It is straightforward to confirm that, with the usually quoted mass m and size d of everything visible in the universe, this condition is indeed fulfilled. We do need general relativity, and thus curved space-time, when talking about the whole of nature.

Similarly, quantum theory is required for the description of the motion of an object whenever we approach it within a distance d of the order of the Compton wavelength λ_C, i.e., whenever

$$d \approx \lambda_C = \frac{h}{mc} \,. \tag{840}$$

Obviously, for the total mass of the universe this condition is not fulfilled. However, we are not interested in the motion of the universe itself; we are interested in the motion of its components. In the description of these components, quantum theory is required whenever pair production and annihilation play a role. This is especially the case in the early history of the universe and near the horizon, i.e., for the most distant events that we can observe in space and time. We are thus obliged to include quantum theory in any precise description of the universe.

Since at cosmological scales we need both quantum theory and general relativity, we start our investigation with the study of time, space and mass, by asking at large scales the same questions that we asked before at Planck scales.

Maximum time

Is it possible to measure time intervals of any imaginable size? General relativity shows that in nature there is a maximum time interval, with a value of about fourteen thousand million years, or 430 Ps, providing an upper limit to the measurement of time. It is called the 'age' of the universe, and has been deduced from two sets of measurements: the expansion of space-time and the age of matter.

We are all familiar with clocks that have been ticking for a long time: the hydrogen atoms in our body. All hydrogen atoms were formed just after the big bang. We can almost say that the electrons in these atoms have been orbiting their nuclei since the dawn of time. In fact, the quarks inside the protons in these atoms have been moving a few hundred thousand years longer than the electrons.

Challenge 1641 s

We thus have an upper time limit for any clock made of atoms. Even 'clocks' made of radiation (can you describe one?) yield a similar maximum time. The study of the spatial expansion of the universe leads to the same maximum. No clock or measurement device was ticking *longer ago* than this maximum time, and no clock could provide a record of having done so.

In summary, it is not possible to measure time intervals greater than the maximum one, either by using the history of space-time or by using the history of matter or radiation.* The maximum time is thus rightly called the 'age' of the universe. Of course, this is

* This implies that so-called 'oscillating universe' models, in which it is claimed that 'before' the big bang

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

not a new idea, although looking at the issue in more detail does reveal some surprises.

Does the universe have a definite age?

> One should never trust a woman who tells one her real age. A woman who would tell one that, would tell one anything.
>
> Oscar Wilde

In light of the above discussion, it may seem silly to talk about the age of the universe. The value is found in many books and tables, including that of Appendix C, and its precise determination is one of the most important quests in modern astrophysics. But is this quest reasonable?

Page 923

In order to measure the duration of a movement or the age of a system, we need a clock that is *independent* of that movement or system, and thus *outside* the system. However, there are no clocks outside the universe, and no clock inside it can be independent. In fact we have just seen that no clock inside the universe can run throughout its history.

Time can be defined only if it is possible to distinguish between matter and space-time. Given this distinction, we can talk either about the age of *space-time*, by assuming that matter provides suitable and independent clocks – as is done in general relativity – or about the age of *matter*, such as stars or galaxies, by assuming that the extension of space-time, or some other matter, provides a good clock. Both possibilities are being explored experimentally in modern astrophysics – and both give the same result, of about fourteen thousand million years, which was mentioned above. However, for the universe as a *whole*, an age cannot be defined.

The issue of the starting point of time makes this difficulty even more apparent. We may imagine that going back in time leads to only two possibilities: either the starting instant $t = 0$ is part of time or it is not. (Mathematically, this means that the segment representing time is either closed or open.) Both these possibilities imply that it is possible to measure arbitrarily small times; but we know from the combination of general relativity and quantum theory that this is *not* the case. In other words, neither possibility is correct: the beginning cannot *be* part of time, nor can it *not be* part of it. There is only one solution to this paradox: there was no beginning at all.

So the situation is consistently muddled. Neither the age of the universe nor its origin makes sense. What is going wrong? Or rather, *how* are things going wrong? What happens if instead of jumping directly to the big bang, we *approach* it as closely as possible? The best way to clarify the issue is to ask about the measurement *error* in our statement that the universe is fourteen thousand million years old. This turns out to be a fascinating topic.

How precise can age measurements be?

> No woman should ever be quite accurate about her age. It looks so calculating.
>
> Oscar Wilde

there were other phenomena, cannot be justified on the basis of nature or observations. They are based on beliefs.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The first way to measure the age of the universe* is to look at clocks in the usual sense of the word, namely at clocks made of *matter*. As explained in the part on quantum theory, Ref. 1197, Ref. 1198 Salecker and Wigner showed that a clock built to measure a total time T with a precision Δt has a minimum mass m given by

$$m > \frac{\hbar}{c^2}\frac{T}{(\Delta t)^2} \,. \tag{841}$$

A simple way to incorporate general relativity into this result was suggested by Ng and Ref. 1246 van Dam. Any clock of mass m has a minimum resolution Δt due to the curvature of space that it introduces, given by

$$\Delta t > \frac{Gm}{c^3} \,. \tag{842}$$

If m is eliminated, these two results imply that a clock with a precision Δt can only measure times T up to a certain maximum value, namely

$$T < \frac{(\Delta t)^3}{t_{\mathrm{Pl}}^2} \quad , \tag{843}$$

where $t_{\mathrm{Pl}} = \sqrt{\hbar G/c^5} = 5.4 \cdot 10^{-44}$ s is the Planck time. (As usual, we have omitted factors of order one in this and in all the following results of this section.) In other words, the higher the accuracy of a clock, the shorter the time during which it works dependably. The precision of a clock is limited not only by the expense of building it, but also by nature itself. Nevertheless, it is easy to check that for clocks used in daily life, this limit Challenge 1642 e is not even remotely approached. For example, you may wish to calculate how precisely your own age can be specified.

As a consequence of the inequality (843), a clock trying to achieve an accuracy of one Planck time can do so for at most one Planck time! *A real clock cannot achieve Planck-time accuracy.* If we try to go beyond the limit (843), fluctuations of space-time hinder the working of the clock and prevent higher precision. With every Planck time that passes, the clock accumulates a measurement error of at least one Planck time. Thus, the total measurement error is at least as large as the measurement itself. This conclusion is also Challenge 1643 ny valid for clocks based on radiation: for example on the background radiation.

In short, measuring age with a clock always involves some errors. Whenever we try to reduce these errors to Planck level, the clock becomes so imprecise over large times that age measurements become impossible.

* Note that the age t_0 is not the same as the Hubble time $T = 1/H_0$. The Hubble time is only a computed quantity and (almost) always larger than the age; the relation between the two depends on the values of the cosmological constant, the density and other parameters of the universe. For example, for the standard 'hot big bang' scenario, i.e., for the matter-dominated Einstein–de Sitter model, we have the simple relation Ref. 1245 $T = (3/2)\, t_0$.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Does time exist?

> Time is waste of money.
>
> Oscar Wilde

Ever since people began to study physics, the concept of 'time' has designated what is measured by a clock. But the inequality (843) implies that perfect clocks do not exist, and thus that time is only an approximate concept: perfect time does not exist. Thus there is no 'idea' of time, in the Platonic sense. In fact, all the discussion in the previous and present sections can be seen as proof that there are no perfect or 'ideal' examples of any classical or everyday concept.

Page 45

Time does not exist. Yet it is obviously a useful concept in everyday life. The key to understanding this is *energy*. Any clock – in fact, any system of nature – is characterized by a simple number, namely the highest ratio of its kinetic energy to the rest energy of its components. In daily life, this ratio is about $1\,\mathrm{eV}/10\,\mathrm{GeV} = 10^{-10}$. Such *low-energy* systems are well suited for building clocks. The more precisely the motion of the main moving part – the pointer of the clock – can be kept constant, and monitored, the higher the precision of the clock. To achieve very high precision, the pointer must have very high mass. Indeed, both the position and the speed of the pointer must be measured, and the two measurement errors are related by the quantum-mechanical indeterminacy relation $\Delta v\,\Delta x > \hbar/m$. High mass implies low intrinsic fluctuation. Furthermore, in order to screen the pointer from outside influences, even more mass is needed. This connection between mass and accuracy might explain why more accurate clocks are usually more expensive.

Challenge 1644 e

The standard indeterminacy relation quoted above is valid only at everyday energies. We cannot achieve ever higher precision simply by increasing the mass, since general relativity changes the indeterminacy relation to $\Delta v\,\Delta x > \hbar/m + G(\Delta v)^2 m/c^3$. The additional term on the right-hand side, negligible at everyday scales, is proportional to energy. Increasing it by a large amount limits the achievable precision of the clock. The smallest measurable time interval turns out to be the Planck time.

Page 1398

Page 1404

Challenge 1645 e

In summary, time exists, as a good approximation, only for *low-energy* systems. Any increase in precision beyond a certain limit requires an increase in the energy of the components; at Planck energy, this increase will prevent an increase in precision.

What is the error in the measurement of the age of the universe?

It is now straightforward to apply our discussion about the measurement of time to the age of the universe. The inequality (843) implies that the highest precision possible for a clock is about 10^{-23} s, or about the time light takes to move across a proton. The finite age of the universe also yields a maximum *relative* measurement precision. Inequality (843) can be written as

$$\frac{\Delta t}{T} > \left(\frac{t_{\mathrm{Pl}}}{T}\right)^{2/3} \tag{844}$$

Challenge 1646 e

which shows that no time interval can be measured with a precision of more than about 40 decimals.

To clarify the issue, we can calculate the error in measurement as a function of the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 602 Measurement errors as a function of measurement energy

observation energy E_{meas}, the energy of the measurement probe. There are two limit cases. For *low* energies, the error is due to quantum effects and is given by

$$\frac{\Delta t}{T} \sim \frac{1}{E_{\text{meas}}} \tag{845}$$

which decreases with increasing measurement energy. For *high* energies, however, the error is due to gravitational effects and is given by

$$\frac{\Delta t}{T} \sim \frac{E_{\text{meas}}}{E_{\text{Pl}}} \tag{846}$$

so that the total error varies as shown in Figure 602. In particular, very high energies do not reduce measurement errors: any attempt to reduce the measurement error for the age of the universe below 10^{-23} s would require energies so high that the limits of space-time would be reached, making the measurement itself impossible.

We reached this conclusion through an argument based on clocks made of particles. We will see below that trying to determine the age of the universe using space-time expansion leads to the same limit.

Imagine observing a tree which, as a result of some storm or strong wind, has fallen towards second tree, touching it at the very top, as shown in Figure 603. It is possible to determine the heights of both trees by measuring their separation and the angles at the base. The *error* in the heights will depend on the errors in measurement of the separation and angles.

Similarly, the age of the universe can be calculated from the present distance and speed of objects – such as galaxies – observed in the night sky. The distance d corresponds to separation of the trees at ground level, and the speed v to the angle between the two trees. The Hubble time T of the universe (which is usually assumed to be larger than the age of the universe) then corresponds to the height at which the two trees meet. This age – in a naive sense, the time since the galaxies 'separated' – is given, within a factor of order

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 603 Trees and galaxies

one, by

$$T = \frac{d}{v} \,. \tag{847}$$

In simple terms, this is the method used to determine the age of the universe from the expansion of space-time, for galaxies with red-shifts below unity.* The (positive) measurement error ΔT becomes

$$\frac{\Delta T}{T} = \frac{\Delta d}{d} + \frac{\Delta v}{v} \,. \tag{848}$$

It is worthwhile to explore this in more detail. For any measurement of T, we have to choose the object, i.e., a distance d, as well as an observation time Δt, or, equivalently, an observation energy $\Delta E = 2\pi\hbar/\Delta t$. We will now investigate the consequences of these choices for equation (848), always taking into account both quantum theory and general relativity.

At everyday energies, the result of the determination of the age t_0 is about $(13.7 \pm 0.2) \cdot 10^9$ Ga. This value is deduced by measuring red-shifts, i.e., velocities, and distances, using stars and galaxies in distance ranges, from some hundred thousand light years up to a red-shift of about 1. Measuring red-shifts does not produce large velocity errors. The main source of experimental error is the difficulty in determining the distances of galaxies.

What is the smallest possible error in distance? Obviously, inequality (844) implies

$$\frac{\Delta d}{T} > \frac{l_{\mathrm{Pl}}^{2/3}}{d^{2/3}} \tag{849}$$

thus giving the same indeterminacy in the age of the universe as the one we found above in the case of material clocks.

Challenge 1647 e

We can try to reduce this error in two ways: by choosing objects at either small or

* At higher red-shifts, the speed of light, as well as the details of the expansion, come into play. To continue with the analogy of the trees, we find that the trees are not straight all the way up to the top and that they grow on a slope, as suggested by Figure 604.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 604 The speed and distance of remote galaxies

large distances. Let us start with small distances. In order to get high precision at small distances, we need high observation energies. It is fairly obvious that at observation energies near the Planck value, $\Delta T/T$ approaches unity. In fact, both terms on the right-hand side of equation (848) become of order one. At these energies, Δv approaches c and the maximum value for d approaches the Planck length, for the same reason that at Planck energies the maximum measurable time is the Planck time. In short, *at Planck scales it is impossible to say whether the universe is old or young*.

Challenge 1648 e

Let us consider the other extreme, namely objects extremely far away, say with a redshift of $z \gg 1$. Relativistic cosmology requires the diagram of Figure 603 to be replaced by the more realistic diagram of Figure 604. The 'light onion' replaces the familiar light cone of special relativity: light converges near the big bang. In this case the measurement error for the age of the universe also depends on the distance and velocity errors. At the largest possible distances, the signals an object sends out must be of high energy, because the emitted wavelength must be smaller than the universe itself. Thus, inevitably, we reach Planck energies. However, we have seen that in such high-energy situations, the emitted radiation, as well as the object itself, is indistinguishable from the space-time background. In other words, the red-shifted signal we would observe today would have a wavelength as large as the size of the universe, with a correspondingly small frequency.

Ref. 1245

There is another way to describe the situation. At Planck energies or near the horizon, the original signal has an error of the same size as the signal itself. When measured at the present time, the red-shifted signal still has an error of the same size as the signal. As a result, the error in the horizon distance becomes as large as the value to be measured.

In short, even if space-time expansion and large scales are used, the instant of the so-called beginning of the universe cannot be determined with an error smaller than the age of the universe itself: a result we also found at Planck distances. If we aim for perfect precision, we just find that the universe is 13.7 ± 13.7 thousand million years old! In other words, *in both extremal situations, it is impossible to say whether the universe has a non-vanishing age*.

We have to conclude that the anthropocentric concept of 'age' does not make any sense

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

for the universe as a whole. The usual textbook value is useful only for ranges of time, space and energy in which matter and space-time are clearly distinguished, namely at everyday, human-scale energies; the value has no more general meaning.

Challenge 1649 ny You may like to examine the issue of the *fate* of the universe using the same arguments. But we will continue on the path outlined at the start of this section: the next topic is the measurement of length.

Maximum length

General relativity shows that in the standard cosmological model, for hyperbolic (open) and parabolic (marginal) evolutions of the universe, the *size* of the universe is infinite. It is only the *horizon distance*, i.e., the distance of objects with infinite red-shift, that is finite.* For elliptical evolution, the total size is finite and depends on the curvature. Page 587 However, in this case also the present measurement limit yields a minimum size for the universe many times larger than the horizon distance.

Quantum field theory, on the other hand, is based on flat and infinite space-time. Let us see what happens when the two theories are combined. What can we say about measurements of length in this case? For example, would it be possible to construct and use a metre rule to measure lengths larger than the distance to the horizon?

It is true that we would have no time to push it out that far, since in the standard Ref. 1245 Einstein–de Sitter big bang model the horizon moves away from us faster than the speed of light. (We should have started using the metre rule right at the big bang.) But just for fun, let us assume that we have actually managed to do this. How far away can we read off distances? In fact, since the universe was smaller in the past, and since every observation of the sky is an observation of the past, Figure 604 shows that the maximum Ref. 1245 *spatial distance* away from us at which an object can be seen is only $(4/9)ct_0$. Obviously, for space-time intervals, the maximum remains ct_0.

Thus, in all cases it turns out to be impossible to measure lengths larger than the horizon distance, even though general relativity predicts such distances. This result is unsurprising, and in obvious agreement with the existence of a limit for measurements of time intervals. The real surprises come next.

Is the universe really a big place?

Ref. 1247 Astronomers and Hollywood films answer this question in the affirmative. Indeed, the Page 923 distance to the horizon of the universe is often included in tables. Cosmological models specify that the scale factor R, which fixes the distance to the horizon, grows with time t; for the case of the standard mass-dominated Einstein–de Sitter model, i.e., for a vanishing cosmological constant and flat space, we have

$$R(t) = C\, t^{2/3} \,, \tag{850}$$

* In cosmology, we need to distinguish between the scale factor R, the Hubble radius $c/H = cR/\dot{R}$, the horizon distance h and the size d of the universe. The Hubble radius is a computed quantity giving the distance at which objects move away with the speed of light. It is always *smaller* than the horizon distance, at which in the standard Einstein–de Sitter model, for example, objects move away with *twice* the speed of Ref. 1245 light. However, the horizon itself moves away with *three* times the speed of light.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

where the numerical constant C relates the commonly accepted horizon distance to the commonly accepted age. Indeed, observation shows that the universe is large, and is getting larger. But let us investigate what happens if we add some quantum theory to this result from general relativity. Is it really possible to measure the distance to the horizon?

We look first at the situation at high (probe) energies. We saw above that space-time and matter are not distinguishable at Planck scales. Therefore, at Planck energies we cannot state whether or not objects are *localized*. At Planck scales, the distinction between matter and vacuum – so basic to our thinking – disappears.

Another way to say this is that we cannot claim that space-time is *extended* at Planck scales. Our concept of extension derives from the possibility of measuring distances and time intervals, and from observations such as the ability to align several objects behind one another. Such observations are not possible at Planck scales and energies, because of the inability of probes to yield useful results. In fact, all of the everyday observations from which we deduce that space is extended are impossible at Planck scales, where *the basic distinction between vacuum and matter, namely between extension and localization, disappears*. As a consequence, at Planck energies the size of the universe cannot be measured. It cannot even be called larger than a matchbox.

The problems encountered with probes of high probe energies have drastic consequences for the size measurement of the universe. All the arguments given above for the errors in measurement of the age can be repeated for the distance to the horizon. To reduce size measurement errors, a measurement probe needs to have high energy. But at high energy, measurement errors approach the value of the measurement results. At the largest distances and at Planck energies, the measurement errors are of the same magnitude as the measured values. If we try to determine the size of the universe with high precision, we get no precision at all.

Challenge 1650 ny

The inability to get precise values for the size of the universe should not come unexpected. For a reliable measurement, the standard must be different, independent, and outside the system to be measured. For the universe this is impossible.

Studying the size of the big bang also produces strange results. The universe is said to have been much smaller near the big bang because, on average, all matter is moving away from all other matter. But if we try to follow the path of matter into the past with high precision, using Planck energy probes, we get into trouble: since measurement errors are as large as measurement data, we cannot claim that the universe was smaller near the big bang than it is today: there is no way to reliably distinguish size values.

There are other confirmations too. If we had a metre rule spanning the whole universe, even beyond the horizon, with zero at the place where we live, what measurement *error* would it produce for the horizon? It does not take long to work out that the expansion of space-time, from Planck scales to the present size, implies an expansion in the error from Planck size to a length of the order of the present distance to the horizon. Again, the error is as large as the measurement result. Again, the size of the universe turns out not to be a meaningful property.

Challenge 1651 ny

Since this reasoning also applies if we try to measure the diameter of the universe instead of its radius, it is impossible to say whether the antipodes in the sky really are distant from each other!

We can summarize the situation by noting that anything said about the size of the universe is as limited as anything said about its age. *The height of the sky depends on the*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

observation energy. If we start measuring the sky at standard observation energies, and try to increase the precision of measurement of the distance to the horizon, the measurement error increases beyond all bounds. At Planck energies, the volume of the universe is indistinguishable from the Planck volume - and vice versa.

The boundary of space-time – is the sky a surface?

The horizon of the universe – essentially, the black part of the night sky – is a fascinating entity. Everybody interested in cosmology wants to know what happens there. In newspapers the horizon is sometimes called the *boundary of space-time*. Some surprising insights – which have not yet made it to the newspapers – appear when we combine general relativity and quantum mechanics.

We saw above that the errors in measuring the distance of the horizon are substantial. They imply that we cannot pretend that all points of the sky are equally far away from us. Thus we cannot say that the sky is a surface; it could be a volume. In fact, there is no way to determine the dimensionality of the horizon, or the dimensionality of space-time near the horizon.*

Thus measurements do not allow us to determine whether the boundary is a point, a surface, or a line. It may be a very complex shape, even knotted. In fact, quantum theory tells us that it must be all of these from time to time: that *the sky fluctuates in height and shape*. In short, it is impossible to determine the topology of the sky. But that is nothing new. As is well known, general relativity is unable to describe pair creation particles with spin 1/2. The reason for this is the change in space-time topology required by the process. The universe is full of such processes, implying that it is impossible to define a topology for the universe and, in particular, for the horizon. Can you find at least two other arguments to show this?

Challenge 1653 ny

Worse still, quantum theory shows that space-time is not continuous at a horizon: this can easily be deduced using the Planck-scale arguments from the previous section. Time and space are not defined there.

Page 1398

Finally, there is no way to decide whether the various boundary points are *different* from each other. The distance between two points in the night sky is undefined. Therefore it is unclear what the *diameter* of the horizon is.

In summary, the horizon has no specific distance or shape. The horizon, and thus the universe, cannot be shown to be manifolds. This leads us to the next question.

Does the universe have initial conditions?

Ref. 1248

One often reads about the quest for the initial conditions of the universe. But before joining this search, we should ask *whether* and *when* such initial conditions make any sense.

Obviously, our everyday description of motion requires knowledge of initial conditions, which describe the *state* of a system, i.e., all those aspects that differentiate it from

* The measurement errors also imply that we cannot say anything about translational symmetry at cosmological scales. Can you confirm this? In addition, at the horizon it is impossible to distinguish between spacelike and timelike distances. Even worse, concepts such as 'mass' or 'momentum' become muddled at the horizon. This means that, as at Planck energies, we are unable to distinguish between object and background, and between state and intrinsic properties. We will come back to this important point shortly.

Challenge 1652 ny

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

a system with the same intrinsic properties. Initial conditions – like the state – are attributed to a system by an *outside* observer.

Quantum theory tells us that initial conditions, or the state of a system, can only be defined by an outside observer with respect to an environment. It is already difficult to be outside the universe – but even inside the universe, a state can only be defined if matter can be distinguished from vacuum. This is impossible at Planck energies, near the big bang, or at the horizon. Thus the universe has no state. This means also that it has *no wave function*.

Page 1398 The limits imposed by the Planck values confirm this conclusion in other ways. First of all, they show that the big bang was not a singularity with infinite curvature, density or temperature, because infinitely large values do not exist in nature. Secondly, since instants of time do not exist, it is impossible to define the state of any system at a given time. Thirdly, as instants of time do not exist, neither do events, and so the big bang was not an event, and neither an initial state nor an initial wave function can be ascribed to the universe. (Note that this also means that the universe cannot have been created.)

In short, *there are no initial conditions for the universe*. Initial conditions make sense only for subsystems, and only far from Planck scales. Thus, for initial conditions to exist, the system must be far from the horizon and it must have evolved for some time 'after' the big bang. Only when these two requirements are fulfilled can objects *move* in space. Of course, this is always the case in everyday life.

At this point in our mountain ascent, where neither time nor length is clearly defined at cosmological scales, it should come as no surprise that there are similar difficulties concerning the concept of mass.

Does the universe contain particles and stars?

The total number of stars, about $10^{23\pm1}$, is included in every book on cosmology, as it is Page 923 in the table of Appendix C. A smaller number can be counted on clear nights.

We can ask the same question about particles instead of stars. The commonly quoted numbers are is $10^{81\pm1}$ baryons and $10^{90\pm1}$ photons. However, the issue is not settled. Neither quantum theory nor general relativity alone makes predictions about the number of particles, either inside or outside the horizon. What happens if we combine them?

In order to define the number of particles in a region, quantum theory first of all re- Page 1055 quires a vacuum state to be defined. The number of particles is defined by comparing the system with the vacuum. If we neglect or omit general relativity by assuming flat space-time, this procedure poses no problem. However, if we include general relativity, and thus a curved space-time, especially one with a strangely behaved horizon, the answer is simple: there is *no* vacuum state with which we can compare the universe, for two reasons. First, nobody can explain what an empty universe would look like. Secondly, and more importantly, there is no way to define a state of the universe. The number of particles in the universe thus becomes undefinable. Only at everyday energies and for finite dimensions are we able to speak of an approximate number of particles.

Comparison between a system and the vacuum is also impossible, in the case of the universe, for purely practical reasons. The particle counter would have to be outside the Challenge 1654 ny system. (Can you confirm this?) In addition, it is impossible to remove particles from the universe.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The impossibility of defining a vacuum state, and thus the number of particles in the universe, is not surprising. It is an interesting exercise to investigate the measurement errors that appear when we try to determine the number of particles despite this fundamental impossibility.

Challenge 1655 ny

Can we count the stars? In principle, the same conclusion applies as for particles. However, at everyday energies the stars can be counted *classically*, i.e., without taking them out of the volume in which they are enclosed. For example, this is possible if the stars are differentiated by mass, colour or any other individual property. Only near Planck energies or near the horizon are these methods inapplicable. In short, the number of stars is only defined as long as the observation energy is low, i.e., as long as we stay away from Planck energies and from the horizon.

So, despite appearances on human scales, *there is no definite number of particles in the universe*. The universe cannot be distinguished from vacuum by counting particles. Even though particles are necessary for our own existence and functioning, a complete count of them cannot be made.

This conclusion is so strange that we should try to resist it. Let us try another method of determining the content of matter in the universe: instead of counting particles, let us weigh them.

Does the universe contain masses and objects?

Page 923

The average density of the universe, about $10^{-26}\,\mathrm{kg/m^3}$, is often cited in texts. Is it different from a vacuum? Quantum theory shows that, as a result of the indeterminacy relation, even an empty volume of size R has a mass. For a zero-energy photon inside such a vacuum, we have $E/c = \Delta p > \hbar/\Delta x$, so that in a volume of size R, we have a minimum mass of at least $m_{\min}(R) = \hbar/cR$. For a spherical volume of radius R there is thus a minimal mass density given approximately by

$$\rho_{\min} \approx \frac{m_{\min}(R)}{R^3} = \frac{\hbar}{cR^4} \,. \tag{851}$$

For the universe, if the standard horizon distance R_0 of 14 000 million light years is inserted, the value becomes about $10^{-142}\,\mathrm{kg/m^3}$. This describes the density of the vacuum. In other words, the universe, with a density of about $10^{-26}\,\mathrm{kg/m^3}$, seems to be clearly different from vacuum. But are we sure?

We have just deduced that the radius of the horizon is undefined: depending on the observation energy, it can be as small as the Planck length. This implies that the density of the universe lies somewhere between the lowest possible value, given by the density of vacuum just mentioned, and the highest possible one, namely the Planck density.* In short, the relation (851) does not really provide a clear statement.

---

* In fact, at everyday energies the density of the universe lies midway between the two values, yielding the strange relation

Challenge 1656 ny

$$m_0^2/R_0^2 \approx m_{\mathrm{Pl}}^2/R_{\mathrm{Pl}}^2 = c^4/G^2 \,. \tag{852}$$

Page 1217

But this is nothing new. The approximate equality can be deduced from equation 16.4.3 (p. 620) of Steven Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology*, Wiley, 1972, namely $Gn_b m_p = 1/t_0^2$. The relation is required by several cosmological models.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Another way to measure the mass of the universe would be to apply the original definition of mass, as given by Mach and modified by special relativity. Thus, let us try to collide a standard kilogram with the universe. It is not hard to see that whatever we do, using either low or high energies for the standard kilogram, the mass of the universe cannot be constrained by this method. We would need to produce or to measure a velocity change Δv for the rest of the universe after the collision. To hit all the mass in the universe at the same time, we need high energy; but then we are hindered by Planck energy effects. In addition, a properly performed collision measurement would require a mass outside the universe, which is rather difficult to achieve.

Page 439

Challenge 1657 ny

Yet another way to measure the mass would be to determine the gravitational mass of the universe through straightforward weighing. But the lack of balances outside the universe makes this an impractical solution, to say the least.

Another way out might be to use the most precise definition of mass provided by general relativity, the so-called *ADM mass*. However, the definition of this requires a specified behaviour at infinity, i.e., a background, which the universe lacks.

We are then left with the other general-relativistic method: determining the mass of the universe by measuring its average curvature. Let us take the defining expressions for average curvature κ for a region of size R, namely

Page 543

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{r_{\text{curvature}}^2} = \frac{3}{4\pi}\,\frac{4\pi R^2 - S}{R^4} = \frac{15}{4\pi}\,\frac{4\pi R^3/3 - V}{R^5}\,. \tag{853}$$

We have to insert the horizon radius R_0 and either its surface area S_0 or its volume V_0. However, given the error margins on the radius and the volume, especially at Planck energies, we again find no reliable result for the radius of curvature.

Challenge 1658 ny

An equivalent method starts with the usual expression provided by Rosenfeld for the indeterminacy $\Delta\kappa$ in the scalar curvature for a region of size R, namely

Ref. 1249

$$\Delta\kappa > \frac{16\pi l_{\text{Pl}}^2}{R^4}\,. \tag{854}$$

However, this expression also shows that the error in the radius of curvature behaves like the error in the distance to the horizon.

In summary, *at Planck energies, the average radius of curvature of nature lies between infinity and the Planck length*. This implies that the density of matter lies between the minimum value and the Planck value. There is thus no method to determine the mass of the universe at Planck energies. (Can you find one?) The concept of mass cannot be applied to the universe as a whole. Thus, *the universe has no mass*.

Challenge 1659 ny

Do symmetries exist in nature?

We have already seen that at the horizon, space-time translation symmetry breaks down. Let us have a quick look at the other symmetries.

What happens to permutation symmetry? Permutation is an operation on objects in space-time. It thus necessarily requires a distinction between matter, space and time. If we cannot distinguish positions, we cannot talk about exchange of particles. Therefore, at

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

the horizon, general relativity and quantum theory together make it impossible to define permutation symmetry.

The same is true of CPT symmetry. As a result of measurement errors or of limiting maximum or minimum values, it is impossible to distinguish between the original and the transformed situations. Therefore we cannot claim that that CPT is a symmetry of nature at horizon scales. In other words, matter and antimatter cannot be distinguished at the horizon.

Challenge 1660 ny

The same is true of gauge symmetry, as you may wish to check in detail yourself. For its definition, the concept of gauge field requires a distinction between time, space and mass; at the horizon this is impossible. We therefore also deduce that at the horizon, concepts such as algebras of observables cannot be used to describe nature. Renormalization breaks down too.

All symmetries of nature break down at the horizon. None of the vocabulary we use to talk about observations – including terms such as such as 'magnetic field', 'electric field', 'potential', 'spin', 'charge', or 'speed' – can be used at the horizon.

Does the universe have a boundary?

It is common to take 'boundary' and 'horizon' as synonyms in the case of the universe, because they are the same for all practical purposes. Knowledge of mathematics does not help us here: the properties of mathematical boundaries – for example, that they themselves have no boundary – are not applicable to the universe, since space-time is not continuous. We need other, physical arguments.

The boundary of the universe is supposed to represent the boundary between *something* and *nothing*. There are three possible interpretations of 'nothing':

— 'Nothing' could mean 'no matter'. But we have just seen that this distinction cannot be made at Planck scales. So either the boundary will not exist at all or it will encompass the horizon *as well as* the whole universe.
— 'Nothing' could mean 'no space-time'. We then have to look for those domains where space and time cease to exist. These occur at Planck scales and at the horizon. Again, either the boundary will not exist or it will encompass the whole universe.
— 'Nothing' could mean 'neither space-time nor matter.' The only possibility is a boundary that encloses domains *beyond* the Planck scale and *beyond* the horizon; but again, such a boundary would also encompass all of nature.

This is puzzling. When combining quantum theory and relativity, we do not seem to be able to find a conceptual definition of the horizon that distinguishes it from what it includes. (If you find one, publish it!) A distinction *is* possible in general relativity alone, and in quantum theory alone; but as soon as we combine the two, the boundary becomes indistinguishable from its content. *The interior of the universe cannot be distinguished from its horizon*. There is no boundary.

Challenge 1661 ny

This difficulty in distinguishing the horizon from its contents is interesting: it suggests that nature may be *symmetric* under transformations that exchange interiors and boundaries. This connection is called *holography*, because it vaguely recalls the working of credit-card holograms. It is a busy research field in high-energy physics. However, for the time being, we shall continue with our original theme, which leads us to our next

Ref. 1250

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

question.

Is the universe a set? – Again

> Domina omnium et regina ratio.*
>
> Cicero

We are used to thinking of the universe the sum of all matter and all space-time. In doing so, we imply that the universe is a set of mutually distinct components. This idea has been assumed in three situations: in claiming that matter consists of particles; that space-time consists of events (or points); and that different states consist of different initial conditions. However, our discussion shows that the universe is *not* a set of such distinguishable elements. We have encountered several proofs: at the horizon, at the big bang and at Planck scales, it becomes impossible to distinguish between events, between particles, between observables, and between space-time and matter. In those domains, distinctions of any kind become impossible. We have found that distinguishing between two entities – for example, between a toothpick and a mountain – is only *approximately* possible. It is approximately possible because we live at energies well below the Planck energy. The approximation is so good that we do not notice the error when we distinguish cars from people and from toothpicks. Nevertheless, our discussion of the situation at Planck energies shows that a perfect distinction is impossible in principle. *It is impossible to split the universe into separate entities.*

Another way to reach this result is the following. Distinguishing between two entities requires different measurement results: for example, different positions, masses or sizes. Whatever quantity we choose, at Planck energies the distinction becomes impossible. Only at everyday energies is it approximately possible.

In short, since the universe contains no distinguishable entities, there are no elements in nature. Simply put: *the universe is not a set*. We envisaged this possibility earlier on; now it is confirmed. The concepts of 'element' and 'set' are already too specialized to describe the universe. *The universe must be described by a mathematical concept that does not contain any set.* The new concept must be more general than that of a set.

Page 860

This is a powerful result: it means that no precise description of the universe can use any concept that presupposes the use of sets. But all the concepts we have used so far to describe nature, such as space-time, metric, phase space, Hilbert space and its generalizations (Fock space and particle space), are based on elements and sets. They must all be abandoned at Planck energies, and in any precise description.

Furthermore, many speculations about unified descriptions do depend on sets. In particular, all studies of quantum fluctuations, mathematical categories, posets, complex mathematical spaces, computer programs, Turing machines, Gödel's theorem, creation of any sort, space-time lattices, quantum lattices and Bohm's unbroken wholeness presuppose sets. In addition, almost none of the speculations about the origin of the universe can be correct. For example, you may wish to check the religious explanations you know against this result. In fact, no approach used by theoretical physicists in the year 2000 satisfies the requirement that elements and sets must be abandoned. Perhaps a future

Ref. 1251

Challenge 1662 ny

* 'The mistress and queen of all things is reason.' *Tuscalanae Disputationes*, 2.21.47.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

version of string or M theory will do so. The task is not easy: do you know of a single concept not based on elements or sets? Challenge 1663 s

Note that this radical conclusion is deduced from only two statements: the necessity of using quantum theory whenever the dimensions are of the order of the Compton wavelength, of using general relativity whenever the dimensions are of the order of the Schwarzschild radius. Together, they mean that no precise description of nature can contain elements and sets. We have reached this result after a long and interesting, but in a sense unnecessary, digression. The difficulties in complying with this result may explain why the unification of the two theories has not so far been successful. Not only does unification require that we stop using space, time and mass for the description of nature; it also requires that all distinctions, of any kind, should be only approximate. But all physicists have been educated on the basis of exactly the opposite creed!

Note that, because it is not a set, *the universe is not a physical system*. Specifically, it has no state, no intrinsic properties, no wave function, no initial conditions, no density, no entropy and no cosmological constant. The universe is thus neither thermodynamically closed nor open; and it contains no information. All thermodynamic quantities, such as entropy, temperature and free energy, are defined using *ensembles*. Ensembles are limits of systems which are thermodynamically either open or closed. As the universe is neither open nor closed, no thermodynamic quantity can be defined for it.* All physical properties are defined only for parts of nature which are approximated or idealized as sets, and thus are physical systems.

Curiosities and fun challenges about the universe

> Insofern sich die Sätze der Mathematik auf die Wirklichkeit beziehen, sind sie nicht sicher, und sofern sie sicher sind, beziehen sie sich nicht auf die Wirklichkeit.**
>
> Albert Einstein

In mathematics, 2 + 2 = 4. This statement is an idealization of statements such as 'two apples plus two apples makes four apples.' However, we now know that at Planck energies this is not a correct statement about nature. At Planck energies, objects cannot be counted. Can you confirm this? Challenge 1664 ny

* *

In 2002, Seth Lloyd estimated how much information the universe can contain, and how many calculations it has performed since the big bang. This estimate is based on two ideas: that the number of particles in the universe is a well-defined quantity, and that the universe is a computer, i.e., a physical system. We now know that neither assumption is correct. This shows the power of the criteria that we have deduced for any precise or complete description of motion. Ref. 1252

* Some people knew this long before physicists. For example, the belief that the universe is or contains information was ridiculed most thoroughly in the popular science-fiction parody by Douglas Adams, *The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy*, 1979, and its sequels.

** 'In so far as mathematical statements describe reality, they are not certain, and as far as they are certain, they are not a description of reality.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

People take pictures of the cosmic background radiation and its variations. Is it possible that these photographs will show that the spots in one direction of the sky are exactly the same as those in the diametrically opposite direction? Challenge 1665 ny

* *

In 1714, Leibniz published his *Monadologie*. In it he explores what he calls a simple substance, which he defined to be a substance that has no parts. He called it a *monade* and describes some of its properties. However, mainly thanks to his incorrect deductions, the term has not been generally adopted. What is the physical concept most closely related to that of a monade? Ref. 1253 Challenge 1666 s

* *

We usually speak of *the* universe, implying that there is only one of them. Yet there is a simple case to be made that 'universe' is an observer-dependent concept, since the idea of 'all' is observer-dependent. Does this mean that there are many universes? Challenge 1667 ny

* *

If all particles were removed (assuming one knew where to put them), there wouldn't be much of a universe left. True? Challenge 1668 ny

* *

At Planck energies, interactions cannot be defined. Therefore, 'existence' cannot be defined. In short, at Planck energies we cannot say whether particles exist. True? Challenge 1669 ny

Hilbert's sixth problem settled

In the year 1900, David Hilbert gave a famous lecture in which he listed 23 of the great challenges facing mathematics in the twentieth century. Most of these provided challenges to many mathematicians for decades afterwards. A few are still unsolved, among them the sixth, which challenged mathematicians and physicists to find an *axiomatic* treatment of physics. Page 833 Ref. 1254

Since the universe is not even a set, we can deduce that such an axiomatic description of nature is *impossible*. The reasoning is simple: all mathematical systems, be they algebraic systems, order systems or topological systems, are based on elements and sets. Mathematics does not have axiomatic systems that do not contain elements and sets. The reason for this is simple: any (mathematical) concept contains at least one element and one set. However, nature does not.

The impossibility of an axiomatic system for physics is also confirmed in another way. Physics starts with a *circular* definition: space-time is defined with the help of objects and objects are defined with the help of space-time. Thus physics has *never* been fully modelled on the basis of mathematics. Physicists have always had to live with logical problems. Mathematics helps physics, but mathematics is not the foundation of physics. Page 317

The situation is similar to a child's description of the sky as 'made of air and clouds'. Looking closely, we discover that clouds are made up of water droplets. However, there is air inside clouds, and there is also water vapour elsewhere in the air. When clouds and

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

air are viewed through a microscope, there is no clear boundary between the two. We cannot define either of the terms 'cloud' and 'air' without the other.

Objects and vacuum are also indistinguishable in this sense. Virtual particles are found in vacuum, and vacuum is found inside objects. At Planck scales there is no clear boundary between the two; we cannot define either without the other. Despite the lack of a precise definition, and the logical problems that ensue, in both cases the description works well at large, everyday scales.

The result does not mean that physics has to abandon mathematics. This is not necessary. The way out will become clear as we continue in our ascent of motion mountain.

We note that, since the universe is not a set and since it contains no information, the Page 316 paradox of the physics book containing a full description of nature disappears. Such a book *could* exist, as it does not contradict any property of the universe. But then a further question arises.

Does the universe make sense?

> Drum hab ich mich der Magie ergeben,
> [...]
> Daß ich erkenne, was die Welt
> Im Innersten zusammenhält.*
>
> Goethe, *Faust*

Is the universe really the sum of matter–energy and space-time? Or of particles and vacuum? We have heard these statements so often that we may forget to check them. We do not need magic, as Faust thought: we only need to list what we have found so far, es- Page 804 pecially in this section, in the section on Planck scales, and in the chapter on brain and language. Table 122 shows the result.

Not only are we unable to state that the universe is made of space-time and matter; we are unable to say anything about the universe at all!** It is not even possible to say that it exists, since it is impossible to interact with it. The term 'universe' does not allow us to Challenge 1671 r make a single sensible statement. (Can you find one?) We are only able to list properties it does *not* have. We are unable to find any property that the universe *does* have. Thus, the universe has no properties! We cannot even say whether the universe is something or nothing. *The universe isn't anything in particular.* In other words, the term 'universe' is not at all useful for the description of motion.

Page 821 We can obtain a confirmation of this strange conclusion from an earlier chapter. There we found that any concept needs defined content, defined limits and a defined domain of application. In this section, we have found that the term 'universe' has none of these; there is thus no such concept. If somebody asks why the universe exists, the answer is: not only does the use of the word 'why' wrongly suggest that something may exist outside the universe, providing a reason for it and thus contradicting the definition of the term 'universe' itself; but more importantly, the universe does not exist. In summary, any sentence containing the word 'universe' is meaningless. The word only *seems* to express

* 'Thus I have devoted myself to magic, [...] that I understand how the innermost world is held together.'

** There is another well-known, non-physical concept about which nothing can be said. Many scholars have Challenge 1670 s explored it in detail. What is it?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 122 Physical statements about the universe

The universe has no age.	The universe has no beginning.
The universe has no size.	The universe has no volume.
The universe has no shape.	The universe's particle number is undefined.
The universe has no mass.	The universe has no energy.
The universe has no density.	The universe contains no matter.
The universe has no cosmological constant.	The universe has no initial conditions.
The universe has no state.	The universe has no wave function.
The universe is not a physical system.	The universe contains no information.
The universe is not isolated.	The universe is not open.
The universe has no boundaries.	The universe does not interact.
The universe cannot be measured.	The universe cannot be said to exist.
The universe cannot be distinguished from nothing.	The universe cannot be distinguished from a single event.
The universe contains no moments.	The universe is not composite.
The universe is not a set.	The universe is not a concept.
The universe cannot be described.	There is no plural for 'universe'.
The universe cannot be distinguished from vacuum.	The universe was not created.

something.*

This conclusion may be interesting, even strangely beautiful, but does it help us to understand motion more precisely? Yes, it does.

Abandoning sets and discreteness eliminates contradictions

Our discussion of the term 'universe' shows that the term cannot include any element or set. Nature cannot be made of atoms. Nature cannot be made of space-time points. Nature cannot be made of separate, distinct and discrete entities. This conclusion will help us on the way to a precise description of nature. We will see how later on.

The difficulties in giving a sharp definition of 'universe' also show that the fashionable term 'multiverse' makes no sense. There is no way to define such a term, since there is no empirical way and no logical way to distinguish one universe from another.

By taking into account the limits on length, time, mass and all the other quantities we have encountered, we have reached a number of almost painful conclusions about nature. However, we have also received something in exchange: all the contradictions between general relativity and quantum theory that we mentioned at the beginning of this chapter are now resolved. Although we have had to leave many cherished habits behind us, in exchange we have the promise of a description of nature without contradictions. But we get even more.

Challenge 1672 e

* Of course, the term 'universe' still makes sense if it is defined more restrictively: for example, as everything interacting with a particular human or animal observer in everyday life. But such a definition is not useful for our quest, as it lacks the precision required for a description of motion.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 123 Properties of nature at maximal, everyday and minimal scales

PHYSICAL PROPERTY OF NATURE	AT HORIZON SCALE	AT EVERYDAY SCALE	AT PLANCK SCALE
requires quantum theory and relativity	true	false	true
intervals can be measured precisely	false	true	false
length and time intervals	limited	unlimited	limited
space-time is not continuous	true	false	true
points and events cannot be distinguished	true	false	true
space-time is not a manifold	true	false	true
space is 3-dimensional	false	true	false
space and time are indistinguishable	true	false	true
initial conditions make sense	false	true	false
space-time fluctuates	true	false	true
Lorentz and Poincaré symmetry	does not apply	applies	does not apply
CPT symmetry	does not apply	applies	does not apply
renormalization	does not apply	applies	does not apply
permutation symmetry	does not apply	applies	does not apply
interactions	do not exist	exist	do not exist
number of particles	undefined	defined	undefined
algebras of observables	undefined	defined	undefined
matter indistinguishable from vacuum	true	false	true
boundaries exist	false	true	false
nature is a set	false	true	false

EXTREMAL SCALES AND OPEN QUESTIONS IN PHYSICS

Page 1340

In the chapter *Quantum physics in a nutshell* we listed all the unexplained properties of nature left open either by general relativity or by quantum theory. The present conclusions provide us with new connections among them. Indeed, many of the cosmological results of this section sound surprisingly familiar. Let us compare them systematically with those of the section on Planck scales. Both sections explored topics from the list of unexplained properties of nature, some in more detail than others.

First, Table 123 shows that *none* of the unexplained properties makes sense at *both* limits of nature, the small and the large. All open questions are open at both extremes. Secondly, and more importantly, nature behaves in the same way at horizon scales and at Planck scales. In fact, we have not found any difference between the two cases. (can you discover one?) We are thus led to the hypothesis that nature does not distinguish between the large and the small. Nature seems to be characterized by *extremal identity*.

Challenge 1673 r

IS EXTREMAL IDENTITY A PRINCIPLE OF NATURE?

The principle of extremal identity incorporates some rather general points:

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

— All open questions about nature appear at its two extremes.
— Any description of nature requires both general relativity and quantum theory.
— Nature, or the universe, is not a set.
— Initial conditions and evolution equations make no sense at nature's limits.
— There is a relation between local and global issues in nature.
— The concept of 'universe' has no content.

Extremal identity thus looks like a good candidate tool for use in the search for a unified description of nature. To be a bit more provocative, it may be the *only* known principle incorporating the idea that the universe is not a set, and thus might be the only candidate tool for use in the quest of unification. Extremal identity is beautiful in its simplicity, in its unexpectedness and in the richness of its consequences. You might enjoy exploring it by yourself. Challenge 1674 ny

The study of the consequences of extremal identity is currently the focus of much activity in high-energy particle physics, although often under different names. Ref. 1255 The simplest approach to extremal identity – in fact, one that is too simple to be correct – is *inversion*. It looks as if extremal identity implies a connection such as

$$r \leftrightarrow \frac{l_{\mathrm{Pl}}^2}{r} \quad \text{or} \quad x_\mu \leftrightarrow \frac{l_{\mathrm{Pl}}^2 \, x_\mu}{x_\mu \, x^\mu} \tag{855}$$

relating distances r or coordinates x_μ with their inverse values using the Planck length l_{Pl}. Can this mapping be a symmetry of nature? At every point of space? For example, if the horizon distance is inserted, the relation (855) implies that lengths smaller than $l_{\mathrm{Pl}}/10^{61} \approx 10^{-96}$ m never appear in physics. Is this the case? What would inversion imply for the big bang? Challenge 1675 ny

Numerous fascinating questions are contained in the simple hypothesis of extremal identity. They lead to two main directions for investigation.

First, we have to search for some stronger arguments for the validity of extremal identity. We will discover a number of simple arguments, all showing that extremal identity is indeed a property of nature, and producing many beautiful insights.

The other quest then follows. We need to find the correct version of the relation (855). That oversimplified expression is neither sufficient nor correct. It is not sufficient because it does not explain *any* of the issues left open by general relativity and quantum theory. It only *relates* some of them, thus reducing their number, but it does not *solve* any of them. (You may wish to check this for yourself.) In other words, we need to find the precise description of quantum geometry and of elementary particles. Challenge 1676 ny

However, inversion is also simply wrong. Inversion is not the correct description of extremal identity because it does not realize a central result discovered above: it does not connect *states* and *intrinsic properties*, but keeps them distinct. This means that inversion does not take *interactions* into account. And most open issues at this point of our mountain ascent concern properties of interactions.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 54

THE PHYSICS OF LOVE – A SUMMARY OF THE FIRST FIVE-AND-A-HALF PARTS

> Sex is the physics urge sublimated.
>
> Graffito

Maybe you have once met a physicist who has told you, in one of those moments of confidentiality, that studying physics is even more beautiful than making love.* At this statement, many will simply shake their head in disbelief and probably disapproval. In this section we will argue that it is possible to learn so much about physics while making love that discussions about their relative beauty can be put aside altogether.

Imagine being with your partner on a beautiful tropical island, just after sunset, and looking together at the evening sky. Imagine, as well, that you know little of what is taught at school nowadays – for example, that your knowledge is that of the late Renaissance (which is probably about the average level of modern scientific education anyway).

You are busy enjoying each other's company. The most important results of physics can be deduced from the following experimental facts:**

Love is communication.	Love is tiring.
Love is an interaction between moving bodies.	Love takes time.
Love is attractive.	Love is repulsive.
Love makes noise.	In love, size matters.
Love is for reproduction.	Love can hurt.
Love needs memory.	Love is Greek.
Love uses the sense of sight.	Love is animal.
Love is motion.	Love is holy.
Love is based on touch.	Love uses motion.
Love is fun.	Love is private.
	Love makes one dream.

* This section is based on a talk, with the title 'The physics of sex', given in 1998 at the Delft University of Technology.

** Here we deduce physics from love. We could also deduce physics from sexuality. The modern habit of saying 'sex' instead of 'sexuality' confuses two completely different concepts. In fact, studying the influences of *sex* on physics is almost a complete waste of time. Maybe one day we will understand why there do not seem to be any female crackpots proposing pet physical theories.

Ref. 1256
Ref. 1257

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Let us see what these observations imply for the description of nature.

* *

Love is *communication*. Communication is possible because nature looks similar from different standpoints and because there are no surprises in nature. Without similarity we could not understand each other, and a world of surprises would even make thinking impossible: it would not be possible to form concepts to describe observations. But fortunately, the world is regular; it thus allows us to use concepts such as time and space for its description.

* *

Love is an *interaction between moving bodies*. Together with the previous result, this implies that we can and need to describe moving bodies with *mass*, *energy* and *momentum*.
Challenge 1677 s That is not a small feat. For example, it implies that the Sun will rise tomorrow.

* *

Love is *attractive*. When feeling attracted to your partner, you may wonder if this attraction is the same as that which keeps the Moon going around the Earth. You make a quick calculation and find that applying the expression for universal gravity

$$E_{\text{pot}} = -\frac{GMm}{r} \tag{856}$$

to both of you, the energy involved is about as much as the energy added by the leg of a fly on the skin. (M and m are your masses, r your distance apart, and the gravitational constant has the value $G = 6.7 \cdot 10^{-11}\,\mathrm{m^3/kg\,s^2}$.) In short, your partner teaches you that in nature there are other attractive interactions apart from gravity.

Nevertheless, this first equation is important: it allows us to predict the position of the planets, the time of the tides, the time of eclipses, the return of comets, and so on, to a high accuracy, thousands of years in advance.

* *

Love *makes noise*. That is not news. However, even after making love, even when everybody and everything is quiet, in a completely silent environment, we do hear something. The noises we hear are produced within the ear, partly by the blood flowing through the head, partly by the electrical noise generated in the nerves. That is strange. If matter were continuous, there would be no noise even for low signal levels. In fact, all proofs of the discreteness of matter, of electric current, of energy, or of light are based on the increase of fluctuations with the smallness of the system under consideration. The persistence of noise thus makes us suspect that matter is made of smallest entities. Making love confirms this suspicion in several ways.

* *

Love is for *reproduction*. We owe our life to love, as we are all results of reproduction. But the reproduction of a structure is possible only if it can be constructed, in other words if the structure can be built from small standard entities. Thus we again suspect ourselves

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

to be made of smallest, discrete entities.

Love is also a complicated method of reproduction. Mathematics provides a much simpler one. If matter objects were not made of particles, but were continuous, it would be possible to perform reproduction by cutting and reassembling. A famous mathematical theorem by Banach and Tarski proves that it is possible to take a continuous solid, cut it into five pieces and rearrange the pieces to obtain *two* copies of the same size and volume as the original. In fact, volumes can be increased in this way, thus achieving growth without any need for food. Mathematics thus provides some interesting methods for growth and reproduction. However, they assume that matter is continuous, without a smallest length scale. The observation that these methods do not work in nature is compatible with the idea that matter is not continuous.

* *

Ref. 1258 Love *needs memory*. If you could not recognize your partner among all possible ones, your love life would be quite complicated. A memory is a device which, in order to store information, must have *small* internal fluctuations. Fluctuations in systems get smaller as the number of components in them increases. Since our memory works so well, we must be made of a large number of small particles.

In summary, love shows that we are made of some kind of Lego bricks: depending on the level of magnification, these bricks are called molecules, atoms, or elementary particles. It is possible to estimate their size using the sea around the tropical island and Challenge 1678 s a bit of oil. Can you imagine how?

* *

Love *uses the sense of sight*. It is only possible for us to see each other because we are cold whereas the Sun is hot. If we and our environment all had the same temperature as the Ref. 1259 Sun, we would not see each other. This can be checked experimentally: looking into a glowing oven filled with glowing objects, it is impossible to discern the objects against the background.

* *

Love *is motion*. Bodies move against each other. Moreover, their speed can be measured. Since measurement is a comparison with a standard, there must be a velocity standard in nature: some special velocity that stands out. Such a standard must be either the minimum or the maximum possible value. Now, we know from daily life that there is no minimum velocity, so we must look for a maximum value. To estimate the value of the maximum, just take out your mobile phone and ring home from the island to your family. From the delay in the line and the height of the satellite, you can deduce the telephone speed c and get $3 \cdot 10^8$ m/s.

The existence of a maximum speed c implies that time is different for different observers. Looking into the details, we find that this effect becomes noticeable at energies

$$E_{\text{different time}} \approx mc^2 \,, \tag{857}$$

where m is the mass of the object. For example, this applies to electrons inside a television tube.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

Love is based on *touch*. When we touch our partner, we sometimes get small shocks. The energies involved are larger than than those of touching fly legs. In short, people are electric.

In the dark, we observe that discharges emit light. Light is thus related to electricity. In addition, touching proves that light is a wave: simply observe the dark lines between two fingers near your eye in front of a bright background. The lines are due to interference effects. Thus light does not move with infinite speed. In fact, it moves with the same speed as mobile phone calls.

Challenge 1679 s

* *

Love is *fun*. People like to make love in different ways – for example, in a dark room. But rooms get dark when the light is switched off only because we live in a space with an odd number of dimensions. In even-dimensional space, a lamp would not turn off directly after the switch is flicked, but only dim slowly.

Page 234

Love is also fun because with our legs, arms and bodies we can make knots. Knots are possible only in three dimensions. In short, love is fun only because we live in three dimensions.

* *

Love is *tiring*. The reason is gravity. But what is gravity? A little thinking shows that since there is a maximum speed, gravity is the curvature of space-time. Curved space also means that a *horizon* – a largest possible visible distance – can appear. From equations (856) and (857), we deduce that this happens when distances are of the order of

$$R_{\text{horizon}} \approx Gm/c^2 \,. \tag{858}$$

For example, it is only because of a horizon – albeit one appearing in a different way – that the night sky is dark.

* *

Love *takes time*. It is known that men and women have different opinions on durations. It is also known that love happens between your ears. Indeed, biological research has shown that we have a clock inside the brain, which depends on circulating electrical currents. This clock provides our normal sense of time. Since this clock exists, there must be a time standard in nature. Such a standard must be either a minimum or a maximum time interval. We shall discover it later on.

Ref. 1260

* *

Love is *repulsive*. And in love, *size matters*. These facts turn out to be two sides of the same coin. Love is based on touch, and touch needs repulsion. Repulsion needs a length scale, but neither gravity nor classical electrodynamics provides one. Classical physics only allows for the measurement of speed. It cannot explain how the measurement of length, time, or mass is possible.* Classically, matter cannot be hard: it should be possible

* Note that the classical electron radius is not an exception: it depends on the elementary charge e, which

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

to compress it. But love shows us that this is not the case. Love shows us that lengths scales do exist, and thus that classical physics is not sufficient for the description of nature.

* *

Love can *hurt*. For example, it can lead to injuries. Atoms can get ripped apart. That happens when energies are concentrated on small volumes: a few attojoule per atom. Investigating such situations more precisely, we finds that strange phenomena appear at distances r if energies exceed the value

$$E \approx \frac{\hbar\, c}{r} \quad . \tag{859}$$

In particular, energy becomes chunky, things become fuzzy, boxes are not tight, and particles get confused. These are called *quantum* phenomena. The new constant $\hbar = 10^{-34}$ Js is important: it determines the size of things, because it allows us to define distance and time units. In other words, objects tear and break because in nature there is a minimum action, given roughly by $\hbar$.

If even more energy is concentrated in small volumes – of the order of mc^2 per particle – one even observes transformation of energy into matter, or *pair production*. From equations (857) and (859), we deduce that this happens at distances of

$$r_{\text{pair production}} \approx \frac{\hbar}{m\, c} \, . \tag{860}$$

At such small distances we cannot avoid using the quantum description of nature.

* *

Love is not only *Greek*. The Greeks were the first to make theories above love, as Plato did in his *Phaedrus*. But they also described it in another way. Before Plato, Democritus said that making love is an example of particles moving and interacting in a vacuum. If we change 'a vacuum' to 'curved 3+1-dimensional space' and 'particle' to 'quantum particle', we do indeed make love in the way Democritus described 2,500 years ago.

It seems that physics has not made much progress in the mean time. Take the statement made in 1939 by the British astrophysicist Arthur Eddington:

Ref. 1261

> I believe there are 15,747,724,136,275,002,577,605,653,961,181,555,468,044,717,914, 527,116,709,366,231,425,076,185,631,031,296 protons in the universe and the same number of electrons.

Compare it with the version of 2009:

> Baryons in the universe: $10^{81\pm2}$. Total charge: near zero.

depends on a length scale, as shown on page 620.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The second version is more honest, but which of the two is less sensible? Both statements show that there are unexplained facts in the Greek description nature, in particular the number of particles.

* *

Love is *animal*. We have seen that we can learn a lot about nature from the existence of love. We could be tempted to see this approach to understanding nature as a case of the so-called *anthropic principle*. However, some care is required here. We could have learned exactly the same if we had taken as our starting point the observation that *apes* or *pigs* have love. There is no 'law' of nature which distinguishes between them and humans. In fact, there is a simple way to determine whether any 'anthropic' statement makes sense: the reasoning must be equally true for humans, apes, and pigs.

One famous anthropic deduction was stated by the British astrophysicist Fred Hoyle. While studying stars, he predicted a resonance in the carbon-12 nucleus. If it did not exist, he argued, stars could not have produced the carbon which afterwards was spread out by explosions into interstellar space and collected on Earth. Since apes or pigs might also reason in this way, Hoyle's statement does make sense.

On the other hand, claiming that the universe is made *especially* for people is not sensible: pigs would say that it is made for pigs. The existence of either humans or pigs requires all 'laws' of nature. In summary, the anthropic principle is valid only in so far as its consequences are indistinguishable from those of the porcine or the simian principle. In short, the animal side of love imposes limits on the philosophy of physics.

* *

Love is *holy*. According to the famous definition by the theologian Rudolf Otto, holiness results from a mixture of a *mysterium tremendum* and a *mysterium fascinans*. *Tremendum* means that it makes one tremble. Indeed, love produces heat and is a dissipative process. All systems in nature that produce heat have a finite lifetime. That is true for machines, stars, animals, lightning, fire, lamps and people. Through heat, love shows us that we are going to die. Physicists call this the second principle of thermodynamics.

Ref. 1262

But love also fascinates. Everything that fascinates has a story. Indeed, this is a principle of nature: every dissipative structure, every structure which appears or is sustained through the release of energy, has a story. Take atoms, for example. All the protons we are made of formed during the big bang. Most of the hydrogen we are made of is also that old. The other elements were formed in stars and then blown into the sky during nova or supernova explosions. They then regrouped during planet formation. We really are made of stardust.

Why do such stories fascinate? If you only think about how you and your partner met, you will discover that it was through a chain of incredible coincidences. If only one of these coincidences had not taken place, you and your partner would not be together. And of course, we all owe our existence to such chains of coincidences, which brought our parents together, and our grandparents, and made life appear on Earth.

The realization of the importance of coincidences automatically produces two kinds of questions: *why?* and *what if?* Physicists have produced a list of answers to all the repeated 'why' questions, and many are working on the 'what if' questions. The first list, the 'why' list of Table 124, gives all facts still unexplained. It can also be called the list of

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

all surprises in nature. (We said above that there are no surprises in nature about *what* happens. However, there still are a few surprises about *how* all these things happen.)

TABLE 124 *Everything* quantum field theory and general relativity do *not* explain; in other words, a list of *the only* experimental data and criteria available for tests of the unified description of motion

OBSERVABLE	PROPERTY UNEXPLAINED SO FAR
Local quantities, from quantum theory	
α_{em}	the low energy value of the electromagnetic coupling constant
α_w	the low energy value of the weak coupling constant
α_s	the value of the strong coupling constant at one specific energy value
m_q	the values of the 6 quark masses
m_l	the values of 6 lepton masses
m_W	the value of the mass of the W vector boson
m_H	the value of the mass of the scalar Higgs boson
θ_w	the value of the weak mixing angle
$\theta_{12}, \theta_{13}, \theta_{23}$	the value of the three quark mixing angles
δ	the value of the CP violating phase for quarks
$\theta^\nu_{12}, \theta^\nu_{13}, \theta^\nu_{23}$	the value of the three neutrino mixing angles
$\delta^\nu, \alpha_1, \alpha_2$	the value of the three CP violating phases for neutrinos
3	the number of particle generations
3 + 1	the number of space and time dimensions
Global quantities, from general relativity	
$1.2(1) \cdot 10^{26}$ m (?)	the distance of the horizon, i.e., the 'size' of the universe (if it makes sense)
10^{82} (?)	the number of baryons in the universe (if it makes sense), i.e., the average matter density in the universe
10^{92} (?)	the initial conditions for more than 10^{92} particle fields in the universe (if or as long as they make sense), including those at the origin of galaxies or stars
ρ_{de} =0.5 nJ/m^3	the value and nature of the observed vacuum energy density, dark energy or cosmological constant
ρ_{dm}	the nature of dark matter
Local structures, from quantum theory	
$S(n)$	the origin of particle identity, i.e., of permutation symmetry
Ren. group	the renormalization properties, i.e., the existence of point particles
SO(3,1)	the origin of Lorentz (or Poincaré) symmetry (i.e., of spin, position, energy, momentum)
C^*	the origin of the algebra of observables
Gauge group	the origin of gauge symmetry, in particular:
U(1)	the origin of the electromagnetic gauge group (i.e., of the quantization of electric charge, as well as the vanishing of magnetic charge)
SU(2)	the origin of weak interaction gauge group
SU(3)	the origin of strong interaction gauge group

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Observable	Property unexplained so far
Global structures, from general relativity	
maybe $R \times S^3$ (?)	the unknown topology of the universe (if it makes sense)

This 'why' list is fascinating because it is so short, and many researchers are still trying to reduce it further. But it is equally interesting to study what the consequences would be if any of the values from Table 124 were just a tiny bit different. Small changes in nature would lead to completely different observations, as shown in Table 125.

TABLE 125 A small selection of consequences of changing aspects of nature

Observable	Change	Result
Moon size	smaller	small Earth magnetic field; too much cosmic radiation; widespread child cancers
Moon size	larger	large Earth magnetic field; too little cosmic radiation; no evolution into humans
Jupiter	smaller	many comet impacts on Earth; extinction of animal life
Jupiter	larger	few comet impacts on Earth; no Moon; no dinosaur extinction
Oort belt	smaller	no comets, no irregular asteroids, no Moon; still dinosaurs
Star distance	smaller	irregular planetary motion; supernova dangers
Strong coupling constant	smaller	proton decay; leukaemia

The large number of coincidences of life forces our mind to realize that we are only a *tiny* part of nature. We are a small droplet shaken around in the ocean of nature. Even the tiniest changes in nature would prevent the existence of humans, apes and pigs. In other words, making love tells us that the universe is much larger than we are, and how much we are dependent on and connected to the rest of the universe.

* *

We said above that love uses *motion*. This fact contains a remarkable mystery, worth a second look.

Motion is the change of position with time of some bodies. Position is what we measure with a ruler. Time is what we measure with a clock. Both rulers and clocks are bodies.

A body is an entity distinct from its environment by its shape or its mass. Shape is the extension of a body in space (and time). Mass is measured by measuring speed or acceleration, i.e., by measuring space and time.

This means that we define space-time in terms of bodies – as in general relativity – and we define bodies in terms of space-time – as in quantum theory. This circular reasoning shows that making love is truly a mystery. It has not yet been eliminated yet: modern theoretical physicists are busy with the attempt. In the year 2000, the most promising

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

approach seems to be M-theory, an extension of string theory. But any such attempt has to overcome major difficulties – which can also be experienced while making love.

* *

Love is *private*. But is it? The concept of privacy assumes that a person can separate from the rest, without important interactions, at least for a given time, and come back later. This is possible only if there is enough *empty space* between the person and others. In other words, privacy is based on the idea that objects can be distinguished from vacuum. Let us check whether this is always possible.

Ref. 1263 What is the smallest measurable distance? This question was *almost* answered by Max Planck in 1899. The distance δl between two objects of mass m is surely larger than their position indeterminacy $\hbar/\Delta p$; and the momentum indeterminacy must be smaller that the momentum leading to pair production, i.e., $\Delta p < mc$. Thus

$$\delta l \geqslant \Delta l \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{mc} \,. \tag{861}$$

In addition, measurement requires that signals leave the objects, so the two masses must not be black holes. Their masses must be small enough to ensure that the Schwarzschild radius is smaller than the distance to be measured. This means that $r_S \approx Gm/c^2 < \delta l$, or

$$\delta l \geqslant \sqrt{\frac{\hbar G}{c^3}} = l_{\text{Pl}} = 1.6 \cdot 10^{-35}\,\text{m} \,. \tag{862}$$

This expression defines a minimum length in nature, the so-called *Planck length*. Every other Gedanken experiment leads to this characteristic length as well. In fact, this minimum distance (and the corresponding minimum time interval) provides the measurement standard we were looking for at the beginning of our musings about length and time measurements.

A more detailed discussion shows that the smallest *measurable* distance is somewhat larger, because measurements require a distinction to be made between matter and radiation. This happens at scales of about 800 times the Planck length.

In other words, privacy has its limits. In fact, the issue becomes even more muddled when we explore the consequences for bodies. A body (even a human one) is something we can touch, throw, hit, carry or weigh. Physicists say that a body is something with energy or momentum. Vacuum has none of these properties. In addition, vacuum is unbounded, whereas objects are bounded.

What happens if we try to weigh objects at Planck scales? Quantum theory makes a simple prediction. If we put an object of mass M in a box of size R onto a scale – as in Figure 605 – equation (859) implies that there is a minimal mass error ΔM given by

$$\Delta M \approx \frac{\hbar}{cR} \,. \tag{863}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 605 A Gedanken experiment showing that at Planck scales, matter and vacuum cannot be distinguished

If the box has Planck size, the mass error is the Planck mass

$$\Delta M = M_{\mathrm{Pl}} = \sqrt{\hbar c/G} \approx 22\,\mu\mathrm{g}\,. \tag{864}$$

How large a mass can we put into a box of Planck size? Obviously one with the maximum possible mass density. To determine this, imagine a planet with a satellite in orbit around it, just skimming its surface. The density ρ of the planet with radius r is given by

$$\rho \approx \frac{M}{r^3} = \frac{v^2}{Gr^2}\,. \tag{865}$$

Using equation (861) we find that the maximum mass density in nature, within a factor of order one, is the so-called *Planck density*, given by

$$\rho_{\mathrm{Pl}} = \frac{c^5}{G^2\hbar} = 5.2 \cdot 10^{96}\,\mathrm{kg/m^3}\,. \tag{866}$$

Therefore the maximum mass that can be contained inside a Planck box is the Planck mass. But that was also the measurement *error* for that situation. This implies that we cannot say whether the original box we measured was empty or full: vacuum *cannot* be distinguished from matter at Planck scales. This astonishing result is confirmed by every other Gedanken experiment exploring this issue. Ref. 1263

It is straightforward to deduce with similar arguments that objects are not bound in size at Planck scales, i.e., that they are not localized, and that the vacuum is not necessarily extended at those scales. In addition, the concept of particle number cannot be defined at Planck scales. Challenge 1680 s

So, why is there something instead of nothing? Making love shows that there is no difference between the two options!

* *

Love makes us *dream*. When we dream, especially at night, we often look at the sky. How

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

far away is it? How many atoms does it enclose? How old is it? These questions have an answer for small distances and for large distances; but for the whole of the sky, or the whole of nature, they cannot have an answer, as there is no way to be outside the sky in order to measure it. In fact, the impossibility of measuring nature at the smallest scales is found again at the largest scales. There seems to be a fundamental equivalence, or a *duality*, between the very large and the very small.

Ref. 1264

Hopefully, the coming years will show how we can translate these results into an even more precise description of motion and of nature. In particular, this description should allow us to reduce the number of unexplained properties of nature.

Summary on love and physics

In short, making love is a good physics lesson. Enjoy the rest of your day.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 55

MAXIMUM FORCE AND MINIMUM DISTANCE – PHYSICS IN LIMIT STATEMENTS

The principle of maximum force or power allows us to summarize each of the major physical theories – special relativity, quantum theory and general relativity – in one fundamental limit principle. The three principles are fully equivalent to the standard formulations of the theories. In particular, we show that the maximum force $c^4/4G$ implies and is equivalent to the field equations of general relativity. The combination of this limit with the speed limit of special relativity and the action–angular momentum limit of quantum theory implies a bound for every physical observable, from acceleration to size. The new, precise limit values differ from the usual Planck values by numerical factors of order unity.* Continuing with this approach, we show that every observable in nature has both a lower and an upper limit value.

Because of the maximum force and minimum length, the non-continuity of space-time is an inevitable consequence of the unification of quantum theory and relativity. Furthermore, the limits imply the maximum entropy bound, including the correct numerical factor. They also imply a maximum possible measurement precision, thus showing that any description of nature in terms of the real numbers is only approximate. Finally, the limits show that nature cannot be described by sets. As a result, the limit principles point to a solution to Hilbert's sixth problem. They also show that vacuum and matter cannot be fully distinguished in detail: they are two limiting cases of the same entity. These fascinating results provide the basis for any search for a unified theory of motion.

FUNDAMENTAL LIMITS TO ALL OBSERVABLES

At dinner parties, physicists are regularly asked to summarize physics in a few sentences. It is useful to have a few simple statements ready to answer such a request.** We propose some here. We are already familiar with each statement from our exploration of motion thus far. But by putting them all together, we will get direct insight into the results of modern research on unification.

The main lesson of modern physics is the following: *nature limits the possibilities of motion*. Such limits lie at the origin of special relativity, general relativity and quantum theory. In fact, we will see that nature limits *every* aspect of motion – but let us put first things first.

* These limits were given for the first time in 2003, in this section of the present text.

** Stimulating discussions with Saverio Pascazio, Corrado Massa and Steve Carlip helped shape this section.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Special relativity in one statement

The step from everyday, or Galilean, physics to special relativity can be summarized in a single limit statement on motion. It was popularized by Hendrik Antoon Lorentz: *There is a maximum energy speed in nature.* For all physical systems and all observers,

$$v \leqslant c \,. \tag{867}$$

A few well-known facts set the framework for the discussion that follows. The speed v is less than or equal to the speed of light c for *all* physical systems;* in particular, this limit is valid both for composite systems and for elementary particles. The speed limit is also valid for *all* observers. Indeed, only a maximum speed ensures that cause and effect can be distinguished in nature, or that sequences of observations can be defined. The opposite hypothesis, that speeds greater than c are possible, which implies the existence of (real) tachyons, has been explored and tested in great detail; it leads to numerous conflicts with observations.

The maximum speed forces us to use the concept of *space-time* to describe nature. The existence of a maximum speed implies that space and time mix. It also implies observer-dependent time and space coordinates, length contraction, time dilation, mass–energy equivalence, and all the other effects that characterize special relativity. Only this principle leads to the principle of maximum ageing that governs special relativity; and only this principle leads to the principle of least action at low speeds. In addition, only with a finite speed limit is it possible to define a *unit* of speed that is valid at all places and at all times. If there were no global speed limit, there could be no natural measurement standard for speed, independent of all interactions; speed would not then be a measurable quantity.

Page 409

Special relativity also limits the size of systems – whether composite or elementary. Indeed, the limit speed implies that acceleration a and size l cannot be increased independently without bounds, because the two ends of a system must not interpenetrate. The most important case concerns massive systems, for which we have

$$l \leqslant \frac{c^2}{a} \,. \tag{868}$$

This size limit is induced by the speed of light c; it is also valid for the *displacement* d of a system, if the acceleration measured by an external observer is used. Finally, the speed limit implies a relativistic 'indeterminacy relation'

$$\Delta l \, \Delta a \geqslant c^2 \tag{869}$$

for the length and acceleration indeterminacies. You may wish to take a minute to deduce this relation from the time–frequency indeterminacy. All this is standard knowledge.

Challenge 1681 s

* A *physical system* is a region of space-time containing mass–energy, the location of which can be followed over time and which interacts incoherently with its environment. This definition excludes images, geometrical points or incomplete entangled situations.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.net Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Quantum theory in one statement

In the same way, the difference between Galilean physics and quantum theory can be summarized in a single statement on motion, due to Niels Bohr: *There is a minimum action in nature.* For all physical systems and all observers,

Ref. 1265 Page 976

$$S \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{2} \,. \tag{870}$$

Half the Planck constant $\hbar$ is the smallest observable action or angular momentum. This statement is valid for both composite and elementary systems.

The action limit is used less frequently than the speed limit. It starts from the usual definition of the action, $S = \int (T - U) \mathrm{d}t$, and states that between two observations performed at times t and $t + \Delta t$, even if the evolution of a system is not known, the action is at least $\hbar/2$. Physical action measures the change in the state of a physical system. Thus there is always a minimum change of state between two observations of a system. The quantum of action expresses the fundamental fuzziness of nature at a microscopic scale.

It can easily be checked that no observation – whether of photons, electrons or macroscopic systems – gives a smaller action than this. The minimum action has been verified for fermions, bosons, laser beams and matter systems, and for any combination of these. The opposite hypothesis, implying the existence of arbitrary small change, has been explored in detail: Einstein's long discussion with Bohr, for example, can be seen as a repeated attempt by Einstein to find experiments that would make it possible to measure arbitrarily small changes in nature. In every case, Bohr found that this could not be achieved.

The principle of minimum action can be used to deduce the indeterminacy relation, the tunnelling effect, entanglement, permutation symmetry, the appearance of probabilities in quantum theory, the information-theoretic formulation of quantum theory, and the existence of elementary particle reactions. It implies that, in quantum theory, the three concepts of state, measurement operation and measurement result need to be distinguished from each other; this is done be means of a so-called *Hilbert space*. The minimal action is also part of the Einstein–Brillouin–Keller quantization. The details of these connections can be found in the chapter on quantum theory.

Ref. 1266 Page 976

The existence of a quantum of action has been known from the very beginning of quantum theory. It is at the basis of – and completely equivalent to – all the standard formulations of quantum theory, including the many-path and the information-theoretic formulations.

Note also that only a finite action limit makes it possible to define a *unit* of action. If there were no action limit, there could be no natural measurement standard for action: action would not then be a measurable quantity.

The action bound $S \leqslant pd \leqslant mcd$, together with the quantum of action, implies a limit on the displacement d of a system between any two observations:

$$d \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{2mc} \,. \tag{871}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

In other words, (half) the (reduced) Compton wavelength of quantum theory appears as the lower limit on the displacement of a system, whenever gravity plays no role. Since the quantum displacement limit applies in particular to an elementary system, it also applies to the *size* of a *composite* system. However, the limit is *not* valid for the sizes of elementary particles.

The action limit of quantum theory also implies Heisenberg's well-known indeterminacy relation for the displacement d and momentum p of systems:

Page 983

$$\Delta d \, \Delta p \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{2} \,. \tag{872}$$

This is valid for both massless and massive systems. All this is textbook knowledge.

General relativity in one statement

Much less well known is the possibility of summarizing the step from universal gravity to general relativity in a single statement on motion: *There is a maximum force or power in nature*. For all physical systems and all observers,

$$F \leqslant \frac{c^4}{4G} = 3.0 \cdot 10^{43}\,\mathrm{N} \quad \text{or} \quad P \leqslant \frac{c^5}{4G} = 9.1 \cdot 10^{51}\,\mathrm{W} \,. \tag{873}$$

These limit statements contain both the speed of light c and the gravitational constant G; they thus qualify as statements about relativistic gravitation. Like the other limit statements described above, they are valid for *all* observers.

This formulation of general relativity is not common; in fact, it seems that it was only discovered 80 years after the theory of general relativity had first been proposed.* A detailed discussion is given in the chapter on general relativity.

Ref. 1267
Page 471

The value of the force limit is the energy of a Schwarzschild black hole divided by its diameter; here the 'diameter' is defined as the circumference divided by π. The power limit is realized when such a black hole is radiated away in the time that light takes to travel along a length corresponding to the diameter.

Force is change of momentum; power is change of energy. Since momentum and energy are conserved, force or power can be pictured as the flow of momentum or energy through a given surface. The maximum force, as well as being the mass–energy of a black hole divided by its diameter, is also the surface gravity of a black hole times its mass. Thus the force limit means that no physical system of a given mass can be concentrated in a region of space-time smaller than a (non-rotating) black hole of that mass. In fact, the mass–energy concentration limit can easily be transformed algebraically into the force limit: they are equivalent.

Challenge 1682 e

It is easily checked that the maximum force is valid for all systems observed in nature, whether they are microscopic, macroscopic or astrophysical. Neither the 'gravitational force' (as long as it is operationally defined) nor the electromagnetic or nuclear interactions are ever found to exceed this limit.

Challenge 1683 e

* It may be that the present author was the first to point it out, in this very text. Gary Gibbons found the limit independently.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

But is it possible to *imagine* a system that exceeds the limit? An extensive discussion Page 471 shows that this is impossible, if the proper size of observers or test masses is taken into account. Even for a moving observer, when the force is increased by the (cube of the) relativistic dilation factor, or for an accelerating observer, when the observed acceleration is increased by the acceleration of the observer itself, the force limit must hold. The limit can never be exceeded, because for high accelerations a, horizons appear at distance a/c^2, and a mass m has a minimum diameter given by $l \geqslant 4Gm/c^2$.

The force and power limits are achieved only at horizons. They are valid for all observers and for all interactions.

As an alternative to the maximum force and power limits, we can take as a basic principle the statement: *There is a maximum rate of mass change in nature.* For all systems and observers, one has

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}m}{\mathrm{d}t} \leqslant \frac{c^3}{4G} = 1.0 \cdot 10^{35}\mathrm{kg/s} \,. \tag{874}$$

Equivalently, we can state: *There is a maximum mass-to-length ratio in nature.* For all systems and observers, one has

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}m}{\mathrm{d}l} \leqslant \frac{c^2}{4G} = 3.4 \cdot 10^{26}\mathrm{kg/m} \,. \tag{875}$$

Both the force and the power limits state that the flow of momentum or of energy through any *physical surface* (a term defined below) of any size, for any observer, in any coordinate system, never exceeds the limit value.

Because of the lack of nearby black holes or horizons, neither limit value is exceeded in any physical system found so far. This is the case at everyday length scales, in the microscopic world and in astrophysical systems. But even in Gedanken experiments the limits Page 471 cannot be exceeded. In fact, the limits become evident only when in such Gedanken experiments the sizes of observers or of test masses are taken into account. Otherwise, Page 471 apparent exceptions can be constructed, which are, however, unphysical.

Deducing general relativity*

In order to elevate the force or power limit to a principle of nature, we have to show that, just as special relativity follows from the maximum speed, so general relativity follows from the maximum force.

Ref. 1268 The maximum force and the maximum power are only realized at horizons. Horizons are regions of space-time where the curvature is so high that it limits the possibility of observation. The name 'horizon' is due to an analogy with the usual horizon of everyday life, which also limits the distance to which one can see. However, in general relativity horizons are surfaces, not lines. In fact, we can *define* the concept of horizon in general relativity as a region of maximum force; it is then easy to prove that it is always a two-dimensional surface, and that it has all the properties usually associated with it.

The connection between horizons and the maximum force or power allows us to deduce the field equations in a simple way. First, there is always a flow of energy at a horizon.

* This section can be skipped at first reading.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Horizons cannot be planes, since an infinitely extended plane would imply an infinite energy flow. To characterize the finite extension of a given horizon, we use its radius R and its total area A.

The energy flow through a horizon is characterized by an energy E and a proper length L of the energy pulse. When such an energy pulse flows perpendicularly through a horizon, the momentum change $\mathrm{d}p/\mathrm{d}t = F$ is given by

$$F = \frac{E}{L} \,. \tag{876}$$

Since we are at a horizon, we need to insert the maximum possible values. In terms of the horizon area A and radius R, we can rewrite the limit case as

$$\frac{c^4}{4G} = \frac{E}{A} 4\pi R^2 \frac{1}{L} \tag{877}$$

where we have introduced the maximum force and the maximum possible area $4\pi R^2$ of a horizon of (maximum local) radius R. The ratio E/A is the energy per unit area flowing through the horizon.

Horizons are often characterized by the so-called surface gravity a instead of the radius R. In the limit case, two are related by $a = c^2/2R$. This leads to

$$E = \frac{1}{4\pi G} a^2 A L \,. \tag{878}$$

Ref. 1269 Special relativity shows that at horizons the product aL of proper length and acceleration is limited by the value $c^2/2$. This leads to the central relation for the energy flow at horizons:

$$E = \frac{c^2}{8\pi G} a A \,. \tag{879}$$

This equation makes three points. First, the energy flowing through a horizon is limited. Secondly, this energy is proportional to the area of the horizon. Thirdly, the energy flow is proportional to the surface gravity. These are fundamental, and characteristic, statements of general relativity.

Taking differentials, the last relation can be rewritten as

$$\delta E = \frac{c^2}{8\pi G} a \, \delta A \,. \tag{880}$$

In this form, the result can also be applied to general horizons, including those that are curved or time-dependent.*

* Relation (880) is well known, though with different names for the observables. Since no communication is possible across a horizon, the detailed fate of energy flowing through a horizon is also unknown. Energy whose detailed fate is unknown is often called *heat*. Relation (880) therefore states that the heat flowing through a horizon is proportional to the horizon area. When quantum theory is introduced into the discussion, the area of a horizon can be called 'entropy' and its surface gravity can be called 'temperature'; relation

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Ref. 1270 In a well-known paper, Jacobson has given a beautiful proof of a simple connection: if energy flow is proportional to horizon area for all observers and all horizons, then general relativity follows. To see the connection to general relativity, we generalize relation (880) to general coordinate systems and general energy-flow directions.

The proof uses tensor notation. One introduces the general surface element $\mathrm{d}\Sigma$ and the local boost Killing vector field k that generates the horizon (with suitable norm). Jacobson rewrites the left-hand side of relation (880) as

$$\delta E = \int T_{ab} k^a \mathrm{d}\Sigma^b \,, \tag{882}$$

where T_{ab} is the energy–momentum tensor. This is valid in arbitrary coordinate systems and for arbitrary energy flow directions. Jacobson's main result is that the essential part of the right-hand side of relation (880) can be rewritten, using the (purely geometric) Raychaudhuri equation, as

$$a\delta A = c^2 \int R_{ab} k^a \mathrm{d}\Sigma^b \,, \tag{883}$$

where R_{ab} is the Ricci tensor describing space-time curvature.

Combining these two steps, we find that the energy–area relation (880) for horizons can be rewritten as

$$\int T_{ab} k^a \mathrm{d}\Sigma^b = \frac{c^4}{8\pi G} \int R_{ab} k^a d\Sigma^b \,. \tag{884}$$

Jacobson shows that this equation, together with local conservation of energy (i.e., vanishing divergence of the energy–momentum tensor), can only be satisfied if

$$T_{ab} = \frac{c^4}{8\pi G} \left(R_{ab} - (\frac{1}{2}R + \Lambda) g_{ab} \right) \,, \tag{885}$$

where Λ is a constant of integration whose value is not determined by the problem. These are the full field equations of general relativity, including the cosmological constant Λ.

The field equations are thus shown to be valid at horizons. Since it is possible, by choosing a suitable coordinate transformation, to position a horizon at any desired space-time event, the field equations must be valid over the whole of space-time.

Since it is possible to have a horizon at every event in space-time, at every event in nature there is the same maximum possible force (or power). This maximum force (or power) is thus a constant of nature.

In other words, the field equations of general relativity are a direct consequence of the limited energy flow at horizons, which in turn is due to the existence of a maximum force or power. One can thus speak of the maximum force *principle*. Conversely, the field equations imply maximum force. Maximum force and general relativity are thus equivalent.

(880) can then be rewritten as

$$\delta Q = T\delta S \,. \tag{881}$$

However, this translation of relation (880), which requires the quantum of action, is unnecessary here. We only cite it to show the relation between horizon behaviour and quantum gravity.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The bounds on force and power have important consequences. In particular, they imply statements on cosmic censorship, the Penrose inequality, the hoop conjecture, the non-existence of plane gravitational waves, the lack of space-time singularities, new experimental tests of the theory, and the elimination of competing theories of relativistic gravitation. These consequences are presented elsewhere. Ref. 1271

Deducing universal gravitation

Universal gravitation can be derived from the force limit in the case where both forces and speeds are much smaller than the maximum values. The first condition implies $\sqrt{4GMa} \ll c^2$, the second $v \ll c$ and $al \ll c^2$. Let us apply this to a specific case. Consider a satellite circling a central mass M at distance R with acceleration a. This system, with length $l = 2R$, has only one characteristic speed. Whenever this speed v is much smaller than c, v^2 must be proportional both to $al = 2aR$ and to $\sqrt{4GMa}$. Taken together, these results imply that $a = fGM/R^2$, for some numerical factor f. A quick check, for example using the observed escape velocity values, shows that $f = 1$. Forces and speeds much smaller than the limit values thus imply that the inverse square law of gravity holds. In other words, nature's limit on force implies the universal law of gravity. Challenge 1684 e

The size of physical systems in general relativity

General relativity, like the other theories of modern physics, implies a limit on the *size* of systems. There is a limit to the amount of matter that can be concentrated into a small volume:

$$l \geqslant \frac{4Gm}{c^2} \,. \tag{886}$$

The size limit is only achieved for black holes, those well-known systems which swallow everything that is thrown into them. It is fully equivalent to the force limit. All *composite* systems in nature comply with the lower size limit. Whether elementary particles fulfil or even match this limit remains one of the open questions of modern physics. At present, neither experiment nor theory allows clear statements on their size. More about this issue below.

General relativity also implies an 'indeterminacy relation': Ref. 1272

$$\frac{\Delta E}{\Delta l} \leqslant \frac{c^4}{4G} \,. \tag{887}$$

Since experimental data are available only for composite systems,* we cannot yet say whether this inequality also holds for elementary particles. This relation is not as well known as the previous one. In fact, tests of it – for example with binary pulsars – may distinguish general relativity from competing theories.

* For example, the latest measurements for the Sun give $T_\odot = GM_\odot/c^3 = 4.925\,490\,947\,\mu s$; the error in E is thus much smaller than the (scaled) error in its radius. Ref. 1273

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

A MECHANICAL ANALOGY FOR THE MAXIMUM FORCE

The maximum force is central to the theory of general relativity. Indeed, its value (adorned with a factor 2π) appears in the field equations. Its importance becomes clearer when we return to our old image of space-time as a deformable mattress. Like any material body, a mattress is described by a material constant that relates the deformation values to the values of applied energy. Similarly, a mattress, like any material, is described by the maximum stress it can bear before it breaks. These two values describe crystals as well as mattresses. In fact, for perfect crystals (without dislocations), these two material constants are the same.

Empty space-time somehow behaves like a perfect crystal, or a perfect mattress: it has a deformation-energy constant that is equal to the maximum force that can be applied to it. The constant of gravitation thus determines the elasticity of space-time. Now, crystals are not homogeneous, but are made up of atoms, while mattresses are made up of foam bubbles. What is the corresponding structure of space-time? This is a central question in the rest of our adventure. One thing is sure: unlike crystals, vacuum has no preferred directions. In fact, all these analogies suggest that the appearance of matter might be nature's way of preventing space-time from ripping apart. We have to patient for a while, before we can judge this opinion. By putting all the limits together, we take first step towards answering the question of the structure of space-time.

UNITS AND LIMIT VALUES FOR ALL PHYSICAL OBSERVABLES

The existence of a maximum force in nature is equivalent to general relativity. As a result, physics can now be seen as making three simple statements on motion:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{quantum theory on action:} && S \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{2} \\ &\text{special relativity on speed:} && v \leqslant c \\ &\text{general relativity on force:} && F \leqslant \frac{c^4}{4G} \,. \end{aligned} \tag{888}$$

These limits are valid for all physical systems, whether composite or elementary, and for all observers. Note that the limit quantities of special relativity, quantum theory and general relativity can also be seen as the right-hand sides of the respective indeterminacy relations. Indeed, the set (869, 872, 887) of indeterminacy relations or the set (868, 871, 886) of length limits is each fully equivalent to the three limit statements (888). Each set of limits can be taken as a (somewhat selective) summary of twentieth-century physics.

Challenge 1685 e

By combining the three fundamental limits, we can obtain limits on a number of physical observables. The following limits are valid generally, for both composite and elementary systems:

$$\text{time interval:} \qquad t \geqslant \sqrt{\frac{2G\hbar}{c^5}} \quad = \quad 7.6 \cdot 10^{-44}\,\text{s} \tag{889}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

$$\text{time-distance product:} \quad td \geqslant \frac{2G\hbar}{c^4} = 1.7 \cdot 10^{-78}\,\text{ms} \tag{890}$$

$$\text{acceleration:} \quad a \leqslant \sqrt{\frac{c^7}{2G\hbar}} = 4.0 \cdot 10^{51}\,\text{m/s}^2 \tag{891}$$

$$\text{angular frequency:} \quad \omega \leqslant 2\pi\sqrt{\frac{c^5}{2G\hbar}} = 8.2 \cdot 10^{43}\,\text{/s} \tag{892}$$

With the additional knowledge that space and time can mix, we get

$$\text{distance:} \quad d \geqslant \sqrt{\frac{2G\hbar}{c^3}} = 2.3 \cdot 10^{-35}\,\text{m} \tag{893}$$

$$\text{area:} \quad A \geqslant \frac{2G\hbar}{c^3} = 5.2 \cdot 10^{-70}\,\text{m}^2 \tag{894}$$

$$\text{volume:} \quad V \geqslant \left(\frac{2G\hbar}{c^3}\right)^{3/2} = 1.2 \cdot 10^{-104}\,\text{m}^3 \tag{895}$$

$$\text{curvature:} \quad K \leqslant \frac{c^3}{2G\hbar} = 1.9 \cdot 10^{69}\,\text{/m}^2 \tag{896}$$

$$\text{mass density:} \quad \rho \leqslant \frac{c^5}{8G^2\hbar} = 6.5 \cdot 10^{95}\,\text{kg/m}^3 \tag{897}$$

Of course, speed, action, angular momentum, power and force are also limited, as already stated. Up to a numerical factor, the limit for every physical observable corresponds to the Planck value. (The limit values are deduced from the commonly used Planck values simply by substituting $4G$ for G and $\hbar/2$ for $\hbar$.) These limit values are the true *natural units* of nature. In fact, the ideal would be to redefine the usual Planck values for all observables to these extremal values, by absorbing the numerical factors into the respective definitions. In the following, we call the limit values the *(corrected) Planck limits* and assume that the factors have been properly included. In other words, *every natural unit or (corrected) Planck unit is the limit value of the corresponding physical observable.*

Page 1398

Most of these limit statements are found throughout the literature, though the numerical factors are often different. Each limit has attracted a string of publications. The

Ref. 1274

existence of a smallest measurable distance and time interval of the order of the Planck values is discussed in quantum gravity and string theory. The maximum curvature has

Ref. 1275

been studied in quantum gravity; it has important consequences for the 'beginning' of the universe, where it excludes any infinitely large or small observable. The maximum mass density appears regularly in discussions on the energy of the vacuum.

With our present deduction of the limits we have achieved two results. First, the various arguments used in the literature are reduced to three generally accepted principles. Secondly, the confusion about the numerical factors is resolved. In the history of the Planck units, there has been much variation in the numerical factors employed. For example, the founding fathers of quantum theory forgot the 1/2 in the definition of the quantum of action. Similarly, the early relativists omitted the factor 4. With the present framework, the question of the correct factors in the Planck units can be considered set-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

tled.

Note that the dimensional independence of the three limits in nature means that quantum effects cannot be used to overcome the force limit; similarly, the power limit cannot be used to overcome the speed limit. The same is true for any other combination of limits: they are mutually independent and consistent.

Limits to space and time

> Those are my principles, and if you don't like them... well, I have others.
>
> Groucho Marx

The three limits of nature (888) result in a minimum distance and a minimum time interval. These minimum intervals arise directly from the *unification* of quantum theory and relativity: they do not appear if the theories are kept separate. In short, unification implies that there is a smallest length in nature. This result is important: the formulation of physics as a set of limit statements shows that *the continuum model of space and time is not correct.* Continuity and manifolds are only approximations, valid for large actions, low speeds and small forces. The reformulation of general relativity and quantum theory with limit statements makes this especially clear. No other assumptions are needed.

Ref. 1276 In fact, the connection between minimum length and gravity is not new. In 1969, Andrei Sakharov pointed out that a minimum length implies gravity. He showed that regularizing quantum field theory on curved space with a cut-off will induce counter-terms that include to lowest order the cosmological constant and then the Einstein–Hilbert action.

Page 1398 The existence of limit values for the length observable (and all others) has numerous consequences, discussed in detail elsewhere. In particular, the existence of a smallest length – and a corresponding shortest time interval – implies that no surface is *physical* if any part of it requires a localization in space-time to scales below the minimum length. (In addition, a physical surface must not cross any horizon.) Only by insisting on this condition can we eliminate unphysical examples that contravene the force and power limits. For example, this condition was overlooked in Bousso's early discussion of Ref. 1277 Bekenstein's entropy bound – though not in his more recent ones.

Ref. 1278 The corrected value of the Planck length should also appear in the so-called theories of 'doubly special relativity'. These theories try to expand special relativity in such a way that an invariant length appears.

The existence of a force limit in nature implies that no physical system can be smaller than a Schwarzschild black hole of the same mass. In particular, *point particles do not exist*. In addition, elementary particles are predicted to be larger than the corrected Planck length. So far, this prediction has not been tested by observations, as the scales in question are so small that they are beyond experimental reach. Detecting the sizes of elementary particles – for example, with electric dipole measurements – would make it possible Page 1398 to check the force limit directly. If quantum theory is taken into account, the bound is sharpened.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Mass and energy limits

Mass plays a special role in all these arguments. The set of limits (888) does not make it possible to extract a limit statement on the mass of physical systems. To find one, we have to restrict our aim somewhat.

The Planck limits mentioned so far apply to *all* physical systems, whether composite or elementary. Other limits apply only to elementary systems. In quantum theory, the distance limit is a size limit only for *composite* systems. A particle is elementary if the system size l is smaller than any conceivable dimension:

$$\text{for elementary particles:} \quad l \leqslant \frac{\hbar}{2mc} \,. \tag{898}$$

Using this new limit, valid only for elementary particles, we find the well-known mass, energy and momentum limits:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{for elementary particles:} \quad m \leqslant \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{8G}} &&= 7.7 \cdot 10^{-9}\,\text{kg} = 0.42 \cdot 10^{19}\,\text{GeV/c}^2 \\
&\text{for elementary particles:} \quad E \leqslant \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c^5}{8G}} &&= 6.9 \cdot 10^{8}\,\text{J} = 0.42 \cdot 10^{19}\,\text{GeV} \\
&\text{for elementary particles:} \quad p \leqslant \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c^3}{8G}} &&= 2.3\,\text{kg m/s} = 0.42 \cdot 10^{19}\,\text{GeV/c}
\end{aligned} \tag{899}$$

These single-particle limits, corresponding to the corrected Planck mass, energy and momentum, were discussed in 1968 by Andrei Sakharov, though with different numerical factors. They are regularly cited in elementary particle theory. All known measurements comply with them. It is also known that the unification of the electromagnetic and the two nuclear interactions takes place at an energy near, but still clearly below, the maximum particle energy.

Ref. 1279

Virtual particles – a new definition

In fact, there are physical systems that exceed all three limits. Nature does contain systems that move faster than light, that show actions below half the quantum of action, and that experience forces larger than the force limit.

We know from special relativity that the virtual particles exchanged in collisions move faster than light. We know from quantum theory that virtual particle exchange implies actions below the minimum action. Virtual particles also imply an instantaneous change of momentum; they thus exceed the force limit. Thus *virtual particles* are those particles that exceed all the limits that hold for (real) physical systems.

Page 444

Page 1037

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Limits in thermodynamics

Thermodynamics can also be summarized in a single statement about motion: *There is a smallest entropy in nature.*

$$S \geqslant \frac{k}{2} \,. \tag{900}$$

The entropy S is limited by half the Boltzmann constant k. This result is almost 100 years old; it was stated most clearly by Leo Szilard, though with a different numerical factor. Like the other limit statements we have examined, this result can also be phrased as a indeterminacy relation:

Ref. 1280

$$\Delta \frac{1}{T} \, \Delta U \geqslant \frac{k}{2} \,. \tag{901}$$

This relation was given by Bohr and discussed by Heisenberg and many others (though with k instead of $k/2$). It is mentioned here in order to complete the list of indeterminacy relations and fundamental constants. With the single-particle limits, the entropy limit leads to an upper limit for temperature:

Ref. 1281

$$T \leqslant \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c^5}{2Gk^2}} = 1.0 \cdot 10^{32}\,\mathrm{K} \,. \tag{902}$$

This corresponds to the temperature at which the energy per degree of freedom is given by the (corrected) Planck energy. A more realistic value would have to take account of the number of degrees of freedom of a particle at Planck energy. This would change the numerical factor.

Electromagnetic limits and units

Our discussion of limits can be extended to include electromagnetism. Using the (low-energy) electromagnetic coupling constant α, one gets the following limits for physical systems interacting electromagnetically:

electric charge: $$q \geqslant \sqrt{4\pi\varepsilon_0 \alpha c \hbar} = e = 0.16\,\mathrm{aC} \tag{903}$$

electric field: $$E \leqslant \sqrt{\frac{c^7}{64\pi\varepsilon_0 \alpha \hbar G^2}} = \frac{c^4}{4Ge} = 2.4 \cdot 10^{61}\,\mathrm{V/m} \tag{904}$$

magnetic field: $$B \leqslant \sqrt{\frac{c^5}{64\pi\varepsilon_0 \alpha \hbar G^2}} = \frac{c^3}{4Ge} = 7.9 \cdot 10^{52}\,\mathrm{T} \tag{905}$$

voltage: $$U \leqslant \sqrt{\frac{c^4}{32\pi\varepsilon_0 \alpha G}} = \frac{1}{e}\sqrt{\frac{\hbar c^5}{8G}} = 1.5 \cdot 10^{27}\,\mathrm{V} \tag{906}$$

inductance: $$L \geqslant \frac{1}{8\pi\varepsilon_0 \alpha}\sqrt{\frac{2\hbar G}{c^7}} = \frac{1}{e^2}\sqrt{\frac{\hbar^3 G}{2c^5}} = 4.4 \cdot 10^{-40}\,\mathrm{H} \tag{907}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

With the additional assumption that in nature at most one particle can occupy one Planck volume, one gets

$$\text{charge density:} \quad \rho_e \leqslant \sqrt{\frac{\pi\varepsilon_0\alpha}{2G^3}}\,\frac{c^5}{\hbar} = e\sqrt{\frac{c^9}{8G^3\hbar^3}} = 1.3\cdot 10^{85}\,\mathrm{C/m^3} \tag{908}$$

$$\text{capacitance:} \quad C \geqslant 8\pi\varepsilon_0\alpha\sqrt{\frac{2\hbar G}{c^3}} = e^2\sqrt{\frac{8G}{c^5\hbar}} = 1.0\cdot 10^{-46}\,\mathrm{F} \tag{909}$$

For the case of a single conduction channel, one gets

$$\text{electric resistance:} \quad R \geqslant \frac{1}{8\pi\varepsilon_0\alpha c} = \frac{\hbar}{2e^2} = 2.1\,\mathrm{k\Omega} \tag{910}$$

$$\text{electric conductivity:} \quad G \leqslant 8\pi\varepsilon_0\alpha c = \frac{2e^2}{\hbar} = 0.49\,\mathrm{mS} \tag{911}$$

$$\text{electric current:} \quad I \leqslant \sqrt{\frac{2\pi\varepsilon_0\alpha c^6}{G}} = e\sqrt{\frac{c^5}{2\hbar G}} = 7.4\cdot 10^{23}\,\mathrm{A} \tag{912}$$

Many of these limits have been studied already. The magnetic field limit is significant in the study of extreme stars and black holes. The maximum electric field plays a role in the theory of gamma ray bursters. For current, conductivity and resistance in single channels, the limits and their effects were studied extensively in the 1980s and 1990s by researchers who will probably win a Nobel Prize in the not too distant future.

Ref. 1282
Ref. 1283

The observation of quarks and of collective excitations in semiconductors with charge $e/3$ does not necessarily invalidate the charge limit for physical systems. In neither case is there is a physical system – defined as localized mass–energy interacting incoherently with the environment – with charge $e/3$.

Vacuum and mass–energy – two sides of the same coin

We have found that there is a fixed limit to every physical observable. Many consequences have been discussed already in previous sections. We have seen that the existence of a limit to every observable implies that at Planck scales no physical observable can be described by real numbers, and that no low-energy symmetry is valid.

Page 1396
Page 1425

One conclusion is especially important for the rest of our adventure. We saw that there is a limit to the precision of length measurements in nature. This limit is valid both for length measurements of empty space and for length measurements of matter (or radiation). Now let us recall what we do when we measure the length of a table with a ruler. To find the ends of the table, we must be able to distinguish the table from the surrounding air. In more precise terms, we must be able to distinguish matter from vacuum. But at Planck energy we cannot do this. At this scale, the intrinsic measurement limitations of nature mean that we cannot say whether we are measuring vacuum or matter.

Page 1398

We have explored this conclusion in detail, and seen that it is the only consistent description at Planck scales. You can pick any observable you want to use to distinguish vacuum from matter – for example, colour, mass, size, charge, speed or angular momentum.

Page 471

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

At Planck scales, the limits to observables lead to limits to measurement precision. Furthermore, the measurement limits are of the same size as the observable to be measured. Therefore, at Planck scales it is impossible to distinguish between matter and vacuum, and you cannot tell whether a box is full or empty.

To state the conclusion in the sharpest possible terms: *vacuum and matter do not differ at Planck scales*. This counter-intuitive result is one of the charms of theoretical high-energy physics. It has inspired many researchers in the field and some have written best-sellers about it. Brian Greene was particularly successful in presenting this side of quantum geometry to the wider public. Ref. 1284

At this point of our adventure, many questions are still open. The precise manner in which a minimum distance leads to a homogeneous and isotropic vacuum is unclear. We still have to find a way to describe matter and vacuum with the same concepts. And of course, there is still the list of open questions in physics given above. However, these conceptual results give hope: there are interesting ideas awaiting us.

Curiosities and fun challenges about Planck limits

The (corrected) Planck limits are statements about properties of nature. There is no way to measure values exceeding these limits, with any kind of experiment. Naturally, such a claim provokes the search for counter-examples and leads to many paradoxes.

* *

The minimum angular momentum may come as a surprise at first, especially when one thinks about particles with spin zero. However, the angular momentum in question is *total* angular momentum, including the orbital part with respect to the observer. The total angular momentum is never smaller than $\hbar/2$.

* *

How can the maximum force be determined by gravity alone, which is the weakest interaction? It turns out that in situations near the maximum force, the other interactions are negligible. This is the reason why gravity must be included in a unified description of nature.

* *

At first sight, it seems that electric charge can be used in such a way that the acceleration of a charged body towards a charged black hole is increased to a value, when multiplied with the mass, exceeding the force limit. However, the changes in the horizon for charged black holes prevent this. Challenge 1686 ny

* *

The general fact that to every limit value in nature there is a corresponding indeterminacy relation is valid in particular for electricity. Indeed, there is an indeterminacy relation for capacitors, of the form

$$\Delta C \, \Delta U \geqslant e \tag{913}$$

where e is the positron charge, C capacity and U potential difference; there is also an

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

indeterminacy relation between electric current I and time t

$$\Delta I \, \Delta t \geqslant e \; . \tag{914}$$

Ref. 1285 Both these relations may be found in the literature.

* *

The gravitational attraction between two masses never yields force values high enough to exceed the force limit. Why? First of all, masses m and M cannot come closer together than the sum of their horizon radii. Using $F = GmM/r^2$ with the distance r given by the (naive) sum of the two black hole radii as $r = 2G(M + m)/c^2$, one gets

$$F \leqslant \frac{c^4}{4G} \frac{Mm}{(M+m)^2} \; , \tag{915}$$

which is never larger than the force limit. Thus even two attracting black holes cannot exceed the force limit – in the inverse-square approximation of universal gravity. In short, the minimum size of masses means that the maximum force cannot be exceeded.

* *

It is well known that gravity bends space. Therefore, if they are to be fully convincing, our calculation needs to be repeated taking into account the curvature of space. The simplest way is to study the force generated by a black hole on a test mass hanging from a wire that is lowered towards a black hole horizon. For an *unrealistic point mass*, the force would Ref. 1286 diverge at the horizon. Indeed, for a point mass m lowered towards a black hole of mass M at (conventionally defined radial) distance d, the force would be

$$F = \frac{GMm}{d^2 \sqrt{1 - \frac{2GM}{dc^2}}} \; . \tag{916}$$

This diverges at $d = 0$, the location of the horizon. However, even a test mass cannot be smaller than its own gravitational radius. If we want to reach the horizon with a *realistic* test mass, we need to choose a small test mass m: only a small mass can get near the horizon. For vanishingly small masses, however, the resulting force tends to zero. Indeed, letting the distance tend to the smallest possible value by letting $d = 2G(m + M)/c^2 \to 2GM/c^2$ requires $m \to 0$, which makes the force $F(m, d)$ vanish. If on the other hand, we remain away from the horizon and look for the maximum force by using a mass as large as can possibly fit into the available distance (the calculation is straightforward), then again the force limit is never exceeded. In other words, for *realistic* test masses, expression (916) is *never* larger than $c^4/4G$. Taking into account the minimal size of test masses, we thus see that the maximum force is never exceeded in gravitational systems.

* *

An absolute power limit implies a limit on the energy that can be transported per unit time through any imaginable surface. At first sight, it may seem that the combined power

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

emitted by two radiation sources that each emit 3/4 of the maximum value should give 3/2 times the maximum value. However, the combination forms a black hole, or at least prevents part of the radiation from being emitted by swallowing it between the two sources.

* *

One possible system that actually achieves the power limit is the final stage of black hole evaporation. But even in this case, the power limit is not exceeded.

* *

The maximum force limit states that the stress–energy tensor, when integrated over any physical surface, does not exceed the limit value. No such integral, over any physical surface, of any tensor component in any coordinate system, can exceed the force limit, provided that it is measured by a nearby observer or a test body with a realistic proper size. The maximum force limit thus applies to any component of any force vector, as well as to its magnitude. It applies to gravitational, electromagnetic, and nuclear forces; and it applies to all realistic observers. It is not important whether the forces are real or fictitious; nor whether we are discussing the 3-forces of Galilean physics or the 4-forces of special relativity. Indeed, the force limit applied to the zeroth component of the 4-force is the power limit.

Ref. 1267

* *

In terms of mass flows, the power limit implies that flow of water through a tube is limited in throughput. This limit seems to be unrecorded in the literature.

* *

The force limit cannot be overcome with Lorentz boosts. A Lorentz boost of any non-vanishing force value seems to allow the force limit to be exceeded at high speeds. However, such a transformation would create a horizon that makes any point with a potentially higher force value inaccessible.

* *

The power limit is of interest if applied to the universe as a whole. Indeed, it can be used to explain Olbers' paradox: the sky is dark at night because the combined luminosity of all light sources in the universe cannot be brighter than the maximum value.

* *

The negative energy volume density $-\Lambda c^4/4\pi G$ introduced by the positive cosmological constant Λ corresponds to a negative pressure (both quantities have the same dimensions). When multiplied by the minimum area it yields a force value

$$F = \frac{\Lambda\hbar c}{2\pi} = 4.8 \cdot 10^{-79}\,\mathrm{N}\,. \tag{917}$$

This is also the gravitational force between two corrected Planck masses located at the cosmological distance $\sqrt{\pi/4\Lambda}$. If we make the (wishful) assumption that this is the smallest

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

possible force in nature (the numerical prefactor is not yet known for sure), we arrive at the fascinating conjecture that the full theory of general relativity, including the cosmological constant, might be defined by the combination of a maximum and a minimum force in nature.

UPPER AND LOWER LIMITS TO OBSERVABLES

In our quest to understand motion, we have focused our attention on the limitations to which it is subject. Special relativity posits a limit to speed, namely the speed of light c. Page 471 General relativity limits force and power respectively by $c^4/4G$ and $c^5/4G$, and quantum theory introduces a smallest value $\hbar/2$ for angular momentum or action. We have seen that nature imposes the limit k on entropy and the limit e on electrical charge. Together, all these limits induce extremal values for *all* physical observables, given by the corresponding (corrected) Planck values. Page 1458 We explored the Planck limits in the last section.

A question arises: does nature also impose limits on physical observables at the opposite end of the measurement scale? For example, there is a highest force and a highest power in nature. Is there also a lowest force and a lowest power? Is there also a lowest speed?

We will show that there are indeed such limits, for all observables. We give the general method to generate such bounds, and explore several examples.* This exploration will take us on an interesting survey of modern physics.

Size and energy dependence

While looking for additional limits in nature, we note a fundamental fact. Any upper limit for angular momentum, and any lower limit for power, must be *system-dependent*. Such limits will not be absolute, but will depend on properties of the system. Now, a physical system is a part of nature characterized by a boundary and its content.** Thus the simplest properties shared by all systems are their size (characterized in the following by the diameter) L and their energy E. With these characteristics we can deduce system-dependent limits for every physical observable. The general method is straightforward: we take the known inequalities for speed, action, power, charge and entropy, and then extract a limit for any observable, by inserting the length and energy as required. We then have to select the strictest of the limits we find.

Angular momentum, action and speed

It only takes a moment to check that the ratio of angular momentum D to mass times length has the dimensions of speed. Since speeds are limited by the speed of light, we get

$$D_{\text{system}} \leqslant \frac{1}{c} LE \,. \tag{918}$$

* This results were added in June 2004.

** Quantum theory refines this definition: a physical system is a part of nature that in addition interacts *incoherently* with its environment. Page 1081 In the following discussion we will assume that this condition is satisfied.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Indeed, there do not seem to be any exceptions to this limit in nature. In no known system, from atoms to molecules, from ice skaters to galaxies, does the angular momentum exceed this value. Even the most violently rotating objects, the so-called extremal black holes, are limited in angular momentum by $D \leqslant LE/c$. (Actually, this limit is correct only if the energy is taken as the irreducible mass times c^2; if the usual mass is used, the limit is too large by a factor of 4.) The limit deduced from general relativity, given by $D \leqslant L^2c^3/4G$, is not stricter than the one just given. No system-dependent lower limit for angular momentum can be deduced.

Ref. 1287

The maximum value for angular momentum is also interesting when it is seen as an action limit. Action is the time integral of the difference between kinetic and potential energy. Since nature always seeks to minimize the action W, it seems strange to search for systems that maximize it. You might check for yourself that the action limit $W \leqslant LE/c$ is not exceeded in any physical process.

Challenge 1687 ny

Similarly, speed times mass times length is an action. Since action values in nature are limited from below by $\hbar/2$, we get

$$v_{\text{system}} \geqslant \frac{\hbar c^2}{2} \frac{1}{LE} \,. \tag{919}$$

This is not a new result: it is just a form of the indeterminacy relation of quantum theory. It gives a minimum speed for any system of energy E and diameter L. Even the extremely slow radius change of a black hole by evaporation just realizes this minimal speed. Continuing with the same method, one also finds that the limit deduced from general relativity, $v \leqslant (c^2/4G)(L/E)$, gives no new information. Therefore, no *system-dependent* upper speed limit exists.

Challenge 1688 ny

Challenge 1689 e

For *single particles*, we get the absolute lower speed limit given by

$$v_{\text{particle}} \geqslant \frac{\sqrt{G\hbar c^3}}{2L_{\text{universe}}} = \frac{L_{\text{c.Planck}}}{L_{\text{universe}}} c \approx 7 \cdot 10^{-53}\,\text{m/s} \,. \tag{920}$$

It has never been reached or approached by any observation.

Incidentally, the limits are not unique. Other limits can be found in a systematic way. Upper limits can be multiplied, for example, by factors of $(L/E)(c^4/4G)$ or $(LE)(2/\hbar c)$, yielding less strict upper limits. A similar rule can be given for lower limits.*

With the same approach, we can now systematically deduce all size- and energy-dependent limits for physical observables. We embark on a tour of the most important ones.

* The strictest upper limits are those with the smallest exponent for length, and the strictest lower limits are those with the largest exponent of length.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Force, power and luminosity

We have seen that force and power are central to general relativity. Thanks to the connection $W = FLT$ between action W, force F, distance L and time T, we can deduce

$$F_{\text{system}} \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{2c}\,\frac{1}{T^2}\,. \tag{921}$$

Experiments do not reach this limit. The smallest forces measured in nature are those in atomic force microscopes, where values as small as 1 aN are observed. But even these values are above the lower force limit.

The power P emitted by a system of size L and mass M is limited by

$$c^3\,\frac{M}{L} \geqslant P_{\text{system}} \geqslant 2\hbar G\,\frac{M}{L^3}\,. \tag{922}$$

The limit on the left is the upper limit for any engine or lamp, as deduced from relativity; not even the universe exceeds it. The limit on the right is the minimum power emitted by any system through quantum gravity effects. Indeed, no system is completely tight. Even black holes, the systems with the best ability to keep components inside their enclosure, radiate. The power radiated by black holes should just meet this limit, provided the length L is taken to be the circumference of the black hole. Thus the claim of the quantum gravity limit is that the power emitted by a black hole is the smallest power that is emitted by any composite system of the same surface gravity. (However, the numerical factors in the black hole power appearing in the literature are not yet consistent.)

Acceleration

The acceleration a of a system of size L and mass M, as measured by a *nearby* inertial observer, is limited by

$$c^2\,\frac{1}{L} \geqslant a_{\text{system}} \geqslant 4G\,\frac{M}{L^2}\,. \tag{923}$$

The lower limit (on the right) gives the acceleration due to universal gravity. Indeed, the relative acceleration between a system and an observer has at least this value. The upper limit (on the left) is due to special relativity. No exception to either of these limits has ever been observed. Using the limit on the size of masses, the upper limit can be transformed into the equivalent acceleration limit

Ref. 1288

$$\frac{2c^3}{\hbar}\,M \geqslant a \tag{924}$$

which has also never been approached, despite many attempts. Thus the upper limit to acceleration is a quantum limit, the lower one a gravitational limit.

The acceleration of the radius of a black hole due to evaporation can be much lower than the limit $a \geqslant 4GM/L^2$. Why is this not a counter-example?

Challenge 1690 ny

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Momentum

The momentum p of a system of size L is limited by

$$\frac{c^3}{4G}\, L \geqslant p_{\text{system}} \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{2}\,\frac{1}{L}\,. \tag{925}$$

The lower limit is due to quantum theory; experiments have confirmed it for all radiation and matter. The upper limit is due to general relativity; it has never been exceeded.

Ref. 1289 For particles, the absolute limit is

$$p_{\text{particle}} \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{2L_{\text{universe}}} = \frac{L_{\text{c.Planck}}}{2L_{\text{universe}}}\, p_{\text{c.Planck}} \approx 8 \cdot 10^{-61}\,\text{kgm/s}\,. \tag{926}$$

Lifetime, distance and curvature

Time is something special. What are the limits to time measurements? As before, we find that any measured time interval t in a system in thermal equilibrium is limited by

$$\frac{2}{\hbar}\, ML^2 \geqslant t_{\text{thermal system}} \geqslant \frac{4G}{c^3}\, M\,. \tag{927}$$

The lower time limit is the gravitational time. No clock can measure a time shorter than this. Similarly, no system can produce signals of shorter duration. Black holes, for example, emit radiation with a frequency given by this minimum value.

The upper time limit is expected to be the exact lifetime of a black hole. (There is not yet a consensus in the literature on the numerical factor.) The upper limit to time measurements is due to quantum theory. It leads to an obvious question: what happens to a single atom in space after the limit time has passed by? As a composite system, an atom is not comparable with a black hole. The formula for the lifetime assumes that decay can take place in the tiniest energy steps. If there is no decay mechanism, the formula does not apply. Thus the expression (927) does not apply to atoms.

Distance limits are straightforward:

$$\frac{2c}{\hbar}\, ML^2 \geqslant d \geqslant \frac{4G}{c^2}\, M\,. \tag{928}$$

Since curvature is an inverse square of distance, also the curvature of space-time is limited.

Mass change

The rate of mass change $\mathrm{d}M/\mathrm{d}t$ of a system of size L and mass M is limited by

$$\frac{c^5}{16G^2}\,\frac{L}{M} \geqslant \frac{\mathrm{d}M}{\mathrm{d}t} \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{2}\,\frac{1}{L^2}\,. \tag{929}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

The limits apply to systems in thermal equilibrium. The upper limit (on the left) is due to general relativity; it is never exceeded. The lower limit (on the right) is due to quantum theory. Again, all experiments are consistent with these limit values.

Mass and density

Limits for rest mass only make sense if the system is characterized by a size L only. We then have

$$\frac{c^2}{4G}\, L \geqslant M \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{2c}\,\frac{1}{L}\,. \tag{930}$$

We have discussed the upper limit for mass in relation to general relativity. Adding mass or energy to a black hole always increases its size. The mass of a system can never exceed this value – indeed, no such system is even imaginable. The lower limit on mass is due to quantum theory: it follows directly from the quantum of action.

The mass density ρ of a system of size L is limited by

$$\frac{c^2}{4G}\,\frac{1}{L^2} \geqslant \rho \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{2c}\,\frac{1}{L^4}\,. \tag{931}$$

The upper limit, due to general relativity, is only achieved for black holes. The lower limit is due to quantum theory. It also applies to the vacuum, if a piece of vacuum of size L is taken as a physical system. Again, many other (less strict) limits can be formulated by using the transformation rules mentioned above. Page 1476

The strange charm of the entropy bound

Ref. 1290 In 1973, Bekenstein discovered a famous limit that connects the entropy S of a physical system with its size and mass. No system has a larger entropy than one bounded by a horizon. The larger the horizon surface, the larger the entropy. We write

$$\frac{S}{S_{\text{limit}}} \leqslant \frac{A}{A_{\text{limit}}} \tag{932}$$

which gives

$$S \leqslant \frac{kc^3}{4G\hbar}\, A\,, \tag{933}$$

where A is the surface of the system. Equality is realized only for black holes. The old question of the origin of the factor 4 in the entropy of black holes is thus answered here: it is due to the factor 4 in the force or power bound in nature (provided that the factors from the Planck entropy and the Planck action cancel). Time will tell whether this explanation will be generally accepted. Ref. 1291 Page 290 Stay tuned.

We can also derive a more general relation by using a mysterious assumption, which we will discuss afterwards. We assume that the limits for vacuum are opposite to those

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

for matter. We can then write $c^2/4G \leqslant M/L$ for the vacuum. This gives

$$S \leqslant \frac{\pi kc}{\hbar} ML = \frac{2\pi kc}{\hbar} MR \,. \tag{934}$$

In other words, we used

$$\frac{S}{S_{\text{c.Planck}}} \leqslant \frac{M}{M_{\text{c.Planck}}} \frac{A}{A_{\text{c.Planck}}} \frac{L_{\text{c.Planck}}}{L} \,. \tag{935}$$

Expression (934) is called *Bekenstein's entropy bound*. No exception has ever been found or constructed, despite many attempts. Again, the limit value itself is only realized for black holes. Ref. 1277

We need to explain the strange assumption used above. We are investigating the entropy of a horizon. Horizons are not matter, but limits to empty space. The entropy of horizons is due to the large number of virtual particles found at them. In order to deduce the maximum entropy of expression (935) one therefore has to use the properties of the vacuum. In other words, *either* we use a mass-to-length ratio for vacuum *above* the Planck limit, *or* we use the Planck entropy as the *maximum* value for vacuum.

Other, equivalent limits for entropy can be found if other variables are introduced. For example, since the ratio of the shear viscosity η to the volume density of entropy (times k) has the dimensions of action, we can directly write Ref. 1292

$$S \leqslant \frac{k}{\hbar} \eta V \,. \tag{936}$$

Again, equality is only attained in the case of black holes. In time, no doubt, the list of similar bounds will grow longer.

Is there also a smallest entropy? So far, there does not seem to be a system-dependent minimum value for entropy: the present approach gives no expression that is larger than k. Challenge 1691 ny

The establishment of the entropy limit is an important step towards making our description of motion consistent. If space-time can move, as general relativity maintains, it also has an entropy. How could entropy be limited if space-time were continuous? Clearly, because of the existence of a minimum distance and minimum time in nature, space-time cannot be continuous, but must have a finite number of degrees of freedom, and thus a finite entropy.

The Bekenstein limit also leads to some interesting speculations. Let us speculate that the universe itself, being surrounded by a horizon, meets the Bekenstein bound. The entropy bound gives a bound to all degrees of freedom inside a system: it tells us that the number $N_{\text{d.o.f.}}$ of degrees of freedom of the universe is roughly Challenge 1692 e

$$N_{\text{d.o.f.}} \approx 10^{132} \,. \tag{937}$$

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Compare this with the number $N_{\text{Pl. vol.}}$ of Planck volumes in the universe

$$N_{\text{Pl. vol.}} \approx 10^{183} \tag{938}$$

and with the number $N_{\text{part.}}$ of particles in the universe

$$N_{\text{part.}} \approx 10^{91} \,. \tag{939}$$

We see that particles are only a tiny fraction of what moves around. Most motion must be movement of space-time. But also, space-time moves much less than naively expected. To find out how all this happens is the challenge of the unified description of motion.

Temperature

A lower limit for the temperature of a thermal system can be found using the idea that the number of degrees of freedom of a system is limited by its surface, or more precisely, by the ratio between the surface and the Planck surface. One gets the limit

$$T \geqslant \frac{4G\hbar}{\pi kc} \frac{M}{L^2} \,. \tag{940}$$

Alternatively, using the method given above, one can use the limit on the thermal energy $kT/2 \geqslant \hbar c/2\pi L$ (the thermal wavelength must be smaller than the size of the system) together with the limit on mass $c^2/4G \geqslant M/L$, and deduce the same result.

We have met this limit already: when the system is a black hole, it gives the temperature of the emitted radiation. In other words, the temperature of black holes is the lower limit for all physical systems for which a temperature can be defined, provided they share the *same boundary gravity*. The latter condition makes sense: boundary gravity is accessible from the outside and describes the full physical system, since it depends on both its boundary and its content. So far, no exception to this claim is known. All systems from everyday life comply with it, as do all stars. Even the coldest known systems in the universe, namely Bose–Einstein condensates and other cold matter produced in laboratories, are much hotter than the limit, and thus much hotter than black holes of the same surface gravity. (We saw earlier that a consistent Lorentz transformation for temperature is not possible; so the minimum temperature limit is only valid for an observer at the same gravitational potential as the system under consideration and stationary relative to it.)

Challenge 1693 s
Page 438

There seems to be no consistent way to define an upper limit for a system-dependent temperature. Limits for other thermodynamic quantities can be found, but we will not discuss them here.

Challenge 1694 ny

Electromagnetic observables

When electromagnetism plays a role in a system, the system also needs to be characterized by a charge Q. Our method then gives the following lower limit for the electric field

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

E:

$$E \geqslant 4Ge\,\frac{M^2}{Q^2L^2}\,. \tag{941}$$

We write the limit in terms of the elementary charge e, though it would be more appropriate to write it using the fine structure constant via $e = \sqrt{4\pi\varepsilon_0\alpha\hbar c}$. In observations, this limit has never been exceeded. Can you show whether it is attained by maximally charged black holes? Challenge 1695 ny

For the magnetic field we get

$$B \geqslant \frac{4Ge}{c}\,\frac{M^2}{Q^2L^2}\,. \tag{942}$$

Again, this limit is satisfied by all known systems in nature.

Similar limits can be found for the other electromagnetic observables. In fact, several of the limits given earlier are modified when electrical charge is included. Can you show how the size limit changes when electric charge is taken into account? There is an entire research field dedicated to the deduction of the most general limits valid in nature. Challenge 1696 ny

Curiosities and fun challenges about limits to observables

These limits yield a plethora of interesting paradoxes that can be discussed in lectures and student exercises. All paradoxes can be solved by carefully taking into account the combination of effects from general relativity and quantum theory. Apparent violations only occur when one of the two aspects is somehow forgotten. We will study a few examples.

* *

Several black hole limits are of importance to the universe itself. For example, the observed average mass density of the universe is not far from the corresponding black hole limit. The black hole lifetime limit provides an upper limit for the age of the universe. However, the age of the universe is far from that limit by a large factor. In fact, since the universe's size and age are increasing, the age limit is pushed further into the future with every second that passes. The universe evolves so as to escape its own decay.

* *

The content of a system is characterized not only by its mass and charge, but also by its strangeness, isospin, colour charge, charge and parity. Can you deduce the limits for these quantities? Challenge 1697 r

* *

In our discussion of black hole limits, we silently assumed that they interact, like any thermal system, in an incoherent way with the environment. Which of the results of this section change when this condition is dropped, and how? Which limits can be overcome? Challenge 1698 s

* *

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1699 e Can you find a general method to deduce all limits?

* *

Brushing aside some important details, we can give the following summary of our study of nature. For Galilean physics, there is no difference between composite and elementary systems; for quantum theory, there are no (really large) composite systems; for general relativity, there are no elementary systems. Now, a unified theory of nature has to unify quantum theory and general relativity. Since quantum theory affirms that no (really large) composite systems exist, while general relativity affirms that no elementary systems exist, a unified theory should affirm that *no* systems exist. This indeed seems to be a valid conclusion. It is corroborated by the result that in a unified description of nature, the observables time, space and mass cannot be clearly distinguished from each other, which implies that systems cannot be clearly distinguished from their surroundings. More precisely, systems do not really exist at unification energy. We will come back to this issue.

Page 1458

LIMITS TO MEASUREMENT PRECISION AND THEIR CHALLENGE TO THOUGHT

We now know that in nature, every physical measurement has a lower and an upper bound. One of the bounds is size-dependent, the other is absolute. So far, no exception to these claims is known.

The smallest relative measurement error possible in nature is thus the ratio of the two bounds. In short, the existence of a smallest length, a highest force and a smallest action, taken together, imply that *all measurements are limited in precision.*

The existence of a fundamental limit to measurement precision is not a new result. But it raises many issues. If the mass and the size of any system are themselves imprecise, what happens to the limit formulae given above?

Challenge 1700 r

Because of the fundamental limits to measurement precision, *the measured values of physical observables do not require the full set of real numbers.* In fact, limited precision implies that no observable can be described by the real numbers. We thus recover a result that appears whenever quantum theory and gravity are brought together.

In addition, we found that measurement errors increase when the characteristic measurement energy approaches the Planck energy. In that domain, the measurement errors of any observable are comparable with the measurement values themselves.

Page 1398

Limited measurement precision thus implies that at the Planck energy it is impossible to speak about points, instants, events or dimensionality. Similarly, at the Planck length it is impossible to distinguish between positive and negative time values: so particles and antiparticles are not clearly distinguished at Planck scales. The minimum length implies that there is no way to define the exact boundaries of objects or elementary particles. But a boundary is what separates matter from vacuum. In short, a minimum measurement error means that, at Planck scales, it is impossible to distinguish objects from vacuum with complete precision. To put it bluntly, at Planck scales, neither systems nor time and space do exist.

Page 1398

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

These conclusions are in complete agreement with the conclusions of modern research on unified theories. The limit principles imply the same conceptual results as are found in string theory and the various approaches to quantum gravity. To show the power of the maximum force limit, we now explore a few conclusions that go beyond such approaches.

Measurement precision and the existence of sets

The impossibility of completely eliminating measurement errors has an additional and important consequence. In physics, it is generally assumed that nature is a *set* of components. These components are assumed to be separable from each other. This tacit assumption is introduced in three main situations: it is assumed that matter consists of separable particles, that space-time consists of separable events or points, and that the set of states consists of separable initial conditions. So far, physics has built the whole of its description of nature on the concept of a *set*.

A fundamental limit to measurement precision implies that nature is *not* a set of such separable elements. It implies that physical entities can be distinguished only approximately. The approximate distinction is only possible at energies much lower than the Planck energy. As humans, we do live at such relatively small energies, and we can safely make the approximation. Indeed, the approximation is excellent; we do not notice any error. But at Planck energies, a perfect separation is impossible in principle. In particular, at the cosmic horizon, at the big bang, and at Planck scales, any precise distinction between two events or two particles becomes impossible.

Page 1398

Another way to reach this result is the following. Separation of two entities requires *different measurement results* – for example, different positions, different masses or different velocities. Whatever observable is chosen, at the Planck energy the distinction becomes impossible because of the large measurements errors. Only at everyday energies is a distinction approximately possible. Any distinction between two physical systems – for example, between a toothpick and a mountain – is possible only *approximately*: at Planck scales, a boundary cannot be drawn.

Page 1398

A third argument is the following. In order to *count* any entities in nature – a set of particles, a discrete set of points, or any other discrete set of physical observables – the entities have to be separable. But the inevitable measurement errors contradict separability. Thus at the Planck energy it is impossible to count physical objects with precision. *Nature has no parts.*

Page 1398

In short, at Planck energies, perfect separation is impossible in principle. We cannot distinguish observations. *At Planck scales it is impossible to split nature into separate entities.* In nature, elements of sets cannot be defined. Neither discrete nor continuous sets can be constructed. *Nature does not contain sets or elements.*

Page 1398

Since sets and elements are only approximations, the concept of a 'set', which assumes separable elements, is too specialized to describe nature. Nature cannot be described at Planck scales – i.e., with full precision – if any of the concepts used for its description presupposes sets. However, all concepts used in the past 25 centuries to describe nature – space, time, particles, phase space, Hilbert space, Fock space, particle space, loop space or moduli space – are based on sets. They must all be abandoned at Planck energy.

Nature is one and has no parts. *No correct mathematical model of nature can be based*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

on sets. But none of the approach used so far in theoretical physics – not even string theory or the various quantum gravity approaches – has abandoned sets. This requirement must guide us in the future search for the unification of relativity and quantum theory.

> Es ist fast unmöglich, die Fackel der Wahrheit durch ein Gedränge zu tragen, ohne jemandem den Bart zu sengen.*
>
> Georg Christoph Lichtenberg (1742–1799)

Why are observers needed?

Some papers on quantum theory give the impression that observers are indispensable for quantum physics. We have debunked this belief already, showing that the observer in quantum theory is mainly a bath with a definite interaction. Often, humans are observers.

Page 1096

At Planck scales, quantum theory is mandatory. The exploration of these domains shows that observers must satisfy an additional requirement: they must function at low energies. Only at low energy can an observer introduce sets for the description of nature. Introducing observers is thus the same as introducing sets.

To put it in another way, the limitation of human observers is that they cannot avoid using sets. However, human observers are not unique in this respect: they share this limitation with video recorders, cameras, computers, and pencil and paper.

In simple terms, observers are needed to describe nature at Planck scales only in so far as they are and use sets. We should not have too inflated a view of our own importance.

A solution to Hilbert's sixth problem

In the year 1900, David Hilbert gave a well-known lecture in which he listed 23 of the great challenges facing mathematics in the twentieth century. Most of these problems provided challenges to mathematicians for decades afterwards. Among those that are still unsolved is Hilbert's sixth problem, which challenges mathematicians and physicists to find an *axiomatic* treatment of physics. It has remained in the minds of many physicists since that time.

Ref. 1293

Since nature does not contain sets, such an axiomatic description of nature cannot exist. The reasoning is simple: we only have to look at the axiomatic systems found in mathematics. Axiomatic systems define mathematical structures. These structures are of three main types: algebraic systems, order systems or topological systems. Most mathematical structures – such as symmetry groups, vector spaces, manifolds or fields – are combinations of all three. But all mathematical structures are based on elements and sets. Elements and sets are common to all axiomatic systems in mathematics. The underlying reason is that every mathematical concept contains at least one set.

Page 1398

Furthermore, all concepts used so far in physics depend on elements and sets. For humans, it is difficult even to *think* without first defining a set of possibilities. Yet nature does not contain sets. Therefore, *an axiomatic formulation of physics is impossible*. Of course, this conclusion does not rule out unification; however, it does rule out an axiomatic version of it. This is surprising at first. However, as separate axiomatic treatments of quantum theory and general relativity *are* possible. *Axiomatic systems in physics are*

* 'It is almost impossible to carry the torch of truth through a crowd without scorching somebody's beard.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

always approximate. The need to abandon them is one of the reasons why reaching a unified description of nature is so difficult.

Summary

Physics can be summarized in a few limit statements. They imply that in nature every physical observable is limited by a value near the Planck value. The speed limit is equivalent to special relativity, the force limit to general relativity, and the action limit to quantum theory. Although this summary could have been made (or at least conjectured) by Planck, Einstein or the fathers of quantum theory, it is actually much more recent. The numerical factors for most of the limit values are new. The limits suggest interesting Gedanken experiments, none of which leads to their violation. However, the force limit is not yet within direct experimental reach.

The existence of limit values to all observables implies that the description of space-time as a continuous manifold is not correct at Planck scales: it is only an approximation. For the same reason, is predicted that elementary particles are not point-like. Nature's limits also imply that matter and vacuum are in principle indistinguishable. The structure of particles and of space-time remains to be clarified. So far, we can conclude that nature can be described by sets only approximately. The limit statements show that Hilbert's sixth problem cannot be solved, and that unification requires entirely new, untested approaches.

We have seen that at Planck scales there is no time and no space, and there are no particles. Motion is a low-energy phenomenon: it only appears for low-energy observers, in other words, for observers who use sets. The (inaccurate) citation of Zeno at the beginning of our walk, stating that motion is an illusion, turns out to be correct. We now need to find out how motion actually arises.

Page 22

Our discussion so far suggests that motion appears as soon as sets are introduced. To check this hypothesis, we need a description of nature without sets. The only way to avoid the use of sets seems to be a description of empty space-time, radiation and matter as being made of the same underlying entity. It is probably necessary to include space-time dualities and interaction dualities. Indeed, both string theory and modern quantum gravity attempt this, though possibly not yet with the full radicalism necessary. To realize this unification is our next task.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 56

THE SHAPE OF POINTS – EXTENSION IN NATURE

> Nil tam difficile est, quin quaerendo investigari possiet.
>
> Terence*

The expressions for the Compton wavelength $\lambda = h/mc$ and for the Schwarzschild radius $r_s = 2Gm/c^2$ imply a number of arguments which lead to the conclusion that at Planck energies, what we call space-time 'points' and 'point' particles must actually be described by *extended* entities. These arguments point towards a connection between microscopic and macroscopic scales, confirming the results of modern string theory and quantum gravity. At the same time, they provide a pedagogical summary of this aspect of present-day theoretical physics. Here is a summary of what follows.**

1 – Any experiment trying to measure the size or the shape of an elementary particle with high precision inevitably leads to the result that at least one dimension of the particle is of macroscopic size.

2 – There is no evidence that empty space-time is continuous, but plenty of evidence that it is not. In order to build up an entity, such as the vacuum, that is extended in three dimensions, one needs extended building blocks.

3 – The existence of minimum measurable distances and time intervals implies the existence of space-time duality: a symmetry between very large and very small distances. Space-time duality in turn implies that the fundamental entities that make up vacuum and matter are extended.

4 – The constituents of the universe, and thus of space-time, matter and radiation, cannot form a set. As a consequence, any precise description of nature must use extended entities.

5 – The Bekenstein–Hawking expression for the entropy of black holes – in particular its surface dependence – confirms that both space-time and particles are composed of extended entities.

6 – The attempt to extend statistical properties to Planck scales shows that both particles and space-time points behave as braids at high energies – a fact which also requires extended entities.

7 – The Dirac construction for spin provides a model for fermions which is consistent with experiments and which points to extended entities.

* 'Nothing is so difficult that it could not be investigated.' Terence is Publius Terentius Afer (*c.* 190–159 BCE), important roman poet. He writes this in his play *Heauton Timorumenos*, verse 675.

** This section describes a research topic, and is *not* a compendium of generally accepted results (yet). It was written between December 2001 and May 2002.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

An overview of other arguments in favour of extended entities provided by present research efforts is also given. To complete the discussion, experimental and theoretical checks for the idea of extended building blocks of nature are presented.

The starting point – vacuum and particles

> Our greatest pretenses are built up not to hide the evil and the ugly in us, but our emptyness. The hardest thing to hide is something that is not there.
>
> Eric Hoffer, *The Passionate State of Mind*

We can only use continuous space-time and point particles as basic entities when our description of nature is separated into general relativity and quantum theory. When the two theories are united, what we usually call a 'point' turns out to have quite counter-intuitive properties. We explore a few of them in the following.

We have already given a standard argument showing that points do not exist in nature. The Compton wavelength and the Schwarzschild radius together determine a minimal length and a minimal time interval in nature. They are given (within a factor of order one, which we will usually omit) by the Planck length and the Planck time, with the values

Ref. 1294, Ref. 1295

$$\begin{aligned} l_{\mathrm{Pl}} = \sqrt{\hbar G/c^3} &= 1.6 \cdot 10^{-35}\,\mathrm{m} \\ t_{\mathrm{Pl}} = \sqrt{\hbar G/c^5} &= 5.4 \cdot 10^{-44}\,\mathrm{s}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{943}$$

The existence of minimal length and time intervals in nature implies that 'points' in space, time or space-time do not really exist, and forces us to give up the traditional idea of continuity. Even though, properly speaking, points do not exist, and thus space points, events and point particles do not exist either, we can still study these entities in detail. The results provide many fascinating surprises.

Page 1413

Using a simple Gedanken experiment, we found earlier that particles and space-time cannot be distinguished from each other at Planck scales. We argued that the measurement error for a full box and the measurement error for an empty box are the same at Planck scales. Indeed, the largest mass that can be put in a box of size R is a black hole with a Schwarzschild radius of the same value. That is also the largest possible mass measurement error. But an empty box, a piece of vacuum, also has a *smallest* mass measurement error.

The existence of a smallest mass measurement error is so important that it merits special attention. Mass measurement errors always prevent humans from stating that a region of space has zero mass. Similarly, a minimal mass measurement error prevents nature from 'knowing' that the mass of a region is zero. The origin of this mass measurement error is quantum indeterminacy. Energy and mass are always blurred in quantum theory. We are not used to applying this fact to the vacuum, but at Planck scales we have to. We know from quantum field theory that the vacuum, like any other system, has a mass; of course, its value when averaged over a long time is zero. For finite measuring times, there will be an indeterminacy in the mass value of a vacuum.

A box is empty if it does not contain anything. But emptiness is not well defined in relation to photons whose wavelength is greater than or equal to the size R of the box. The

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

mass measurement error for an 'empty' box – corresponding to what we call a vacuum – is due to the indeterminacy relation, and is equal to the mass whose Compton wavelength matches the size of the box. As we saw earlier, the same mass value is found in every other Gedanken experiment – for example, trying to determine the gravitational mass by weighing the 'piece' of vacuum or by measuring its kinetic energy.

Page 1413

Ref. 1294

Another – ultimately equivalent – way to show that a region of vacuum has a finite mass error is to look at how the vacuum energy depends on the positional indeterminacy of the border of the region. Any region is defined by its border. The positional indeterminacy of the border will induce a mass error for the contents of the box, in the same way as a time limit does. Again, the resulting mass error for a region of vacuum is equal to the mass for which the box size is the Compton wavelength.

Summarizing, for a box of size R, nature allows only mass values and mass measurement error values m between two limits:

$$\text{(full box)} \quad \frac{c^2 R}{G} \geqslant m \geqslant \frac{\hbar}{cR} \quad \text{(empty box)} \,. \tag{944}$$

We see directly that for sizes R of the order of the Planck length, the two limits coincide: they both give the Planck mass

$$M_{\text{Pl}} = \frac{\hbar}{c\, l_{\text{Pl}}} = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{G}} \approx 10^{-8}\,\text{kg} \approx 10^{19}\,\text{GeV}/c^2 \,. \tag{945}$$

In other words, for boxes of Planck size, we cannot distinguish a full box from an empty one. This means that there is no difference between vacuum and matter at Planck scales. Of course, a similar statement holds for vacuum and radiation. At Planck scales, vacuum cannot be distinguished from particles of any kind.

How else can we show that matter and vacuum cannot be distinguished?

The statement that it is impossible to distinguish vacuum from particles is a strong one. Such a strong statement needs additional proof.

Mass can also be measured by probing its inertial aspect: that is, by colliding the unknown mass M, at a known velocity V, with a known probe particle of mass m and momentum $p = mv$. We then have

$$M = \frac{\Delta p}{\Delta V} \,, \tag{946}$$

where the differences are taken between the values before and after the collision. The error δM of such a measurement is simply given by

$$\frac{\delta M}{M} = \frac{\delta \Delta v}{\Delta v} + \frac{\delta m}{m} + \frac{\delta \Delta V}{\Delta V} \,. \tag{947}$$

At Planck scales we have $\delta \Delta v / \Delta v \approx 1$, because the velocity error is always – like the

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

velocities themselves – of the order of the speed of light. In other words, at Planck scales the mass measurement error is so large that we cannot determine whether a mass is different from zero: vacuum is indistinguishable from matter.

We reach the same conclusion if we take light with wavelength λ as the probe particle. In this case, expression (946) leads to a mass error

$$\frac{\delta M}{M} = \frac{\delta \Delta\lambda}{\Delta\lambda} + \frac{\delta \Delta V}{\Delta V} \,. \tag{948}$$

In order that photon scattering can probe Planck dimensions, we need a wavelength of the order of the Planck value; but in this case the first term is approximately unity. Again we find that at Planck scales the energy *indeterminacy* is always of the same size as the energy value to be measured. Measurements cannot distinguish between vanishing and non-vanishing mass at Planck scales. This result appears for all methods of mass measurement that can be imagined. (Try it.) At Planck scales, matter cannot be distinguished from vacuum.

Challenge 1701 e

Incidentally, the same arguments are valid if instead of the mass of matter we measure the energy of radiation: it is also impossible to distinguish radiation from vacuum at high energies.

The indistinguishability of particles and vacuum, together with the existence of minimum space-time intervals, suggests that space, time, radiation and matter are macroscopic approximations to a common underlying *discrete* structure. This structure is often called *quantum geometry*. What do the common constituents of all these aspects of nature look like? We will provide several arguments showing that these constituents are *extended* and *fluctuating*.

Ref. 1296

> Also, die Aufgabe ist nicht zu sehen, was noch nie jemand gesehen hat, sondern über dasjenige was jeder schon gesehen hat zu denken was noch nie jemand gedacht hat.*
>
> Erwin Schrödinger

THE SIZE AND SHAPE OF ELEMENTARY PARTICLES

Size is the length of vacuum taken by an object. This definition comes naturally in everyday life, quantum theory and relativity. However, near the Planck energy, vacuum and matter cannot be distinguished: it is impossible to define the boundary between the two, and thus it is impossible to define the size of an object. As a consequence, every object becomes as extended as the vacuum. So we need to be careful about our definition.

What happens if Planck energy is *approached*, advancing step by step to higher energy? Every measurement requires comparison with a standard. A standard is made of matter and comparison is performed using radiation (see Figure 606). Thus any measurement requires distinction between matter, radiation and space-time. However, distinction between matter and radiation is possible only up to the (grand) unification energy, which is about 1/800 of the Planck energy. Measurements do not allow us to prove that particles are point-like.

* 'Our task is not to see what nobody has ever seen, but to think what nobody has ever thought about that which everybody has seen already.'

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 606 Measurement requires matter and radiation

Let us take a step back. Do measurements at least allow us to say whether particles can be contained inside small spheres?

Do boxes exist?

The first and simplest way to determine the size of a compact particle such as a sphere, or something akin to it, is to measure the size of a *box* it fits in. To be sure that the particle fits inside, we must first must be sure that the box is tight: that is, whether anything (such as matter or radiation) can leave the box.

But there is no way to ensure that a box has no holes. Potential-energy 'hills' cannot get higher than the maximum energy, namely the Planck energy; and the tunnelling effect cannot be ruled out. In short, there is no way to make a completely tight box.

Furthermore, at the unification energy there is no way to distinguish between the box and the object enclosed in it, as particles can be transformed from one type into another.

Let us cross-check this result. In everyday life, we call particles 'small' when they can be enclosed. Enclosure is possible in daily life because walls are impenetrable. But walls are only impenetrable for matter particles up to about 10 MeV and for photons up to about 10 keV. In fact, boxes do not even exist at medium energies. So we certainly cannot extend the idea of 'box' to high energies.

Since we cannot state that particles are compact, or of finite size, using boxes, we need to try other methods.

Can the Greeks help? – The limits of knives

The Greeks deduced the existence of atoms by noting that matter cannot be divided indefinitely. In contrast, whenever we think of space (or space-time) as made of points, we assume that it can be subdivided without end. Zeno strongly criticized this assumption. He was right: at Planck energy, any subdivision is impossible. Any attempt to divide space must stop when (or before) we reach Planck scales. Cutting is the insertion of a wall, and knives are limited just as walls are. The limits of walls imply limits to determination of size.

In particular, the limits to walls and knives imply that at Planck energies, a cut does not necessarily lead to two separate parts. One cannot state that the two parts have been really separated: the possibility of a thin connection between them can never be excluded. In short, one cannot prove compactness by cutting objects at Planck scales.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Are cross sections finite?

Particles are not point-like; they are not even compact. Are they, at least, of finite size?

To determine the size of a particle, we can try to determine its departure from point-likeness. At high energy, detecting this departure requires scattering. For example, we can suspend the particle in a trap and then shoot a probe at it. What happens in a scattering experiment at high energies? This question has been studied by Leonard Susskind and his colleagues. When shooting at the particle with a high-energy probe, the scattering process is characterized by an interaction time. Extremely short interaction times imply sensitivity to the size and shape fluctuations due to the quantum of action. An extremely short interaction time provides a cut-off for high-energy shape and size fluctuations, and thus determines the measured size. As a result, the size measured for any microscopic, but extended, object *increases* when the probe energy is increased towards the Planck value.

Ref. 1297

In summary, even though at experimentally achievable energies the size is always smaller than a measurable amount, when one approaches the Planck energy, the size increases above all bounds. So at high energies we cannot give an upper limit to the size of a particle. In other words, since particles are not point-like at everyday energies, at Planck energies they are enormous: particles are extended.

That is quite a statement. Right at the start of our mountain ascent, we distinguished objects from their environment. Objects are by definition localized, bounded and compact. All objects have a boundary, i.e., a surface which does not itself have a boundary. Objects are also bounded in abstract ways: boundedness is a property of the symmetries of an object, such as its gauge group. In contrast, the environment is not localized, but extended and unbounded.

These basic assumptions fail us at Planck scales. At Planck energy, it is impossible to determine whether something is bounded or compact. Compactness and localization are only approximate properties; they are not applicable at high energies. The idea of a point particle is an approximate concept, valid only at low energies.

Let us perform another check on our conclusion that particles at Planck scales are as extended as the vacuum.

Can one take a photograph of a point?

> “Καιρὸν γνῶθι.*”
>
> Pittacus

Humans – or any other types of observers – can only observe a part of the world with finite resolution in time and in space. In this respect, humans resemble a film camera. The highest possible resolution was (almost) discovered in 1899: the Planck time and the Planck length. No human, no film camera and no apparatus can measure space or time intervals smaller than the Planck values. But what would happen if we took photographs with shutter times approaching the Planck time?

Ref. 1298

Ref. 1294, Ref. 1299

* ‘Recognize the right moment.’ Also rendered as: ‘Recognize thine opportunity.’ Pittacus (Πιττακος) of Mytilene (*c.* 650–570 BCE), was a Lesbian tyrant and lawmaker; he was also one of the ‘Seven Sages’ of ancient Greece.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

TABLE 126 Effects of various camera shutter times on photographs

Duration	Blur	Observation possibilities
1 h	high	Ability to see faint quasars at night if motion is compensated
1 s	high	Everyday motion completely blurred
20 ms	lower	Interruption by eyelids; small changes impossible to see
10 ms	lower	Effective eye/brain shutter time; tennis ball impossible to see when hitting it
0.25 ms	lower	Shortest commercial photographic camera shutter time; ability to photograph fast cars
1 µs	very low	Ability to photograph flying bullets; strong flashlight required
c. 10 ps	lowest	Study of molecular processes; ability to photograph flying light pulses; laser light required to get sufficient illumination
10 fs	higher	Light photography impossible because of wave effects
100 zs	high	X-ray photography impossible; only γ-ray imaging left over
shorter times	very high	Photographs darker as illumination decreases; gravitational effects significant
10^{-41} s	highest	Imaging meaningless

Imagine that you have the world's best shutter and that you are taking photographs at shorter and shorter times. Table 126 gives a rough overview of the possibilities. At shorter shutter times, photographs get darker. When the shutter time reaches the oscillation time of light, strange things happen: light has no chance to pass undisturbed; signal and noise become indistinguishable; and the moving shutter will produce colour shifts. In contrast to our everyday experience, the picture would get more *blurred* at extremely short shutter times. Photography is impossible not only at long but also at short shutter times.

The difficulty of taking photographs is independent of the wavelength used. The limits move, but do not disappear. With a shutter time of τ, photons of energy lower than $\hbar/\tau$ cannot pass undisturbed. The blur is small when shutter times are those of everyday life, but *increases* when shutter times are shortened towards Planck times. As a result, there is no way to detect or confirm the existence of point objects by taking pictures. Points in space, as well as instants of time, are *imagined* concepts: they do not belong in a precise description of nature.

At Planck shutter times, only signals with Planck energy can pass through the shutter. Since at these energies matter cannot be distinguished from radiation or from empty space, all objects, light, and vacuum look the same. It is impossible to say what nature looks like at very short times.

But the situation is worse than this: a Planck shutter cannot exist at all, as it would need to be as small as a Planck length. A camera using it could not be built, as lenses do not work at this energy. Not even a camera obscura – without any lens – would work, as diffraction effects would make image production impossible.

In other words, the idea that at short shutter times a photograph of nature shows a frozen image of everyday life, like a stopped film, is completely wrong.* Indeed, at a single

* In fact, a shutter does not exist even at medium energy: shutters, like walls, stop existing at around 10 MeV.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

instant of time nature is not frozen at all. Zeno criticized this idea in his discussions of motion, though not as clearly as we can do now. At short times, nature is blurred. In particular, point particles do not exist.

In summary, whatever the intrinsic shape of what we call a 'point' might be, we know that, being always blurred, it is first of all a cloud. Whatever method is used to photograph of a point particle, it always shows an extended entity. Let us study its shape in more detail.

What is the shape of an electron?

Since particles are not point-like, they have a shape. How can we determine it? We determine the shape of an everyday object by *touching* it from all sides. This works with plants, people or machines. It even works with molecules, such as water molecules. We can put them (almost) at rest, for example in ice, and then scatter small particles off them. Scattering is just a higher-energy version of touching. However, scattering cannot determine shapes of objects smaller than the wavelength of the probes used. To determine the shape of an object as small as an electron, we need the highest energies available. But we already know what happens when approaching Planck scales: the shape of a particle becomes the shape of all the space surrounding it. Shape cannot be determined in this way.

Another way to determine the shape is to build a tight box around the system under investigation and fill it with molten wax. We then let the wax cool and observe the hollow part. However, near Planck energies, boxes do not exist. We are unable to determine the shape in this way.

A third way to measure the shape of an object is to cut it into pieces and then study the pieces. But *cutting* is just a low-energy version of a scattering process. It does not work at high energies. Since the term 'atom' just means 'uncuttable' or 'indivisible', neither atoms nor indivisible particles can exist. Indeed, there is no way to prove that an object is indivisible. Our everyday intuition leads us completely astray at Planck energies.

We could try to distinguish transverse and longitudinal shape, with respect to the direction of motion. However, for transverse shape we get the same issues as for scattering; transverse shape diverges for high energy. And to determine longitudinal shape, we need at least two infinitely high potential walls. We already know that this is impossible.

A further, indirect way of measuring shapes is to measure the moment of inertia. A finite moment of inertia means a compact, finite shape. But when the measurement energy is increased, rotation, linear motion and exchange become mixed up. We do not get meaningful results. Ref. 1294

Yet another way to determine shapes is to measure the *entropy* of a collection of particles we want to study. This allows us to determine the dimensionality and the number of internal degrees of freedom. But at high energies, a collection of electrons would become a black hole. We will study this issue separately below, but again we find no new information.

Are these arguments watertight? We assumed three dimensions at all scales, and that the shape of the particle itself is fixed. Maybe these assumptions are not valid at Planck scales. Let us check the alternatives. We have already shown that because of the fundamental measurement limits, the dimensionality of space-time cannot be determined at

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Ref. 1294 Planck scales. Even if we could build perfect three-dimensional boxes, holes could remain in other dimensions. It does not take long to see that all the arguments against compactness work even if space-time has additional dimensions.

Is the shape of an electron fixed?

Only an object composed of localized entities, such as a house or a molecule, can have a fixed shape. The smaller the system, the more quantum fluctuations play a role. No entity with a finite size – in particular, no elementary particle – can have a fixed shape. In every Gedanken experiment involving a finite shape, the shape itself fluctuates. But we can say more.

The distinction between particles and environment rests on the idea that particles have *intrinsic* properties. In fact, all intrinsic properties, such as spin, mass, charge, and parity, are localized. But we have seen that no intrinsic property is measurable or definable at Planck scales. Thus it is impossible to distinguish particles from the environment. In addition, at Planck energy particles have all the properties that the environment has. In particular, particles are extended.

In short, we cannot prove by experiments that at Planck energy elementary particles are finite in size in all directions. In fact, all experiments one can think of are compatible with extended particles, with 'infinite' size. More precisely, a particle always reaches the borders of the region of space-time under exploration. In simple words, we can also say that particles have *tails*.

Not only are particles extended, but their shape cannot be determined by the methods just explored. The only remaining possibility is that suggested by quantum theory: *the shape of a particle fluctuates*.

We reach the same conclusions for radiation particles. The box argument shows that radiation particles are also extended and fluctuating.

Incidentally, we have also settled an important question about elementary particles. We have already seen that any particle that is smaller than its own Compton wavelength
Page 1038 must be elementary. If it were composite, there would be a lighter component inside it; this lighter particle would have a larger Compton wavelength than the composite particle. This is impossible, since the size of a composite particle must be larger than the Compton wavelength of its components.*

However, an elementary particle *can* have constituents, provided that they are not compact. The difficulties of compact constituents were described by Sakharov in the
Ref. 1300 1960s. If the constituents are extended, the argument does not apply, as extended entities have no localized mass. As a result, a flying arrow – Zeno's famous example – cannot be said to be at a given position at a given time, if it is made of extended entities. Shortening the observation time towards the Planck time makes an arrow disappear in the cloud that makes up space-time.**

* Examples are the neutron, positronium, or the atoms. Note that the argument does not change when the elementary particle itself is unstable, like the muon. The possibility that all components are heavier than the composite, which would avoid this argument, does not seem to lead to satisfying physical properties: for example, it leads to intrinsically unstable composites.

Ref. 1301 ** Thus at Planck scales there is no quantum Zeno effect.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Summary of the first argument for extension

In summary, only the idea of points leads to problems at Planck scales. If space-time and matter are imagined to be made, at Planck scales, of *extended and fluctuating* entities, the problems disappear. We note directly that for extended entities the requirement of a non-local description is satisfied; in addition, for fluctuating entities the requirement of a statistical description of the vacuum is satisfied. The argument forbidding composition of elementary particles is circumvented, as extended entities have no clearly defined mass. Thus the concept of Compton wavelength cannot be defined or applied to extended constituents, and elementary particles can have constituents if they are extended. But if the components are extended, how can compact 'point' particles be formed from them? We will look at a few options shortly.

Ref. 1294

Challenge 1702 e

THE SHAPE OF POINTS IN VACUUM

> Thus, since there is an impossibility that [finite] quantities are built from contacts and points, it is necessary that there be indivisible material elements and [finite] quantities.
>
> Aristotle, *Of Generation and Corruption*

Ref. 1302

We are used to the idea that empty space is made of spatial points. Let us check whether this is true at high energy. At Planck scales, no measurement can give zero length, zero mass, zero area or zero volume. There is no way to state that something in nature is a point without contradicting experimental results. Furthermore, the idea of a point is an extrapolation of what is found in small empty boxes getting smaller and smaller. But we have just seen that at high energies small boxes cannot be said to be empty. In fact, boxes do not exist at all, as they can never have impenetrable walls at high energies.

What's more, the idea of a point as a limiting subdivision of empty space is untenable. At small distances, space cannot be subdivided, as division requires some sort of dividing wall, which is impossible.

Even the idea of repeatedly putting a point between two others cannot be applied. At high energy, it is impossible to say whether a point is exactly on the line connecting the outer two points; and near Planck energy, there is no way to find a point between them at all. In fact, the term 'in between' makes no sense at Planck scales.

We thus find that space points do not exist, just as point particles do not exist. But there are other reasons why space cannot be made of points. Common sense tells us that points need to be kept *apart* somehow, in order to form space. Indeed, mathematicians have a strong argument for why physical space cannot be made of mathematical points: the properties of mathematical spaces described by the Banach–Tarski paradox are quite different from those of the physical vacuum. The Banach–Tarski paradox states that a sphere made of mathematical points can be cut into five pieces which can be reassembled into two spheres each of the same volume as the original sphere. Mathematically, there are sets of points for which volume makes no sense. Physically speaking, we can say that the concept of volume does not exist for continuous space; it is only definable if an intrinsic length exists. This is the case for matter, and it must also be the case for vacuum.

Ref. 1294

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

But any concept with an intrinsic length must be described by one or several extended components.* In summary, we need *extended* entities to build up space-time.

In mathematics it is impossible to define the dimension of a set of points on the basis of the set structure alone. Any compact one-dimensional set has as many points as any compact three-dimensional set – indeed, as any compact set of any dimensionality greater than zero. To build up the physical three-dimensional vacuum, we need entities that organize their neighbourhood. The fundamental entities must possess some sort of ability to form bonds, which will construct or fill precisely three dimensions. Bonds require extended entities. A collection of tangled entities extending to the maximum scale of the region under consideration would work perfectly. Of course, the precise shape of the fundamental entities is not yet known. In any case, we again find that any constituents of physical three-dimensional space must be extended.

In summary, we need extension to define dimensionality and to define volume. This is not surprising. We deduced above that the constituents of particles are extended. Since vacuum is not distinguishable from matter, we would expect the constituents of vacuum to be extended as well. Stated simply, if elementary particles are not point-like, then space-time points cannot be either.

Measuring the void

To check whether space-time constituents are extended, let us perform a few additional Gedanken experiments. First, let us measure the size of a point of space-time. The clearest definition of size is in terms of the cross section. How can we determine the cross section of a point? We can determine the cross section of a piece of vacuum and then determine the number of points inside it. However, at Planck energies, we get a simple result: the cross section of a volume of empty space is independent of depth. At Planck energies, vacuum has a surface, but no depth. In other words, at Planck energy we can only state that a Planck layer covers the surface of a region. We cannot say anything about its interior. One way to picture this result is to say that space points are long tubes.

Another way to determine the size of a point is to count the points found in a given volume of space-time. One approach is to count the possible positions of a point particle in a volume. However, at Planck energies point particles are extended and indistinguishable from vacuum. At Planck energy, the number of points is given by the surface area of the volume divided by the Planck area. Again, the surface dependence suggests that particles are long tubes.

Another approach to counting the number of points in a volume is to fill a piece of vacuum with point particles.

What is the maximum number of particles that fit inside a piece of vacuum?

The maximum mass that fits into a piece of vacuum is a black hole. But in this case too, the maximum mass depends only on the *surface* of the given region of vacuum. The maximum mass increases less rapidly than the volume. In other words, the number of

Ref. 1303 * Imagining the vacuum as a collection of entities, such as spheres, with Planck size in all directions would avoid the Banach–Tarski paradox, but would not allow us to deduce the number of dimensions of space and
Challenge 1703 s time. It would also contradict all the other results of this section. Therefore we do not explore it further.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

points in a region is only proportional to the surface area of the region. We are forced to conclude that vacuum must be made of extended entities crossing the whole region, independently of its shape.

Summary of the second argument for extension

Page 258 More than two thousand years ago, the Greeks argued that matter must be made of par-
Ref. 1304 ticles because salt can be dissolved in water and because fish can swim through water. Now that we know more about Planck scales, we have to reconsider this argument. Like fish swimming through water, particles can move through vacuum; but since vacuum has no bounds, and cannot be distinguished from matter, vacuum cannot be made of localised particles. However, there is another possibility that allows for motion of particles through a vacuum: both vacuum and particles might be made of a web of extended entities. Let us study this possibility in more detail.

THE LARGE, THE SMALL AND THEIR CONNECTION

> I could be bounded in a nutshell and count myself a king of infinite space, were it not that I have bad dreams.
>
> William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*

If two observables cannot be distinguished, there is a symmetry transformation connecting them. For example, by a change of observation frame, an electric field may change into a magnetic one. A symmetry transformation means that we can change the viewpoint (i.e., the frame of observation) in such a way that the same observation is described by one quantity from one viewpoint and by the corresponding quantity from the other viewpoint.

When measuring a length at Planck scales it is impossible to say whether we are measuring the length of a piece of vacuum, the Compton wavelength of a body, or the Schwarzschild diameter of a body. For example, the maximum size for an elementary object is its Compton wavelength. The minimum size for an elementary object is its Schwarzschild radius. The actual size of an elementary object is somewhere in between. If we want to measure the size precisely, we have to go to Planck energy; but then all these quantities are the same. In other words, at Planck scales, there is a symmetry transformation between Compton wavelength and Schwarzschild radius. In short, *at Planck scales there is a symmetry between mass and inverse mass.*

As a further consequence, at Planck scales there is a symmetry between size and inverse size. Matter–vacuum indistinguishability means that there is a symmetry between
Ref. 1305 length and inverse length at Planck energies. This symmetry is called *space-time duality* or *T-duality* in the literature of superstrings.* Space-time duality is a symmetry between situations at scale $n\,l_{\mathrm{Pl}}$ and at scale $f\,l_{\mathrm{Pl}}/n$, or, in other words, between R and $(f\,l_{\mathrm{Pl}})^2/R$, where the empirically determined number f has a value somewhere between 1 and 1000.

* There is also an *S-duality*, which connects large and small coupling constants, and a *U-duality*, which is the combination of S- and T-duality.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Duality is a genuine non-perturbative effect. It does not exist at low energy, since duality automatically also relates energies E and $E_{\mathrm{Pl}}^2/E = \hbar c^3/GE$, i.e., it relates energies below and above Planck scale. Duality is not evident in everyday life. It is a quantum symmetry, as it includes Planck's constant in its definition. It is also a general-relativistic effect, as it includes the gravitational constant and the speed of light. Let us study duality in more detail.

Is small large?

> [Zeno of Elea maintained:] If the existing are many, it is necessary that they are at the same time small and large, so small to have no size, and so large to be without limits.
>
> Simplicius, *Commentary on the Physics of Aristotle*, 140, 34

Ref. 1306

To explore the consequences of duality, we can compare it to rotational symmetry in everyday life. Every object in daily life is symmetrical under a full rotation of 2π. For the rotation of an observer, angles make sense only as long as they are smaller than 2π. If a rotating observer were to insist on distinguishing angles of $0, 2\pi, 4\pi$ etc., he would get a new copy of the universe at each full turn.

Similarly, in nature, scales R and l_{Pl}^2/R cannot be distinguished. Lengths make no sense when they are smaller than l_{Pl}. If, however, we insist on using even smaller values and on distinguishing them from large ones, we get a new copy of the universe at those small scales. Such an insistence is part of the standard continuum description of motion, where it is assumed that space and time are described by the real numbers, which are defined over arbitrarily small intervals. Whenever the (approximate) continuum description with infinite extension is used, the $R \leftrightarrow l_{\mathrm{Pl}}^2/R$ symmetry pops up.

Duality implies that diffeomorphism invariance is only valid at medium scales, not at extremal ones. At extremal scales, quantum theory has to be taken into account in the proper manner. We do not yet know how to do this.

Space-time duality means that introducing lengths smaller than the Planck length (as when one defines space points, which have size zero) means at the same time introducing things with very large ('infinite') value. Space-time duality means that for every small enough sphere the inside equals the outside.

Duality means that if a system has a small dimension, it also has a large one, and vice versa. There are thus no small objects in nature. So space-time duality is consistent with the idea that the basic entities are extended.

Unification and total symmetry

So far, we have shown that at Planck energy, time and length cannot be distinguished. Duality shows that mass and inverse mass cannot be distinguished. As a consequence, length, time, and mass cannot be distinguished from each other. Since every observable is a combination of length, mass and time, *space-time duality means that there is a symmetry*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

between all observables. We call it the *total symmetry*.*

Total symmetry implies that there are many specific types of duality, one for each pair of quantities under investigation. Indeed, in string theory, the number of duality types discovered is increasing every year. It includes, among others, the famous electric–magnetic duality we first encountered in electrodynamics, coupling constant duality, surface–volume duality, space-time duality, and many more. All this confirms that there is an enormous amount of symmetry at Planck scales. Similar symmetries have been known right from the beginning of string theory.

Page 718
Ref. 1307
Ref. 1305

Most importantly, total symmetry implies that gravity can be seen as equivalent to all other forces. Space-time duality shows that unification is possible. Physicists have always dreamt about unification. Duality tells us that this dream can indeed be realized.

It may seem that total symmetry completely contradicts what was said in the previous section, where we argued that all symmetries are lost at Planck scales. Which result is correct? Obviously, both of them are.

At Planck scales, all low-energy symmetries are indeed lost. In fact, all symmetries that imply a *fixed* energy are lost. However, duality and its generalizations combine both small and large dimensions, or large and small energies. Most of the standard symmetries of physics, such as gauge, permutation and space-time symmetries, are valid at each fixed energy separately. But nature is not made this way. The precise description of nature requires us to take into consideration large and small energies at the same time. In everyday life, we do not do that. The physics of everyday life is an approximation to nature valid at low and fixed energies. For most of the twentieth century, physicists tried to reach higher and higher energies. We believed that precision increases with increasing energy. But when we combine quantum theory and gravity we are forced to change this approach. To achieve high precision, we must take high and low energy into account at the same time.**

The great differences between the phenomena that occur at low and high energies are the main reason why unification is so difficult. We are used to dividing nature along a scale of energies: high-energy physics, atomic physics, chemistry, biology, and so on. But we are not allowed to think in this way any more. We have to take all energies into account at the same time. That is not easy, but we do not have to despair. Important conceptual progress was made in the last decade of the twentieth century. In particular, we now know that we need only *one concept* for all things that can be measured. Since there is only one concept, there are many ways to study it. We can start from any (low-energy) concept in physics and explore how it looks and behaves when we approach Planck scales. In the present section, we are looking at the concept of 'point'. Obviously, the conclusions must be the same whatever concept we start with, be it electric field, spin, or any other. Such studies thus provide a check for the results in this section.

Challenge 1704 d

* A symmetry between size and Schwarzschild radius, i.e., a symmetry between length and mass, will lead to general relativity. Additionally, at Planck energy there is a symmetry between size and Compton wavelength. In other words, there is a symmetry between length and inverse mass. This means that there is a symmetry between coordinates and wave functions. This is a symmetry between states and observables. It leads to quantum theory.

** Renormalization energy does connect different energies, but not in the correct way; in particular, it does not include duality.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Summary of the third argument for extension

Unification implies thinking in terms of duality and the concepts that follow from it. The large and the small are connected. This points to extended entities. We also need to understand exactly what happens to duality when we restrict ourselves to low energies, as we do in everyday life. This question is left for the next section.

Challenge 1705 e

DOES NATURE HAVE PARTS?

> Pluralitas non est ponenda sine necessitate.*
> William of Occam

There is another argument, independent of those given above, that points towards a model of nature based on extended entities. Let us take a broader view. Any concept for which we can distinguish parts is described by a set. We usually describe nature as a set of objects, positions, instants and so on. The most famous set-theoretic description of nature is the oldest known, given by Democritus: 'The world is made of indivisible particles and void.' This description was extremely successful in the past: there were no discrepancies with observations. However, after 2500 years, the conceptual difficulties of this approach are obvious.

We now know that Democritus was wrong, first of all, because vacuum and matter cannot be distinguished at Planck scales. Thus the word 'and' in his sentence is already a mistake. Secondly, because of the existence of minimal scales, the void cannot be made of 'points', as we usually assume. Thirdly, the description fails because particles are not compact objects. Finally, total symmetry implies that we cannot distinguish parts in nature. Nothing can be distinguished from anything else with complete precision, and thus the particles or points in space that make up the naive model of the world cannot exist.

In summary, quantum theory and general relativity together show that in nature, *all differences are only approximate*. Nothing can really be distinguished from anything else with complete precision. In other words, there is no way to define a 'part' of nature, whether for matter, space, time, or radiation. *Nature cannot be a set.*

The conclusion that nature is not a set does not come as a surprise. We have already encountered another reason to doubt that nature is a set. Whatever definition we use for the term 'particle', Democritus cannot be correct for a purely logical reason. The description he provided is *not complete*. Every description of nature that defines nature as a set of parts misses certain aspects. Most importantly, it misses the *number* of these parts. In particular, the number of particles and the number of dimensions of space-time must be specified if we describe nature as made from particles and vacuum. We saw above that it is rather dangerous to make fun of the famous statement by Arthur Eddington

Page 860

* 'Multitude should not be introduced without necessity.' This famous principle is commonly called *Occam's razor*. William of Ockham (b. 1285/1295 Ockham, d. 1349/50 München), or Occam in the common Latin spelling, was one of the great thinkers of his time. In his famous statement he expresses that only those concepts which are strictly necessary should be introduced to explain observations. It can be seen as the requirement to abandon *beliefs* when talking about nature. But at this stage of our mountain ascent it has an even more direct interpretation.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Ref. 1308

> I believe there are 15,747,724,136,275,002,577,605,653,961,181,555,468,044,717,914, 527,116,709,366,231,425,076,185,631,031,296 protons in the universe and the same number of electrons.

In fact, practically all physicists share this belief, although they usually either pretend to favour some other number, or worse, keep the number unspecified. We have seen during our walk that in modern physics many specialized sets are used to describe nature. We have used vector spaces, linear spaces, topological spaces and Hilbert spaces. But we consistently refrained, like all physicists, from asking about the origin of their sizes (mathematically speaking, of their dimensionality or cardinality). In fact, it is just as unsatisfying to say that the universe contains some specific number of atoms as it is to say that space-time is made of point-like events arranged in $3+1$ dimensions. Both are statements about set sizes, in the widest sense. In a complete, unified description of nature the number of smallest particles and the number of space-time points must not be part of the description, but must *result* from the description.

Any part of nature is by definition smaller than the whole of nature, and different from other parts. As a result, no description of nature by a set can possibly yield the number of particles or the dimensionality of space-time. As long as we insist on using space-time or Hilbert spaces for the description of nature, we *cannot* understand the number of dimensions or the number of particles.

That is not too bad, as we know already that nature is *not* made of parts. We know that parts are only approximate concepts. In short, if nature were made of parts, it could not be a unity, or a 'one.' On the other hand, if nature is a unity, it cannot have parts.* Nature cannot be separable exactly. It cannot be made of particles.

To sum up, nature cannot be a set. Sets are lists of distinguishable elements. When general relativity and quantum theory are unified, nature shows no elements: *nature stops being a set at Planck scales*. This result clarifies a discussion we started earlier in relation to classical physics. There we discovered that matter objects were defined using space and time, and that space and time were defined using objects. Along with the results of quantum theory, this implies that in modern physics particles are defined in terms of the vacuum and the vacuum in terms of particles. This is clearly not a good idea. But we have just seen that since the two concepts are indistinguishable from each other, we cannot define them in terms of each other. Everything is the same. In fact, there is no 'every' and no 'thing'. Since nature is not a set, the circular reasoning is dissolved.

Space-time duality also implies that space is not a set. It implies that events cannot be distinguished from each other, and thus do not form elements of some space. Phil Gibbs Ref. 1310 has given the name *event symmetry* to this property of nature. This thought-provoking term, although still containing the term 'event', emphasizes the fact that it is impossible to use a set to describe space-time.

In short, nature cannot be made of vacuum and particles. This is a bizarre result. Atomists, from Democritus to Galileo, have been persecuted throughout history. Were their

* As a curiosity, practically the same discussion can already be found in Plato's *Parmenides*, written in the Ref. 1309 fourth century BCE. There, Plato musically ponders different arguments on whether nature is or can be a *unity* or a *multiplicity*, i.e., a set. It seems that the text is based on the real visit to Athens by Parmenides and Zeno. (Their home city, Elea, was near Naples.) Plato does not reach a conclusion. Modern physics, however, does.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

battles all in vain? Let us continue to clarify our thoughts.

Does the universe contain anything?

To state that the universe contains something implies that we are able to distinguish the universe from its contents. However, we now know that precise distinctions are impossible. If nature is not made of parts, it is wrong to say that the universe *contains* something.

Let us go further. We need a description of nature that allows us to state that at Planck energies nothing can be distinguished from anything else. For example, it must be impossible to distinguish particles from each other or from the vacuum. There is only one solution: everything – or at least, what we call 'everything' in everyday life – must be made of the same single entity. All particles are made of one 'piece'. Every point in space, every event, every particle and every instant of time must be made of the same single entity.

An amoeba

> "A theory of nothing describing everything is better than a theory of everything describing nothing."

We have found that parts are approximate concepts. The parts of nature are not strictly smaller than nature itself. As a result, any 'part' must be extended. Let us try to extract some more information about the constituents of nature.

In any unified theory, all the concepts that appear must be only *approximately* parts of the whole. Thus we need an entity Ω, describing nature, which is not a set but which can be approximated by one. This is strange. We are all convinced very early in our lives that we are a *part* of nature. Our senses provide us with this information. We are not used to thinking otherwise. But now we have to.

Let us straight away eliminate a few options for Ω. One concept without parts is the empty set. Perhaps we need to construct a description of nature from the empty set? We could be inspired by the usual construction of the natural numbers from the empty set. Page 828 However, the empty set makes only sense as the opposite of some full set. So the empty set is not a candidate for Ω.

Another possible way to define approximate parts is to construct them from multiple copies of Ω. But in this way we would introduce a new set through the back door. Furthermore, new concepts defined in this way would not be approximate.

We need to be more imaginative. How can we describe a whole which has no parts, but which has parts approximately? Let us recapitulate. The world must be described by a single entity, sharing all properties of the world, but which can be approximated as a set of parts. For example, the approximation should yield a set of space points and a set of particles. But also, whenever we look at any 'part' of nature, without any approximation, we should not be able to distinguish it from the whole world. Composite entities are not always larger than their constituents. On the other hand, composed entities must usually *appear* to be larger than their constituents. For example, space 'points' or 'point' particles are tiny, even though they are only approximations. Which concept without boundaries can be at their origin? Using usual concepts, the world is everywhere at the same time;

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

if nature is to be described by a single constituent, this entity must be extended.

The entity has to be a single one, but it must *seem* to be multiple: it has to be multiple approximately, as nature shows multiple aspects. The entity must be something folded. It must be possible to count the folds, but only approximately. (An analogy is the question of how many grooves there are on an LP or a CD: depending on the point of view, local or global, one gets different answers.) Counting folds would correspond to a length measurement.

The simplest model would be a single entity which is extended and fluctuating, goes to infinity, and allows approximate localization, thus allowing approximate definition of parts and points.* In more vivid imagery, nature could be described by some deformable, folded and tangled entity: a giant, knotted amoeba. An amoeba slides between the fingers whenever one tries to grab a part of it. A perfect amoeba flows around any knife trying to cut it. The only way to hold it would be to grab it in its entirety. However, for someone himself made of amoeba strands, this is impossible. He can only grab it approximately, by catching part of it and approximately blocking it, for example using a small hole so that the escape takes a long time.

Summary of the fourth argument for extension

The lack of particles and of sets in nature leads to describing nature by a single entity. Nature is thus modelled by an entity which is *one single 'object'* (to eliminate distinguishability), which is *extended* (to eliminate localizability) and which is *fluctuating* (to ensure approximate continuity). Nature is a far-reaching, fluctuating fold, similar to an amoeba. The tangled branches of the amoeba allow a definition of length via counting of the folds. In this way, *discreteness* of space, time, and particles could also be realized; the quantization of space-time, matter and radiation thus follows. Any flexible and deformable entity is also a perfect candidate for the realization of diffeomorphism invariance, as required by general relativity.

A simple candidate for the extended fold is the image of a fluctuating, flexible *tube*. Counting tubes implies determining distances or areas. The minimum possible count (one) gives the minimum distance, from which quantum theory is derived. In fact, we can use as a model any flexible object with a small dimension, such as a tube, a thin sheet, a ball chain or a woven collection of rings. These options give the different, but probably equivalent, models currently being explored in simplicial quantum gravity, in Ashtekar's variables and in superstrings.

THE ENTROPY OF BLACK HOLES

We are still collecting approaches to determining the shape of particles. One way is to study situations where they appear in large numbers. Systems composed of many particles behave differently depending on whether the particles are point-like or extended. In particular, their entropy is different. Studying large-number entropy thus allows us to determine the shape of components. The most revealing situations are those in which

Challenge 1706 ny

* Is this the only way to describe nature? Is it possible to find another description, particularly if space and time are not used as background? The answers are unclear at present.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

large numbers of particles are crammed in a small volume. Therefore we study the entropy of black holes. A black hole is a body whose gravity is so strong that even light cannot escape. Black holes tell us a lot about the fundamental entities of nature. It is easily deduced from general relativity that any body whose mass m fits inside the so-called Schwarzschild radius

$$r_S = 2Gm/c^2 \tag{949}$$

is a black hole.

A black hole can be formed when a whole star collapses under its own weight. Such a black hole is a macroscopic body, with a large number of constituents. Therefore it has an entropy. The entropy S of a macroscopic black hole was determined by Bekenstein and Hawking, and is given by

Ref. 1311, Ref. 1312

$$S = \frac{k}{l_{Pl}^2}\frac{A}{4} \quad \text{or} \quad S = k\frac{4\pi G m^2}{\hbar c} \tag{950}$$

where k is the Boltzmann constant and $A = 4\pi r_S^2$ is the surface of the black hole horizon. This important result has been derived in many different ways. The various derivations also confirm that space-time and matter are equivalent, by showing that the entropy value can be interpreted as an entropy either of matter or of space-time. In the present context, the two main points of interest are that the entropy is *finite*, and that it is *proportional to the area* of the black hole horizon.

Ref. 1313

In view of the existence of minimum lengths and times, the finiteness of the entropy is not surprising: it confirms the idea that matter is made of a finite number of discrete entities per given volume. It also shows that these entities behave statistically: they fluctuate. In fact, quantum gravity implies a finite entropy for any object, not only for black holes. Bekenstein has shown that the entropy of an object is always smaller than the entropy of a (certain type of) black hole of the same mass.

Ref. 1314

The entropy of a black hole is proportional to its horizon area. Why? This question has been the topic of a stream of publications.* A simple way to understand the entropy–surface proportionality is to look for other systems in nature whose entropy is proportional to system surface instead of system volume. In general, the entropy of a collection of flexible one-dimensional objects, such as polymer chains, shares this property. Indeed, the entropy of a polymer chain made of N monomers, each of length a, whose ends are kept a distance r apart, is given by

Ref. 1315

Ref. 1317

Ref. 1318

$$S(r) = k\frac{3r^2}{2Na^2} \quad \text{for} \quad Na \gg \sqrt{Na} \gg r\,. \tag{951}$$

This formula can be derived in a few lines from the properties of a random walk on a lattice, using only two assumptions: the chains are extended; and they have a characteristic internal length a given by the smallest straight segment. Expression (951) is only valid if the polymers are effectively infinite: in other words, if the length Na of the chain and

Ref. 1316

* The result can be derived from quantum statistics alone. However, this derivation does not yield the proportionality coefficient.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

the *elongation* $a\sqrt{N}$, are much larger than the radius r of the region of interest. If the chain length is comparable to or smaller than the region of interest, one gets the usual extensive entropy, satisfying $S \sim r^3$. Thus *only flexible extended entities yield an* $S \sim r^2$ *dependence.*

However, there is a difficulty. From the expression for the entropy of a black hole we deduce that the elongation $a\sqrt{N}$ is given by $a\sqrt{N} \approx l_{\text{Pl}}$; thus it is much smaller than the radius of a general macroscopic black hole, which can have a diameter of several kilometres. On the other hand, the formula for long entities is only valid when the chains are longer than the distance r between the end points.

This difficulty disappears when we remember that space near a black hole is strongly curved. All lengths have to be measured in the same coordinate system. It is well known that for an outside observer, any object of finite size falling into a black hole seems to cover the complete horizon for long times (whereas for an observer attached to the object it falls into the hole in its original size). In short, an extended entity can have a proper length of Planck size but still, when seen by an outside observer, be as long as the horizon of the black hole. We thus find that black holes are made of extended entities.

Ref. 1297

Another viewpoint can confirm this result. Entropy is (proportional to) the number of yes-or-no questions needed to know the exact state of the system. This view of black holes has been introduced by Gerard 't Hooft. If a system is defined by its surface, as a black hole is, its components must be extended.

Finally, imagining black holes as made of extended entities is also consistent with the so-called no-hair theorem: black holes' properties do not depend on what falls into them, as all matter and radiation particles are made of the same extended components. The final state only depends on the number of entities. In short, the entropy formula for a black hole is consistent with the idea that it is made of a big tangle of extended entities, fluctuating in shape.

Summary of the fifth argument for extension

Black hole entropy is best understood as resulting form extended entities of space-time and matter.

EXCHANGING SPACE POINTS OR PARTICLES AT PLANCK SCALES

Let us now focus on the exchange behaviour of fundamental entities in nature. We saw above that 'points' in space have to be abandoned in favour of continuous, fluctuating entities common to space, time and matter. Is such an entity a boson or a fermion? If we exchange two points of empty space, in everyday life, nothing happens. Indeed, at the basis of quantum field theory is the relation

$$[x, y] = xy - yx = 0 \tag{952}$$

between any two points with coordinates x and y, making them bosons. But at Planck scales, because of the existence of minimal distances and areas, this relation must at least

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

be changed to

$$[x, y] = l_{\mathrm{Pl}}^2 + \dots \,. \tag{953}$$

This means that 'points' are neither bosons nor fermions.* They have more complex exchange properties. In fact, the term on the right-hand side will be energy-dependent, to an increasing extent as we approach Planck scales. In particular, as we have seen, gravity implies that double exchange does not lead back to the original situation at Planck scales.

Ref. 1294

Entities obeying this or similar relations have been studied in mathematics for many decades: they are called braids. Thus at Planck scales space-time is not made of points, but of braids or their generalizations. Again, quantum theory and general relativity taken together show that the vacuum must be made of extended entities.

Ref. 1319

Ref. 1319

All particles behave in a similar way: we know that at low, everyday energies, particles of the same type are *identical*. Experiments sensitive to quantum effects show that there is no way to distinguish them: any system of several identical particles has permutation symmetry. On the other hand, we know that at Planck energy all low-energy symmetries disappear. We also know that at Planck energy permutation cannot be carried out, as it implies exchanging positions of two particles. At Planck energy, nothing can be distinguished from vacuum; thus no two entities can be shown to have identical properties. Indeed, no two particles can be shown to be indistinguishable, as they cannot even be shown to be separate.

What happens when we slowly approach Planck energy? At everyday energies, permutation symmetry is defined by commutation or anticommutation relations between particle creation operators

$$a^\dagger b^\dagger \pm b^\dagger a^\dagger = 0 \,. \tag{954}$$

At Planck energies this cannot be correct. Quantum gravity effects modify the right-hand side: they add an energy-dependent term, which is negligible at experimentally accessible energies but which becomes important at Planck energy. We know from our experience with Planck scales that, in contrast to everyday life, exchanging particles twice cannot lead back to the original situation. A double exchange at Planck energy cannot have no effect, because at Planck energy such statements are impossible. The simplest extension of the commutation relation (954) for which the right-hand side does not vanish is *braid symmetry*. This again suggests that particles are made of extended entities.

Ref. 1294

Ref. 1319

Summary of the sixth argument for extension

Extrapolating particle indistinguishability to Planck scales points to extended entities.

THE MEANING OF SPIN

Finally, we will show that even at everyday energy, the extension of particles makes sense. Any particle is a part of the universe. A part is something that is different from anything else. Being 'different' means that exchange has some effect. *Distinction means possibility of exchange.* In other words, any part of the universe is described by its exchange behaviour.

* The same reasoning applies to the fermionic or Grassmann coordinates used in supersymmetry.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 607 A possible model for a spin 1/2 particle

In everyday life, exchange can be seen as composed of rotations. Parts are described by their rotation behaviour. This is why, for microscopic particles, exchange behaviour is specified by spin. *Spin distinguishes particles from vacuum.*[*]

We note that volume does not distinguish vacuum from particles; neither does rest mass or charge: there are particles without rest mass or charge, such as photons. The only observables that might distinguish particles from vacuum are spin and momentum. In fact, linear momentum is only a limiting case of angular momentum. We again find that rotation behaviour is the basic aspect distinguishing particles from vacuum.

If spin is the central property that distinguishes particles from vacuum, finding a model for spin is of central importance. But we do not have to search for long. There is a model for spin 1/2 that is part of physics folklore. Any belt provides an example, as
Page 1052 we discussed in detail when exploring permutation symmetry. Any localized structure with any number of long tails attached to it – and reaching the border of the region of space under consideration – has the same properties as a spin 1/2 particle. It is a famous exercise to show that such a model, shown in Figure 607, is indeed invariant under 4π rotations but not under 2π rotations, and that two such particles get entangled when exchanged, but get untangled when exchanged twice. This model has all the properties of spin 1/2 particles, independently of the precise structure of the central region, which remains unknown at this point. The tail model even has the same problems with highly curved space as real spin 1/2 particles have. We will explore this idea in detail shortly.

The tail model thus confirms that rotation is partial exchange. More interestingly, it
Ref. 1320 shows that rotation implies connection with the border of space-time. Extended particles can be rotating. Particles can have spin 1/2 provided that they have tails going to the border of space-time. If the tails do not reach the border, the model does not work. Spin 1/2 thus even seems to *require* extension. We again find that extended entities serve as a good description for particles.

[*] With a flat (or other) background, it is possible to define a *local* energy–momentum tensor. Thus particles can be defined. Without a background, this is not possible, and only global quantities can be defined. Without a background, even particles cannot be defined. Therefore, in this section we assume that we have a slowly varying space-time background.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Summary of the seventh argument for extension

Extrapolating particle spin to Planck scales points to extended entities.

CURRENT RESEARCH

> To understand is to perceive patterns.
>
> Isaiah Berlin

The Greeks deduced the existence of atoms from the fact that fish can swim through
Ref. 1304 water. They argued that only if water is made of atoms could a fish make its way through it, by pushing the atoms aside. We can ask a similar question of a particle flying through a vacuum: why is it able to do so? A vacuum cannot be a fluid or a solid composed of small entities, as its dimensionality would not then be fixed. Only one possibility remains: both vacuum and particles are made of a web of extended entities.

The idea of describing matter as composed of extended entities dates from the 1960s. That of describing nature as composed of 'infinitely' extended entities dates from the 1980s. In addition to the arguments presented so far, current research provides several other approaches that arrive at the same conclusion.

* *

Bosonization, the construction of fermions using an infinite number of bosons, is a cen-
Ref. 1321 tral property of modern unification attempts. It also implies coupling duality, and thus the extension of fundamental constituents.

* *

String theory, and in particular its generalization to membranes, is explicitly based on
Ref. 1322 extended entities, as the name implies. The fundamental entities are indeed assumed to reach the limits of space-time.

* *

Ref. 1323 Research into quantum gravity – in particular the study of spin networks and spin foams – has shown that the vacuum must be thought of as a collection of extended entities.

* *

In the 1990s, Dirk Kreimer showed that high-order *QED* diagrams are related to knot
Ref. 1324 theory. He thus proved that extension arrives by the back door even when electromagnetism is described in terms of point particles.

* *

A recent discovery in particle physics, 'holography', connects the surface and volume of
Ref. 1325 physical systems at high energy. Even if it were not part of string theory, it would still imply extended entities.

* *

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Other fundamental non-localities in the description of nature, such as wave function collapse, can be seen as the result of extended entities.

Page 1086

* *

At the start of the twenty-first century there are a number of new approaches, such as string net condensation or knotted particle models. All these make use of extended entities.

Conceptual checks of extension

Is nature really described by extended entities? The idea is taken for granted in all current frameworks in theoretical physics. How can we be sure about it? The arguments presented above provide several possible checks.

Challenge 1707 ny

— As Ed Witten likes to say, any unified model of nature must be supersymmetric and dual. The idea of extended entities would be immediately dead if it were shown not to be compatible with these requirements.
— Any model of nature must be easily extendible to a model for black holes. If not, it cannot be correct.
— The model must be consistent with the results of quantum gravity, for example on the area and volume quantization.
— Extended entities must appear if one starts from *any* physical (low-energy) concept – not only from length measurements – and studies how it behaves at Planck scales.
— Any contradiction between the idea of extension and string theory or M-theory would lead to strong doubts.
— If the measurement of length could be shown not to be related to the counting of folds, the model would be invalidated.
— A single Gedanken experiment invalidating the extended entity idea would prove it wrong.

Experimental falsification of models based on extended entities

Physics is an experimental science. What kind of data could show that extension is incorrect?

— Observing a single particle in cosmic rays with energy above the Planck energy would bring this approach to a sudden stop. (The present record is a million times lower.)
— Finding any property of nature not consistent with extended entities would spell the end of the idea.
— Finding an elementary particle of spin 0 would invalidate the idea. In particular, finding the Higgs boson and showing that it is elementary, i.e., that its size is smaller than its own Compton wavelength, would invalidate the model.
— Most proposed experimental checks of string theory can also yield information on the idea of extended entities. For example, Paul Mende has proposed a number of checks on the motion of extended objects in space-time. He argues that an extended object moves differently from a mass point; the differences could be noticeable in scattering or dispersion of light near masses.

Ref. 1327

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



FIGURE 608 Planck effects make the energy axis an approximation

— In July 2002, the Italian physicist Andrea Gregori made a surprising prediction, valid for any model using extended entities that reach the border of the universe: if particles are extended in this way, their mass should depend on the size of the universe. Thus particle masses should change with time, especially around the big bang. This new idea is still a topic of research.

Ref. 1328

Incidentally, most of these scenarios would signal the end for almost all current unification attempts.

Possibilities for confirmation of extension models

— The best confirmation would be to find a concrete model for the electron, the muon, the tau, and their neutrinos. In addition, a concrete model for photons and gravitons is needed. With these models, finding a knot-based definition for the electrical charge and the lepton number would be a big step forward. All quantum numbers should be topological quantities deduced from these models and should behave as observed.
— Estimating the coupling constants and comparing them with the experimental values is of course the main dream of modern theoretical physics.
— A detailed proof that extended entities imply exactly three plus one space-time dimensions is still needed.
— Estimating the total number of particles in the visible universe would provide the final check of any extended entity model.

Generally speaking, the *only* possible confirmations are those from the one-page table of unexplained properties of nature given in Chapter 51. No other confirmations are possible. The ones mentioned above are the main ones.

Page 1340

Curiosities and fun challenges about extension

> No problem is so formidable that you can't walk away from it.
>
> Charles Schultz

This section has already provided enough food for thought, but here is some more.

* *

If measurements become impossible near Planck energy, we cannot even draw a diagram with an energy axis reaching that value. (See Figure 608.) Is this conclusion valid in all cases?

Challenge 1708 ny

* *

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1709 s Quantum theory implies that even if tight walls exist, the lid of a box made of them could never be tightly shut. Can you provide the argument?

* *

Challenge 1710 s Would a detector able to detect Planck-mass particles have to be be of infinite size? What about a detector able to detect a particle moving with Planck energy?

* *

Challenge 1711 e Can you provide an argument against the idea of extended entities? If so, publish it (and email it to the author).

* *

Challenge 1712 ny Does duality imply that the cosmic background fluctuations (at the origin of galaxies and clusters) are the same as vacuum fluctuations?

* *

Challenge 1713 ny Does duality imply that a system with two small masses colliding is the same as a system with two large masses gravitating?

* *

Challenge 1714 d It seems that in all arguments so far we have assumed that time is continuous, even though we know it is not. Does this change the conclusions?

* *

Duality also implies that in some sense large and small masses are equivalent. A mass m in a radius r is equivalent to a mass m_{Pl}^2/m in a radius l_{Pl}^2/r. In other words, duality transforms mass density from ρ to $\rho_{\mathrm{Pl}}^2/\rho$. Vacuum and maximum density are equivalent. Vacuum is thus dual to black holes.

* *

Duality implies that the notion of initial conditions for the big bang makes no sense, as we saw earlier by considering the minimal distance. As duality implies a symmetry between large and small energies, the big bang itself becomes a vague concept.

* *

Challenge 1715 s Total symmetry and space-time duality together imply that there is a symmetry between all values an observable can take. Do you agree?

* *

Challenge 1716 s Can supersymmetry be an aspect or special case of total symmetry, or is it something else?

* *

Challenge 1717 s Any description is a mapping from nature to mathematics, i.e., from observed differences (and relations) to thought differences (and relations). How can we do this accurately, if differences are only approximate? Is this the end of physics?

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

* *

Challenge 1718 d What do extended entities imply for the big bang?

* *

Challenge 1719 d Can you show that going to high energies or selecting a Planck-size region of space-time is equivalent to visiting the big bang?

* *

Ref. 1328, Ref. 1329 One needs a description for the expansion of the universe in terms of extended entities. Some approaches are currently being explored; no final conclusions can be drawn yet.
Challenge 1720 ny Can you speculate about the solution?

An intermediate status report

> Wir müssen wissen, wir werden wissen.*
> David Hilbert, 1930

Many efforts towards unification advance by digging deeper and deeper into the details of quantum field theory and general relativity. We have taken the opposite approach: we took a step back and looked at the general picture. We found several arguments, all leading to the same conclusion: space-time points and point particles are made of *extended* entities.

Somehow it seems that the universe is best described by a fluctuating, many-branched entity, a cross between a giant amoeba and a heap of worms. Another analogy is a pot of boiling and branched spaghetti. Such a model of quantum geometry is beautiful and simple, and these two criteria are often taken as an indication, before any experimental tests, of the correctness of a description. We have toured topics such as the existence of Planck limits, three-dimensionality, curvature, renormalization, spin, bosonization, the cosmological constant problem, and the search for a 'background-free' description of
Ref. 1330 nature. We will study and test specific details of the model in the next section. Each of these tests concerns one of only three possible topics: the construction of space-time, the construction of particles, and the construction of the universe. These are the only issues remaining on our ascent of Motion Mountain. We will discuss them in the next section. Before we do so, we enjoy two small thoughts.

Sexual preferences in physics

Fluctuating entities can be seen to answer an old and not-so-serious question. When we discussed the definition of nature as made of tiny balls moving in a vacuum, we described
Page 258 this as a typically male idea. This implies that the female part is missing. Which part would that be?

From the present point of view, the female part of physics might be the quantum description of the vacuum. The unravelling of the structure of the vacuum, as an extended container of localized balls, could be seen as the female half of physics. If women had
Ref. 1331 developed physics, the order of its discoveries would surely have been different. Instead

* 'We must know, we will know.' This was Hilbert's famous personal credo.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

of studying matter, as men did, women might have studied the vacuum first.

In any case, the female and the male approaches, taken together, lead us to the description of nature in terms of extended entities. Extended entities, which show that particles are not balls and that the vacuum is not a container, transcend the sexist approaches and lead to the unified description. In a sense, extended entities are thus the politically correct approach to nature.

A PHYSICAL APHORISM

Ref. 1197, Ref. 1198

To 'show' that we are not far from the top of Motion Mountain, we give a less serious argument as final curiosity. Salecker and Wigner, and then Zimmerman, formulated the fundamental limit for the measurement precision τ attainable by a clock of mass M. It is given by $\tau = \sqrt{\hbar T/Mc^2}$, where T is the time to be measured. We can then ask what time T can be measured with a precision of a Planck time t_{Pl}, given a clock of the mass of the whole universe. We get a maximum time of

$$T = \frac{t_{\mathrm{Pl}}^2 c^2}{\hbar} M \,. \tag{955}$$

Challenge 1721 e

Inserting numbers, we find rather precisely that the time T is the present age of the universe. With the right dose of humour we can see this result as a sign that time is now ripe, after so much waiting, for us to understand the universe down to the Planck scale. We are getting nearer to the top of Motion Mountain. Be prepared for even more fun.

STRING THEORY – EXTENSIOIN AND A WEB OF DUALITIES

> "Throw physic to the dogs; I'll none of it."
> William Shakespeare, *Macbeth*.

String theory, *superstring theory* or *membrane theory* – all are names for related approaches – is the most investigated hypothesis ever. String theory explores a specific approach of particles as extended entities. The theory contains a maximum speed, a minimum action and a maximum force (or tension). String theory thus incorporates special relativity, quantum theory and general relativity. String theory is thus a candidate for the unified theory of motion.

Ref. 1326

In its attempt to achieve a unified description, string theory uses four ideas that go beyond standard general relativity and quantum theory:

1. String theory describes particles as *extended* entities. The original string theory is based on one-dimensional strings. In a further generalization, the new membrane or M-theory describes particles as higher-dimensional membranes.
2. String theory uses *supersymmetry*. Supersymmetry is the symmetry that relates matter to radiation, or equivalently, fermions to bosons. Supersymmetry is the most general local interaction symmetry that we know about.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

3. String theory uses *higher dimensions* to introduce extended entities and to unify interactions. A number of space-time dimensions much higher than 3 + 1, typically 11, seems to be necessary for a consistent theory of strings. At present, however, the topology and size of the dimensions above the fourth is still unclear.
4. String theory makes heavy use of *dualities*. In the context of high-energy physics, dualities are symmetries between large and small values of physical observables. Important examples are space-time duality and coupling constant duality. Dualities are global interaction and space-time symmetries. They are essential if we want to include gravitation in our description of nature. Dualities also imply holography, the idea that physical systems are completely fixed by the states on their bounding surface. String theory uses dualities to express the equivalence between space-time and matter–radiation. Ref. 1332

By incorporating these four ideas, string theory acquires a number of appealing characteristics. First of all, the theory is unique: it has no adjustable parameters. Furthermore, as we would expect from a theory involving extended entities, string theory includes gravity. In addition, string theory describes interactions. It describes gauge fields, such as the electromagnetic field. String theory is thus an extension – and retains all the essential points – of quantum field theory.

String theory has many large symmetries, which arise from its many dualities. These symmetries connect many situations that seem intuitively to be radically different: this makes the theory fascinating but also difficult to picture.

Finally, in string theory there are special cancellations of anomalies and inconsistencies. Historically, the first example was the Green–Schwarz anomaly cancellation; but string theory also solves many other mathematical problems of quantum field theory.

In short, string theorists have shown that general relativity and quantum field theory can be unified using extended entities.

Strings and membranes – why string theory is so difficult

What is string theory? There are two answers to this question. First, we may follow its historical development. Unfortunately, that is almost the hardest of all possible ways to learn and understand string theory. The history of string theory, from around 1970 to 2008, was characterized by short periods of excitement followed by long periods of disappointment. The main reason for this ineffective evolution was that most researchers only studied topics that everybody else was also studying. Young researchers' fear of unemployment and the general fear of missing something out meant that people were reluctant to research topics that nobody else was looking at. Thus string theory had an extremely difficult birth.

The full description of string theory along historical lines starts from the motion of classical strings, and then proceeds to string field theory, while incorporating dualities, higher dimensions and supersymmetry on the way. Each step can be described by a Lagrangian.

The first idea of string theory, as the name implies, is the use of strings to describe particles. Strings replace point particles as the fundamental model. This formulation of string theory takes for granted the existence of a space-time background. The Lagrangian of the first step can be deduced from a new symmetry, the *Virasoro algebra*.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

– CS – more to be added in the future – CS –

Edward Witten likes to say that quantum theory cures the infinities that appear in e^2/r when the distance r goes to zero; in the same way, string theory cures the infinities that appear in m^2/r when the distance r goes to zero.

Also following Witten, in string theory, the interactions follow from the particle definitions: interactions do not have to be added. That is why string theory is so predictive. In particular, it predicts gravity, gauge theory, and supersymmetry.

About gravity, one of the pretty results of string theory is that strings and black holes
Ref. 1333 are complementary to each other. This was argued by Polchinsky, Horowitz and Susskind.

Another reason why string theory is so appealing is that it can be deduced from an extremely small number of fundamental ideas. These ideas lead to M-theory, the most recent formulation of string theory.

M-theory assumes that the basic entities of nature are *membranes* of various dimensions. M-theory incorporates dualities and holography. The existence of interactions can be deduced. Supersymmetry – and, in particular, 'super Yang–Mills' theory – can also be deduced. The entropy formula for black holes also follows from M-theory. Finally, supergravity has been deduced from M-theory. This means that the existence of space-time follows from M-theory. M-theory is thus a candidate for a theory of motion. Let us now turn to the comparison with experiment.

Masses and couplings

One of the main results of QCD, the theory of strong interactions, is the explanation of
Ref. 1334 mass relations such as

$$m_{\text{proton}} \sim \mathrm{e}^{-k/\alpha_{\text{unif}}} m_{\text{Pl}} \quad \text{and} \quad k = 11/2\pi \,,\ \alpha_{\text{unif}} \approx 1/25 \,. \tag{956}$$

Here, the value of the coupling constant α_{unif} is taken at the grand unification energy, usually estimated to be about a factor of 1000 below the Planck energy. In other words, a general understanding of masses of bound states of the strong interaction, such as the proton, requires little more than a knowledge of the unification energy and the coupling constant at that energy. The approximate value $\alpha_{\text{unif}} = 1/25$ is an extrapolation from the
Page 1297 low-energy value, based on experimental data.

Any unified theory must allow one to calculate the three coupling constants as a function of energy, and thus also the value α_{unif} at the unification energy itself. At present, most researchers regard the search for the vacuum state as the main difficulty facing string theory and M-theory. Without knowledge of the vacuum state, no calculations of the masses and coupling constants are possible.

The vacuum state of string theory or M-theory is expected to be one of an extremely involved set of topologically distinct manifolds. It is estimated that there are around 10^{500} candidate vacuum states. The universe contains 10^{80} atoms; it thus seems easier to find a particular atom in the universe that to find the correct vacuum state.

One can also describe the situation in the following way. String theory and M-theory predict states with Planck mass and with zero mass. The zero-mass particles are then thought to get their tiny mass (compared with the Planck mass) from the Higgs mecha-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

nism. However, the Higgs mechanism, including its coupling constants, has not yet been deduced from string theory. In other words, so far, string theory has not predicted any masses for elementary particles. This disappointing situation is the reason why some scientists dismiss string theory and M-theory altogether. Time will tell.

Ref. 1335

Outlook

> Es ist nicht Großes ohne Leidenschaft vollbracht worden, noch kann es ohne solche vollbract werden.*
>
> Friedrich Hegel, *Enzyklopädie*.

It is estimated that 10 000 man-years have been invested in the search for string theory: compare this with about 5 for Maxwell's electrodynamics, 10 for general relativity, and a similar number for the foundation of quantum theory.

Historically, the community of string theorists took over 10 years to understand that strings were not the basic entities of string theory. The fundamental entities are membranes. Then string theorists took another 10 years, and more, to understand that membranes are not the most practical fundamental entities for calculation. The search for the most practical entities is still ongoing. It is probable that *knotted* membranes must be taken into consideration.

Why is M-theory so hard? Doing calculations on knotted membranes is difficult. In fact, it is *extremely* difficult. Mathematicians and physicists all over the world are still struggling to find simple ways to do such calculations.

In short, a new approach to calculation with extended entities is needed. We can then ask the following question. M-theory is based on four basic ideas: extension, higher dimensions, supersymmetry and duality. Can we dispense with any of these assumptions? Duality is related to extension, for which enough experimental and theoretical evidence exists, as we have argued before. However, supersymmetry and higher dimensions are completely speculative. Let us leave them aside, and continue our adventure.

Page 1487

* 'Nothing great has been achieved without passion, nor can it be achieved without it.' Hegel writes this towards the end of the third and last part of his *Enzyklopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften im Grundrisse*, §474, 296.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 57

UNIFICATION (NOT YET AVAILABLE)

– CS – this chapter will appear in the near future – CS –

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



Chapter 58

THE TOP OF THE MOUNTAIN (NOT YET AVAILABLE)

– CS – this chapter will appear in the near future – CS –

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



POSTFACE

Perhaps once you will read Plato's Phaedrus, one of the beautiful philosophical Greek texts. In it, Socrates is made to say that he almost never left the city walls because to him, as a 'lover of learning, trees and the open country do not teach anything, whereas men in the town do.' This is a veiled critique of Democritus, the most important and famous philosopher in Greece during Plato's time. Democritus was the natural philosopher par excellence, and arguably had learned from nature – with its trees and open country – more than anybody else after him.

After this mountain ascent you can decide for yourself which of these two approaches is more congenial to you. It might be useful to know that Aristotle refused to choose and cultivated them both. There is no alternative in life to following one's own mind, and to enjoy doing so. If you enjoyed this particular trip, show it to your friends. For yourself, after this walk, sense intensively the pleasure of having accomplished something important. Many before you did not have the occasion. Enjoy the beauty of the view offered. Enjoy the vastness of horizon it provides. Enjoy the impressions that it creates inside you. Collect them and rest. You will have a treasure that will be useful in many occasions. Then, when you feel the desire of going further, get ready for another of the adventures life has to offer.

Plato's *Phaedrus*, written around 380 BCE, is available in many pocket editions. Do not waste your time learning ancient Greek to read it; the translated versions are as beautiful as the original. Half the text is about love and gave rise to the expression 'platonic love', even though its original meaning has been strongly distorted in the meantime, as you will find out.

Plato's lifelong avoidance of the natural sciences had two reasons. First of all, he was jealous of Democritus. Plato never even cites Democritus in his texts. Democritus was the most prolific, daring, admired and successful philosopher of his time (and maybe of all times). Democritus was a keen student of nature. His written works did not survive, because his studies were not congenial to the followers of christianity, and thus they were not copied by the monks in the Middle Ages. The loss of these texts is related to the second reason that kept Plato away from the natural sciences: he wanted to save his life. Plato had learned one thing from men in the town: talking about nature is dangerous. Starting around his lifetime, for over 2000 years people practising the natural sciences were regularly condemned to exile or to death for impiety. Fortunately, this is only rarely the case today. But such violence still occurs, and is worth remembering the dangers that those preceding us had to overcome in order to enjoy this adventure.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



BIBLIOGRAPHY

> A man who uses a great many words to express his meaning is like a bad marksman who, instead of aiming a single stone at an object, takes up a handful and throws at it in hopes he may hit.
>
> Samuel Johnson

1176 Steven Weinberg, The cosmological constant problem, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **61**, pp. 1–23, 1989. Cited on page 1396.

1177 Steven Weinberg, *The Quantum Theory of Fields*, Cambridge University Press, volumes I, 1995, and II, 1996. Cited on page 1397.

1178 The difficulties are summarised by B. S. DeWitt, Quantum field theory in curved spacetime, *Physics Reports* **19**, pp. 295–357, 1975. Cited on page 1397.

1179 C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne & J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, Freeman, 1973. Cited on pages 1398, 1400, and 1404.

1180 J. A. Wheeler, in *Relativity, Groups and Topology*, edited by C. DeWitt & B. DeWitt, Gordon and Breach, 1994. See also J. A. Wheeler, Physics at the Planck length, *International Journal of Modern Physics A* **8**, pp. 4013–4018, 1993. Cited on page 1398.

1181 J. L. Friedman & R. D. Sorkin, Spin 1/2 from gravity, *Physical Review Letters* **44**, pp. 1100–1103, 1980. Cited on page 1398.

1182 A. P. Balachandran, G. Bimonte, G. Marmo & A. Simoni, Topology change and quantum physics, *Nuclear Physics B* **446**, pp. 299–314, 1995, arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9503046. Cited on page 1398.

1183 Many themes discussed here resulted from an intense exchange with Luca Bombelli, now at the Department of Physics and Astronomy of the University of Mississippi. These pages are a reworked version of those published in French as C. Schiller, Le vide diffère-t-il de la matière? in E. Gunzig & S. Diner, editors, *Le Vide – Univers du tout et du rien – Des physiciens et des philosophes s'interrogent*, Les Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1998. An older English-language version is also available as C. Schiller, Does matter differ from vacuum? arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9610066. Cited on page 1398.

1184 See for example Richard P. Feynman, Robert B. Leighton & Matthew Sands, *The Feynman Lectures on Physics*, Addison Wesley, 1977. Cited on page 1398.

1185 A. Ashtekar, Recent mathematical developments in quantum general relativity, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9411055. C. Rovelli, Ashtekar formulation of general relativity and loop-space non-perturbative quantum gravity: a report, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **8**, pp. 1613–1675, 1991. Cited on pages 1399 and 1420.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

1186 M. B. Green, J. H. Schwarz & E. Witten, *Superstring Theory*, Cambridge University Press, volumes 1 and 2, 1987. G. Veneziano, A stringy nature needs just two constants, *Europhysics Letters* **2**, pp. 199–204, 1986. Cited on pages 1399 and 1420.

1187 S. Majid, Introduction to braided geometry and q-Minkowski space, arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9410241. See also S. Majid, Beyond supersymmetry and quantum symmetry (an introduction to braided groups and braided matrices), in *Quantum Groups, Integrable Statistical Models and Knot Theory*, edited by M.-L. Ge & H. J. de Vega, World Scientific, 1993, pp. 231–282. Cited on pages 1399 and 1420.

1188 C. J. Isham, Prima facie questions in quantum gravity, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9310031. Cited on page 1399.

1189 Steven Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology*, Wiley, 1972. Cited on pages 1400, 1403, and 1404.

1190 The observations of black holes at the centre of galaxies and elsewhere are summarised by R. Blandford & N. Gehrels, Revisiting the black hole, *Physics Today* **52**, June 1999. Cited on page 1400.

1191 M. Planck, Über irreversible Strahlungsvorgänge, *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* pp. 440–480, 1899. Today it is commonplace to use Dirac's $\hbar$ instead of Planck's h, which Planck originally called b. Cited on page 1401.

1192 The argument is given e.g. in E. P. Wigner, Relativistic invariance and quantum phenomena, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **29**, pp. 255–258, 1957. Cited on page 1401.

1193 The starting point for the following arguments is taken from M. Schön, Operative time definition and principal indeterminacy, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9304024, and from T. Padmanabhan, Limitations on the operational definition of space-time events and quantum gravity, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **4**, pp. L107–L113, 1987; see also Padmanabhan's earlier papers referenced there. Cited on page 1401.

1194 W. Heisenberg, Über den anschaulichen Inhalt der quantentheoretischen Kinematik und Mechanik, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **43**, pp. 172–198, 1927. Cited on page 1401.

1195 E. H. Kennard, Zur Quantenmechanik einfacher Bewegungstypen, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **44**, pp. 326–352, 1927. Cited on page 1401.

1196 M. G. Raymer, Uncertainty principle for joint measurement of noncommuting variables, *American Journal of Physics* **62**, pp. 986–993, 1994. Cited on page 1401.

1197 H. Salecker & E. P. Wigner, Quantum limitations of the measurement of space-time distances, *Physical Review* **109**, pp. 571–577, 1958. Cited on pages 1402, 1428, and 1514.

1198 E. J. Zimmerman, The macroscopic nature of space-time, *American Journal of Physics* **30**, pp. 97–105, 1962. Cited on pages 1402, 1428, and 1514.

1199 S. W. Hawking, Particle creation by black holes, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **43**, pp. 199–220, 1975; see also S. W. Hawking, Black hole thermodynamics, *Physical Review D* **13**, pp. 191–197, 1976. Cited on page 1402.

1200 P. Gibbs, The small structure of space-time: a bibliographical review, arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9506171. Cited on pages 1402 and 1417.

1201 C. A. Mead, Possible connection between gravitation and fundamental length, *Physical Review B* **135**, pp. 849–862, 1964. Cited on pages 1403, 1404, 1406, and 1523.

1202 P. K. Townsend, Small-scale structure of space-time as the origin of the gravitational constant, *Physical Review D* **15**, pp. 2795–2801, 1977. Cited on page 1404.

1203 M.-T. Jaekel & S. Renaud, Gravitational quantum limit for length measurement, *Physics Letters A* **185**, pp. 143–148, 1994. Cited on page 1404.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

1204 D. V. Ahluwalia, Quantum measurement, gravitation and locality, *Physics Letters B* **339**, pp. 301–303, 1994, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9308007. Cited on page 1404.

1205 L. Garay, Quantum gravity and minimum length, *International Journal of Modern Physics A* **10**, pp. 145–165, 1995, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9403008. This paper also includes an extensive bibliography. Cited on page 1404.

1206 G. Amelino-Camelia, Limits on the measurability of space-time distances in (the semiclassical approximation of) quantum gravity, *Modern Physics Letters A* **9**, pp. 3415–3422, 1994, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9603014. See also Y. J. Ng & H. Van Dam, Limit to space-time measurement, *Modern Physics Letters A* **9**, pp. 335–340, 1994. Cited on page 1404.

1207 The generalized indeterminacy relation is implicit in Ref. 1201, especially on page 852, but the issue is explained rather unclearly. Probably the author considered the result too simple to be mentioned explicitly. Cited on pages 1404 and 1405.

1208 C. Rovelli & L. Smolin, Discreteness of area and volume in quantum gravity, *Nuclear Physics B* **442**, pp. 593–619, 1995. R. Loll, The volume operator in discretized quantum gravity, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9506014. Cited on page 1405.

1209 D. Amati, M. Ciafaloni & G. Veneziano, Superstring collisions at Planckian energies, *Physics Letters B* **197**, pp. 81–88, 1987. D. J. Gross & P. F. Mende, The high energy behavior of string scattering amplitudes, *Physics Letters B* **197**, pp. 129–134, 1987. K. Konishi, G. Paffuti & P. Provero, Minimum physical length and the generalized uncertainty principle, *Physics Letters B* **234**, pp. 276–284, 1990. P. Aspinwall, Minimum distances in non-trivial string target spaces, *Nuclear Physics B* **431**, pp. 78–96, 1994, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9404060. Cited on page 1405.

1210 M. Maggiore, A generalised uncertainty principle in quantum mechanics, *Physics Letters B* **304**, pp. 65–69, 1993. Cited on page 1405.

1211 A simple approach is S. Doplicher, K. Fredenhagen & J. E. Roberts, Spacetime quantization induced by classical gravity, *Physics Letters B* **331**, pp. 39–44, 1994. Cited on pages 1405 and 1417.

1212 A. Kempf, Uncertainty relation in quantum mechanics with quantum group symmetry, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **35**, pp. 4483–4496, 1994. A. Kempf, Quantum groups and quantum field theory with nonzero minimal uncertainties in positions and momenta, *Czechoslovak Journal of Physics* **44**, pp. 1041–1048, 1994. Cited on page 1405.

1213 E. J. Hellund & K. Tanaka, Quantized space-time, *Physical Review* **94**, pp. 192–195, 1954. Cited on page 1405.

1214 The impossibility of determining temporal ordering in quantum theory is discussed by J. Oppenheimer, B. Reznik & W. G. Unruh, Temporal ordering in quantum mechanics, *Journal of Physics A* **35**, pp. 7641–7652, 2001, or arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0003130. Cited on page 1406.

1215 A. Peres & N. Rosen, Quantum limitations on the measurement of gravitational fields, *Physical Review* **118**, pp. 335–336, 1960. Cited on page 1406.

1216 It is the first definition in Euclid's *Elements*, *c.* 300 BCE. For an English translation see T. Heath, *The Thirteen Books of the Elements*, Dover, 1969. Cited on page 1407.

1217 A beautiful description of the Banach–Tarski paradox is the one by Ian Stewart, Paradox of the spheres, *New Scientist*, 14 January 1995, pp. 28–31. Cited on page 1407.

1218 H. S. Snyder, Quantized space-time, *Physical Review* **71**, pp. 38–41, 1947. H. S. Snyder, The electromagnetic field in quantized space-time, *Physical Review* **72**, pp. 68–74,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

1947. A. Schild, Discrete space-time and integral Lorentz transformations, *Physical Review* **73**, pp. 414–415, 1948. E. L. Hill, Relativistic theory of discrete momentum space and discrete space-time, *Physical Review* **100**, pp. 1780–1783, 1950. H. T. Flint, The quantization of space-time, *Physical Review* **74**, pp. 209–210, 1948. A. Das, Cellular space-time and quantum field theory, *Il Nuovo Cimento* **18**, pp. 482–504, 1960. Cited on page 1409.

1219 D. Finkelstein, 'Superconducting' causal nets, *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **27**, pp. 473–519, 1985. Cited on page 1409.

1220 N. H. Christ, R. Friedberg & T. D. Lee, Random lattice field theory: general formulation, *Nuclear Physics B* **202**, pp. 89–125, 1982. G. 't Hooft, Quantum field theory for elementary particles – is quantum field theory a theory?, *Physics Reports* **104**, pp. 129–142, 1984. Cited on page 1409.

1221 For a discussion, see R. Sorabji, *Time, Creation and the Continuum: Theories in Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, Duckworth, 1983. Cited on page 1409.

1222 See for example: L. Bombelli, J. Lee, D. Meyer & R. D. Sorkin, Space-time as a causal set, *Physical Review Letters* **59**, pp. 521–524, 1987. G. Brightwell & R. Gregory, Structure of random space-time, *Physical Review Letters* **66**, pp. 260–263, 1991. Cited on page 1409.

1223 For quantum gravity, see for example A. Ashtekar, Quantum geometry in action: big bang and black holes, arxiv.org/abs/math-ph/0202008. Cited on page 1410.

1224 The false belief that particles like quarks or electrons are composite is slow to die out. See for example: S. Fredriksson, Preon prophecies by the standard model, arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0309213. Preon models gained popularity in the 1970s and 1980s, in particular through the papers by J. C. Pati & A. Salam, Lepton number as the fourth "color", *Physical Review D* **10**, pp. 275–289, 1974, H. Harari, A schematic model of quarks and leptons, *Physics Letters B* **86**, pp. 83–86, 1979, M. A. Shupe, A composite model of leptons and quarks, *Physics Letters B* **86**, pp. 87–92, 1979, and H. Fritzsch & G. Mandelbaum, Weak interactions as manifestations of the substructure of leptons and quarks, *Physics Letters B* **102**, pp. 319–322, 1981. Cited on page 1410.

1225 A. D. Sakharov, Vacuum quantum fluctuations in curved space and the theory of gravitation, *Soviet Physics – Doklady* **12**, pp. 1040–1041, 1968. Cited on page 1412.

1226 C. Wolf, Upper limit for the mass of an elementary particle due to discrete time quantum mechanics, *Il Nuovo Cimento B* **109**, pp. 213–218, 1994. Cited on page 1412.

1227 N. F. Ramsey & A. Weis, Suche nach permanenten elektrischen Dipolmomenten: ein Test der Zeitumkehrinvarianz, *Physikalische Blätter* **52**, pp. 859–863, 1996. The paper by E. D. Commins, S. B. Ross, D. DeMille & B. C. Regan, Improved experimental limit on the electric dipole moment of the electron, *Physical Review A* **50**, p. 2960, 1994, gives an upper experimental limit to the dipole moment of the electron of $3.4 \cdot 10^{-29}$ *e* m. W. Bernreuther & M. Suzuki, The electric dipole moment of the electron, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **63**, pp. 313–340, 1991. See also the musings in Hans Dehmelt, Is the electron a composite particle?, *Hyperfine Interactions* **81**, pp. 1–3, 1993. Cited on page 1412.

1228 K. Akama, T. Hattori & K. Katsuura, Naturalness bounds on dipole moments from new physics, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0111238. Cited on page 1412.

1229 W. G. Unruh, Notes on black hole evaporation, *Physical Review D* **14**, pp. 870–875, 1976. W. G. Unruh & R. M. Wald, What happens when an accelerating observer detects a Rindler particle, *Physical Review D* **29**, pp. 1047–1056, 1984. Cited on page 1415.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

1230 One way out is proposed in J. Magueijo & L. Smolin, Lorentz invariance with an invariant energy scale, *Physical Review Letters* **88**, p. 190403, 26 April 2002. They propose a modification of the mass energy relation of the kind

$$E = \frac{\gamma mc^2}{1 + \frac{\gamma mc^2}{E_{\text{Pl}}}} \quad \text{and} \quad p = \frac{\gamma mv}{1 + \frac{\gamma mc^2}{E_{\text{Pl}}}} \,. \tag{957}$$

Another, similar approach of recent years, with a different proposal, is called 'doubly special relativity'. A recent summary is G. Amelino-Camelia, Doubly-special relativity: first results and key open problems, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0210063. The paper shows how conceptual problems hinder the advance of the field, as does R. Aloisio, A. Galante, A. F. Grillo, E. Luzio & F. Méndez, Approaching space-time through velocity in doubly special relativity, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0410020. Cited on page 1416.

1231 W. Jauch, Heisenberg's uncertainty relation and thermal vibrations in crystals, *American Journal of Physics* **61**, pp. 929–932, 1993. Cited on page 1417.

1232 H. D. Zeh, On the interpretation of measurement in quantum theory, *Foundations of Physics* **1**, pp. 69–76, 1970. Cited on page 1417.

1233 Steven Weinberg, The cosmological constant problem, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **61**, pp. 1–23, 1989. Cited on page 1419.

1234 See Y. J. Ng, W. A. Christiansen & van Dam, Probing Planck-scale physics with extragalactic sources?, *Astrophysical Journal* **591**, pp. L87–L90, 2003, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0302372; D. H. Coule, Planck scale still safe from stellar images, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **20**, pp. 3107–3112, 2003, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0302333. Negative experimental results (and not always correct calculations) are found in R. Lieu & L. Hillman, The phase coherence of light from extragalactic sources – direct evidence against first order Planck scale fluctuations in time and space, *Astrophysical Journal* **585**, pp. L77–L80, 2003, and R. Ragazzoni, M. Turatto & W. Gaessler, The lack of observational evidence for the quantum structure of spacetime at Planck scales, *Astrophysical Journal* **587**, pp. L1–L4, 2003. Cited on page 1420.

1235 B. E. Schaefer, Severe limits on variations of the speed of light with frequency, *Physical Review Letters* **82**, pp. 4964–4966, 21 June 1999. Cited on page 1420.

1236 G. Amelino-Camelia, J. Ellis, N. E. Mavromatos, D. V. Nanopoulos & S. Sakar, Potential sensitivity of gamma-ray-burster observations to wave dispersion in vacuo, *Nature* **393**, p. 763, 1998, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/9712103. Cited on page 1421.

1237 G. Amelino-Camelia, Phenomenological description of space-time foam, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0104005. The paper includes a clearly written overview of present experimental approaches to detecting quantum gravity effects. See also his update G. Amelino-Camelia, Quantum-gravity phenomenology: status and prospects, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0204051. Cited on page 1421.

1238 G. Amelino-Camelia, An interferometric gravitational wave detector as a quantum gravity apparatus, *Nature* **398**, p. 216, 1999, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9808029. Cited on page 1421.

1239 F. Karolyhazy, Gravitation and quantum mechanics of macroscopic objects, *Il Nuovo Cimento* **A42**, pp. 390–402, 1966. Y. J. Ng & van Dam, Limit to space-time measurement, *Modern Physics Letters A* **9**, pp. 335–340, 1994. Y. J. Ng & H. Van Dam, *Modern Physics Letters A* Remarks on gravitational sources, **10**, pp. 2801–2808, 1995. The

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

discussion is neatly summarised in Y. J. Ng & van Dam, Comment on 'Uncertainty in measurements of distance', preprint at arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0209021. See also Y. J. Ng, Spacetime foam, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0201022. Cited on page 1421.

1240 L. J. Garay, Spacetime foam as a quantum thermal bath, *Physics Review Letters* **80**, pp. 2508–2511, 1998, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9801024. Cited on page 1421.

1241 G. Amelino-Camelia & T. Piran, Planck-scale deformation of Lorentz symmetry as a solution to the UHECR and the TeV-γ paradoxes, preprint at arxiv.org/astro-ph/0008107, 2000. Cited on page 1421.

1242 Experimental tests were described by R. Lieu & L. W. Hillman, The phase coherence of light from extragalactic sources: direct evidence against first-order Planck-scale fluctuations in time and space, *Astrophysical Journal* **585**, pp. L77–L80, 2003, and R. Ragazzoni & al., The lack of observational evidence for the quantum structure of spacetime at Planck scales, *Astrophysical Journal* **587**, pp. L1–L4, 2003. Discussions on the predicted phase values are found in Jack Ng, W. A. Christiansen & van Dam, Probing Planck-scale physics with extragalactic sources?, *Astrophysical Journal* **591**, pp. L87–L90, 2003, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0302372 and D. H. Coule, Planck scale still safe from stellar images, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **20**, pp. 3107–3112, 2003, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0302333. Cited on page 1421.

1243 See the paper by U. Amaldi, de Boer & H. Fürstenau, Comparison of grand unified theories with electroweak and strong coupling constants measured at LEP, *Physics Letters* **260**, pp. 447–455, 1991. This is the standard reference on the topic. Cited on pages 1422 and 1423.

1244 M. V. Romalis, W. C. Griffith, J. P. Jacobs & E. N. Fortson, New limit on the permanent electric dipole moment of ^{199}Hg, *Physical Review Letters* **86**, pp. 2505–2508, 19 March 2001, or at arxiv.org/abs/hep-ex/0012001. Their upper limit on the dipole moment of mercury atoms is $2.1 \cdot 10^{30}\, e\,\mathrm{m}$. Research for better measurement methods is progressing; a modern proposal is by S. K. Lamoreaux, Solid state systems for electron electric dipole moment and other fundamental measurements, arxiv.org/abs/nucl-ex/0109014. Cited on page 1423.

1245 See the lucid discussion by G. F. R. Ellis & T. Rothman, Lost horizons, *American Journal of Physics* **61**, pp. 883–893, 1993. Cited on pages 1428, 1432, and 1433.

1246 F. Karolyhazy, Gravitation and quantum mechanics of macroscopic objects, *Il Nuovo Cimento* **A42**, pp. 390–402, 1966, Y. J. Ng & H. Van Dam, Limit to space-time measurement, *Modern Physics Letters A* **9**, pp. 335–340, 1994, Y. J. Ng & H. Van Dam, Remarks on gravitational sources, *Modern Physics Letters A* **10**, pp. 2801–2808, 1995. For newer summaries see Y. J. Ng & van Dam, Comment on "Uncertainty in measurements of distance", arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0209021 and Y. J. Ng, Spacetime foam, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0201022. Cited on page 1428.

1247 See, for example, the Hollywood film *Contact*, based on the book by Carl Sagan, *Contact*, 1985. Cited on page 1433.

1248 See, for example, the international bestseller by S. Hawking, *A Brief History of Time – From the Big Bang to Black Holes*, 1988. Cited on page 1435.

1249 L. Rosenfeld, in H.-J. Treder, *Entstehung, Entwicklung und Perspektiven der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie*, Springer Verlag, 1966. Cited on page 1438.

1250 Holography in high-energy physics is connected with the work of 't Hooft and Susskind. See for example G. 't Hooft, Dimensional reduction in quantum gravity, pp. 284–296, in A. Ali, J. Ellis & S. Randjbar-Daemi, *Salaamfeest*, 1993, or the much-

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

cited paper by L. Susskind, The world as a hologram, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **36**, pp. 6377–6396, 1995, or arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9409089. A good modern overview is R. Bousso, The holographic principle, *Review of Modern Physics* **74**, pp. 825–874, 2002, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0203101, even though it has some errors in its arguments, as explained on page 1207. Cited on page 1439.

1251 D. Bohm & B. J. Hiley, On the intuitive understanding of nonlocality as implied by quantum theory, *Foundations of Physics* **5**, pp. 93–109, 1975. Cited on page 1440.

1252 S. Lloyd, Computational capacity of the universe, *Physical Review Letters* **88**, p. 237901, 2002. Cited on page 1441.

1253 Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, *La Monadologie*, 1714. Written in French, it is available freely at www.uqac.uquebec.ca/zone30/Classiques_des_sciences_sociales and in various other languages on other websites. Cited on page 1442.

1254 See, for example, H. Wussing & P. S. Alexandrov, editors, *Die Hilbertschen Probleme*, Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Geest & Portig, 1983, or Ben H. Yandell, *The Honours Class: Hilbert's Problems and their Solvers*, A.K. Peters, 2002. Cited on page 1442.

1255 A large part of the study of dualities in string and M theory can be seen as investigations into the detailed consequences of extremal identity. For a review of dualities, see P. C. Argyres, Dualities in supersymmetric field theories, *Nuclear Physics Proceedings Supplement* **61**, pp. 149–157, 1998, preprint available at arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9705076. A classical version of duality is discussed by M. C. B. Abdalla, A. L. Gadelka & I. V. Vancea, Duality between coordinates and the Dirac field, arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0002217. Cited on page 1446.

1256 If you are more interested in sexuality than in love, the best book to read is the fascinating text by Olivia Judson, *Dr. Tatjana's Sex Advice to all Creation*, Metropolitan Books, 2002. Cited on page 1447.

1257 A provocative attempt to explain the lack of women in physics is made in Margaret Wertheim, *Pythagoras' Trousers – God, Physics and the Gender Wars*, Fourth Estate, 1997. Cited on page 1447.

1258 The consequences of memory loss in this case are already told by Voltaire, *Aventure de la mémoire*, 1775. Cited on page 1449.

1259 A picture of objects in a red-hot oven and at room temperature is shown in C. H. Bennett, Demons, Engines and the Second Law, *Scientific American* **255**, pp. 108–117, November 1987. Cited on page 1449.

1260 An introduction to how the sense of time arises as a result of signals in the ganglia and in the temporal lobe of the brain is found in R. B. Ivry & R. Spencer, The neural representation of time, *Current Opinion in Neurobiology* **14**, pp. 225–232, 2004. Cited on page 1450.

1261 This famous statement is found at the beginning of chapter XI, 'The Physical Universe', in Arthur Eddington, *The Philosophy of Physical Science*, Cambridge, 1939. Cited on page 1451.

1262 See Chapter 30 on brain and language for details and references. Cited on page 1452.

1263 Details can be found in Chapter 52 of this text, a reworked version of the article published in French as C. Schiller, Le vide diffère-t-il de la matière? in E. Gunzig & S. Diner, editors, *Le Vide – Univers du tout et du rien – Des physiciens et des philosophes s'interrogent*, Les Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1998. Cited on pages 1455 and 1456.

1264 For details of the arguments leading to duality, see section 53 This section also includes

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

arguments supporting the notion that the universe is not a even a set, and thus proposes a solution to Hilbert's sixth problem. Cited on page 1457.

1265 Bohr explained the indivisibilty of the quantum of action in his famous Como lecture. N. Bohr, *Atomtheorie und Naturbeschreibung*, Springer, Berlin, 1931. More statements about the indivisibility of the quantum of action can be found in N. Bohr, *Atomic Physics and Human Knowledge*, Science Editions, New York, 1961. For summaries of Bohr's ideas by others see Max Jammer, *The Philosophy of Quantum Mechanics*, Wiley, first edition, 1974, pp. 90–91, and John Honner, *The Description of Nature – Niels Bohr and the Philosophy of Quantum Physics*, Clarendon Press, 1987, p. 104. Cited on page 1460.

1266 For an overview of the quantum of action as a basis of quantum theory, see C. Schiller, An appetizer – quantum theory for poets and lawyers, part of this text. Cited on page 1460.

Page 976

1267 The first published statements of the principle of maximum force were in the present textbook and independently in the paper by G. W. Gibbons, The maximum tension principle in general relativity, *Foundations of Physics* **32**, pp. 1891–1901, 2002, or arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0210109. Cited on pages 1461 and 1474.

1268 Maximal luminosity is often mentioned in connection with gravitational wave detection; nevertheless, the general maximum is never mentioned. See for example L. Ju, D. G. Blair & C. Zhao, Detection of gravitational waves, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **63**, pp. 1317–1427, 2000. See also C. Misner, K. Thorne & J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, Freeman, 1973, page 980. Cited on page 1462.

1269 See for example Wolfgang Rindler, *Relativity – Special, General and Cosmological*, Oxford University Press, 2001, p. 70 ff, or Ray d'Inverno *Introducing Einstein's Relativity*, Clarendon Press, 1992, p. 36 ff. Cited on page 1463.

1270 T. Jacobson, Thermodynamics of spacetime: the Einstein equation of state, *Physical Review Letters* **75**, pp. 1260–1263, 1995, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9504004. Cited on page 1464.

1271 C. Schiller, Maximum force: a simple principle encompassing general relativity, part of this text and downloadable as www.motionmountain.eu/MotionMountain-Part2b.pdf. Cited on page 1465.

1272 Indeterminacy relations in general relativity are discussed in C. A. Mead, Possible connection between gravitation and fundamental length, *Physical Review B* **135**, pp. 849–862, 1964. See also P. K. Townsend, Small-scale structure of space-time as the origin of the gravitational constant, *Physical Review D* **15**, pp. 2795–2801, 1977, or the paper by M.-T. Jaekel & S. Renaud, Gravitational quantum limit for length measurement, *Physics Letters A* **185**, pp. 143–148, 1994. Cited on page 1465.

1273 M. Kramer & al., Tests of general relativity from timing the double pulsar, prerpint at arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/060941. Cited on page 1465.

1274 Minimal length and minimal time intervals are discussed, for example, by G. Amelino-Camelia, Limits on the measurability of space-time distances in (the semiclassical approximation of) quantum gravity, *Modern Physics Letters A* **9**, pp. 3415–3422, 1994, and by Y. J. Ng & H. Van Dam, Limit to space-time measurement, *Modern Physics Letters A* **9**, pp. 335–340, 1994. Many other authors have explored the topic. Cited on page 1467.

1275 Maximal curvature, as well as area and volume quantization, are discussed by A. Ashtekar, Quantum geometry and gravity: recent advances, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0112038 and by A. Ashtekar, Quantum geometry in action: big bang and black holes, arxiv.org/abs/math-ph/0202008. Cited on page 1467.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

1276 This was kindly pointed out by Achim Kempf. The story is told in A. D. Sakharov, *General Relativity and Gravitation* **32**, p. 365, 2000, a reprint of a paper of 1969. Cited on page 1468.

1277 Several incorrect counterclaims to the entropy limit were made in R. Bousso, The holographic principle, *Review of Modern Physics* **74**, pp. 825–874, 2002, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0203101. Bousso has changed his position in the mean time. Cited on pages 1468 and 1480.

1278 G. Amelino-Camelia, Doubly-special relativity: first results and key open problems, *International Journal of Modern Physics* **11**, pp. 1643–1669, 2002, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0210063. See also J. Magueijo & L. Smolin, Lorentz invariance with an invariant energy scale, *Physical Review Letters* **88**, p. 190403, 2002, or arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0112090. Cited on page 1468.

1279 Maximons, elementary particles of Planck mass, are discussed by A. D. Sakharov, Vacuum quantum fluctuations in curved space and the theory of gravitation, *Soviet Physics – Doklady* **12**, pp. 1040–1041, 1968. Cited on page 1469.

1280 Minimal entropy is discussed by L. Szilard, Über die Entropieverminderung in einem thermodynamischen System bei Eingriffen intelligenter Wesen, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **53**, pp. 840–856, 1929. This classic paper can also be found in English translation in his collected works. Cited on page 1470.

1281 See for example A. E. Shalyt-Margolin & A. Ya. Tregubovich, Generalized uncertainty relation in thermodynamics, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0307018, or J. Uffink & van Lith-van Dis, Thermodynamic uncertainty relations, *Foundations of Physics* **29**, pp. 655–692, 1999. Cited on page 1470.

1282 Gamma ray bursts are discussed by G. Preparata, R. Ruffini & S.-S. Xue, The dyadosphere of black holes and gamma-ray bursts, *Astronomy and Astrophysics* **338**, pp. L87–L90, 1998, and C. L. Bianco, R. Ruffini & S.-S. Xue, The elementary spike produced by a pure e^+e^- pair-electromagnetic pulse from a black hole: the PEM pulse, *Astronomy and Astrophysics* **368**, pp. 377–390, 2001. Cited on page 1471.

1283 See for example the review in C. W. J. Beenakker & al., Quantum transport in semiconductor nanostructures, pp. 1–228, in H. Ehrenreich & D. Turnbull, editors, *Solid State Physics*, volume 44, Academic Press, 1991. The prediction of a future Nobel Prize was made and conveyed to the authors by C. Schiller in 1992. Cited on page 1471.

1284 Brian Greene, *The Elegant Universe – Superstrings, Hidden Dimensions, and the Quest for the Ultimate Theory*, Vintage, 2000. Cited on page 1472.

1285 A discussion of a different electrical indeterminacy relation, between current and charge, can be found in Y-Q. Li & B. Chen, Quantum theory for mesoscopic electronic circuits and its applications, arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat/9907171. Cited on page 1473.

1286 Wolfgang Rindler, *Relativity – Special, General and Cosmological*, Oxford University Press, 2001, p. 230. Cited on page 1473.

1287 Hans C. Ohanian & Remo Ruffini, *Gravitation and Spacetime*, W.W. Norton & Co., 1994. Cited on page 1476.

1288 A maximal acceleration for microscopic systems was stated by E. R. Caianiello, *Lettere al Nuovo Cimento* **41**, p. 370, 1984. It is discussed by G. Papini, Shadows of a maximal acceleration, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0211011. Cited on page 1477.

1289 C. Bambi & F. R. Urban, Natural extension of the generalised uncertainty principle, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/0709.1965. Cited on page 1478.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

1290 The entropy limit for black holes is discussed by J. D. Bekenstein, Entropy bounds and black hole remnants, *Physical Review D* **49**, pp. 1912–1921, 1994. See also J. D. Bekenstein, Universal upper bound on the entropy-to-energy ratio for bounded systems, *Physical Review D* **23**, pp. 287–298, 1981. Cited on page 1479.

1291 Private communications with Jos Uffink and Bernard Lavenda. Cited on page 1479.

1292 P. Kovtun, D. T. Son & A. O. Starinets, A viscosity bound conjecture, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0405231. Cited on page 1480.

1293 H. Wussing & P. S. Alexandrov, editors, *Die Hilbertschen Probleme*, Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Geest & Portig, 1983, or Ben H. Yandell, *The Honours Class: Hilbert's Problems and their Solvers*, A.K. Peters, 2002. Cited on page 1485.

1294 C. Schiller, Does matter differ from vacuum? arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9610066. A French-language version has been published as C. Schiller, Le vide diffère-t-il de la matière? in E. Gunzig & S. Diner, editors, *Le Vide – Univers du tout et du rien – Des physiciens et des philosophes s'interrogent*, Les Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1998. Cited on pages 1488, 1489, 1492, 1494, 1495, 1496, and 1507.

1295 Most arguments for minimal temporal and spatial intervals are due to M. Schön, Operative time definition and principal uncertainty, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9304024, and to T. Padmanabhan, Limitations on the operational definition of space-time events and quantum gravity, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **4**, pp. L107–L113, 1987; see also his earlier papers referenced there. Cited on page 1488.

1296 A similar point of view, often called monism, was proposed by Baruch Spinoza, *Ethics Demonstrated in Geometrical Order*, 1677, originally in Latin; an affordable French edition is B. Spinoza, *L'Ethique*, Folio-Gallimard, 1954. For a discussion of his ideas, especially his monism, see Don Garret, editor, *The Cambridge Companion to Spinoza*, Cambridge University Press, 1996, or any general text on the history of philosophy. Cited on page 1490.

1297 See L. Susskind & J. Uglum, Black holes, interactions, and strings, arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9410074, or L. Susskind, String theory and the principle of black hole complementarity, *Physical Review Letters* **71**, pp. 2367–2368, 1993, and M. Karliner, I. Klebanov & L. Susskind, Size and shape of strings, *International Journal of Modern Physics A* **3**, pp. 1981–1996, 1988, as well as L. Susskind, Structure of hadrons implied by duality, *Physical Review D* **1**, pp. 1182–1186, 1970. Cited on pages 1492 and 1506.

1298 M. Planck, Über irreversible Strahlungsvorgänge, *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* pp. 440–480, 1899. Today it is commonplace to use $\hbar = h/2\pi$ instead of Planck's h, which he originally called b. Cited on page 1492.

1299 C. A. Mead, Possible connection between gravitation and fundamental length, *Physical Review B* **135**, pp. 849–862, 1964. Cited on page 1492.

1300 A. D. Sakharov, Vacuum quantum fluctuations in curved space and the theory of gravitation, *Soviet Physics – Doklady* **12**, pp. 1040–1041, 1968. Cited on page 1495.

1301 P. Facchi & S. Pascazio, Quantum Zeno and inverse quantum Zeno effects, pp. 147–217, in E. Wolf, editor, *Progress in Optics*, **42**, 2001. Cited on page 1495.

1302 Aristotle, *Of Generation and Corruption*, book I, part 2. See Jean-Paul Dumont, *Les écoles présocratiques*, Folio Essais, Gallimard, p. 427, 1991. Cited on page 1496.

1303 See for example the speculative model of vacuum as composed of Planck-size spheres proposed by F. Winterberg, *Zeitschrift für Naturforschung* **52a**, p. 183, 1997. Cited on page 1497.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

1304 The Greek salt-and-water argument and the fish argument are given by Lucretius, in full Titus Lucretius Carus, *De natura rerum*, *c.* 60 BCE. Cited on pages 1498 and 1509.

1305 J. H. Schwarz, The second superstring revolution, Colloquium-level lecture presented at the Sakharov Conference in Moscow, May 1996, arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9607067. Cited on pages 1498 and 1500.

1306 Cited in Jean-Paul Dumont, *Les écoles présocratiques*, Folio Essais, Gallimard, p. 379, 1991. Cited on page 1499.

1307 D. Olive & C. Montonen, Magnetic monopoles as gauge particles, *Physics Letters* **72B**, pp. 117–120, 1977. Cited on page 1500.

1308 This famous quotation is found at the beginning of chapter XI, 'The Physical Universe', in Arthur Eddington, *The Philosophy of Physical Science*, Cambridge, 1939. Cited on page 1502.

1309 Plato, *Parmenides*, *c.* 370 BCE. It has been translated into most languages. Reading it aloud, like a song, is a beautiful experience. A pale reflection of these ideas is Bohm's concept of 'unbroken wholeness'. Cited on page 1502.

1310 P. Gibbs, Event-symmetric physics, arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9505089; see also his website www.weburbia.com/pg/contents.htm. Cited on page 1502.

1311 J. D. Bekenstein, Black holes and entropy, *Physical Review D* **7**, pp. 2333–2346, 1973. Cited on page 1505.

1312 S. W. Hawking, Particle creation by black holes, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **43**, pp. 199–220, 1975; see also S. W. Hawking, Black hole thermodynamics, *Physical Review D* **13**, pp. 191–197, 1976. Cited on page 1505.

1313 J. B. Hartle & S. W. Hawking, Path integral derivation of black hole radiance, *Physical Review D* **13**, pp. 2188–2203, 1976. See also A. Strominger & C. Vafa, Microscopic origin of Bekenstein–Hawking entropy, *Physics Letters* **B379**, pp. 99–104, 1996, or the downloadable version found at arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9601029. For another derivation of black hole entropy, see G. T. Horowitz & J. Polchinski, A correspondence principle for black holes and strings, *Physical Review D* **55**, pp. 6189–6197, 1997, or arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9612146. Cited on page 1505.

1314 J. D. Bekenstein, Entropy bounds and black hole remnants, *Physical Review D* **49**, pp. 1912–1921, 1994. Cited on page 1505.

1315 J. Maddox, When entropy does not seem extensive, *Nature* **365**, p. 103, 1993. The issue is now found in all textbooks discussing black holes. Cited on page 1505.

1316 L. Bombelli, R. K. Koul, J. Lee & R. D. Sorkin, Quantum source of entropy of black holes, *Physical Review D* **34**, pp. 373–383, 1986. Cited on page 1505.

1317 The analogy between polymers and black holes is due to G. Weber, Thermodynamics at boundaries, *Nature* **365**, p. 792, 1993. Cited on page 1505.

1318 Pierre-Gilles de Gennes, *Scaling Concepts in Polymer Physics*, Cornell University Press, 1979. Cited on page 1505.

1319 See for example S. Majid, Introduction to braided geometry and q-Minkowski space, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9410241, or S. Majid, Duality principle and braided geometry, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/940957. Cited on page 1507.

1320 The relation between spin and statistics has been studied recently by M. V. Berry & J. M. Robbins, Quantum indistinguishability: spin–statistics without relativity or field theory?, in R. C. Hilborn & G. M. Tino, editors, *Spin–Statistics Connection and Commutation Relations*, American Institute of Physics, 2000. Cited on page 1508.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

1321 An example is given by A. A. Slavnov, Fermi–Bose duality via extra dimension, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9512101. See also the standard work by Michael Stone, editor, *Bosonization*, World Scientific, 1994. Cited on page 1509.

1322 A popular account making the point is the bestseller by the US-American string theorist Brian Greene, *The Elegant Universe – Superstrings, Hidden Dimensions, and the Quest for the Ultimate Theory*, Jonathan Cape 1999. Cited on page 1509.

1323 The weave model of space-time appears in certain approaches to quantum gravity, as told by A. Ashtekar, Quantum geometry and gravity: recent advances, December 2001, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0112038. See also A. Ashtekar, Quantum geometry in action: big bang and black holes, arxiv.org/abs/math-ph/0202008. On a slightly different topic, see also S. A. Major, A spin network primer, arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9905020. Cited on page 1509.

1324 A good introduction into his work is the paper D. Kreimer, New mathematical structures in renormalisable quantum field theories, *Annals of Physics* **303**, pp. 179–202, 2003, erratum ibid. **305**, p. 79, 2003, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0211136. Cited on page 1509.

1325 Introductions to holography include E. Alvarez, J. Conde & L. Hernandez, Rudiments of holography, arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0205075, and R. Bousso, The holographic principle, *Review of Modern Physics* **74**, pp. 825–874, 2002, also at arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0203101. (However, this otherwise good review has some errors in its arguments, as explained on page 1207.) The importance of holography in theoretical high-energy physics was underlined by the discovery of J. Maldacena, The large N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity, arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9711200. Cited on page 1509.

1326 For a good introduction to string theory, see the lectures by B. Zwiebach, String theory for pedestrians, agenda.cern.ch/fullAgenda.php?ida=a063319. Cited on page 1514.

1327 P. F. Mende, String theory at short distance and the principle of equivalence, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9210001. Cited on page 1510.

1328 A. Gregori, Entropy, string theory, and our world, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0207195. Cited on pages 1511 and 1513.

1329 String cosmology is a pastime for many. Examples include N. E. Mavromatos, String cosmology, arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0111275, and N. G. Sanchez, New developments in string gravity and string cosmology – a summary report, arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0209016. Cited on page 1513.

1330 Searches for background-free approaches are described by E. Witten, Quantum background independence in string theory, arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9306122 and E. Witten, On background-independent open string theory, arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9208027. Cited on page 1513.

1331 Not even the most combative feminists have ever said what women-centered physics should look like. There is an obvious lack of alternatives in the agressive text by Margaret Wertheim, *Pythagoras' Trousers – God, Physics, and the Gender Wars*, Fourth Estate, 1997, which makes its author look rather silly. Cited on page 1513.

1332 See A. Sen, An introduction to duality symmetries in string theory, in *Les Houches Summer School: Unity from Duality: Gravity, Gauge Theory and Strings (Les Houches, France, 2001)*, Springer Verlag, **76**, pp. 241–322, 2002. Cited on page 1515.

1333 L. Susskind, Some speculations about black hole entropy in string theory, arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9309145. G. T. Horowitz & J. Polchinski, A correspondence principle for

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

black holes and strings, *Physical Review D* **55**, pp. 6189–6197, 1997, preprint at arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9612146. Cited on page 1516.

1334 F. Wilczek, Getting its from bits, *Nature* **397**, pp. 303–306, 1999. Cited on page 1516.

1335 See the well-known blog by Peter Woit, *Not even wrong*, at www.math.columbia.edu/~woit/blog. Cited on page 1517.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



CHALLENGE HINTS AND SOLUTIONS

Challenge 1624, page 1401: The other scale is the horizon of the universe, as we will see shortly.

Challenge 1625, page 1402: Sloppily speaking, such a clock is not able to move its hands in such a way to guarantee precise time reading.

Challenge 1628, page 1416: The final energy E produced by a proton accelerator increases with its radius R roughly as $E \sim R^{1.2}$; as an example, CERN's SPS achieves about 450 GeV for a radius of 740 m. Thus we would get a radius of more than 100 000 light years (larger than our galaxy) for a Planck energy accelerator. An accelerator achieving Planck energy is impossible.

A unification energy accelerator would be about 1000 times smaller. Nature has no accelerator of this power, but gets near it. The maximum measured value of cosmic rays, 10^{22} eV, is about one thousandth of the unification energy. The mechanisms of acceleration are obscure. Black holes are no sources for unification energy particles, due to their gravitational potential. But also the cosmic horizon is not the source, for some yet unclear reasons. This issue is still a topic of research.

Challenge 1629, page 1416: The Planck energy is $E_{\text{Pl}} = \sqrt{\hbar c^5/G} = 2.0\,\text{GJ}$. Car fuel delivers about 43 MJ/kg. Thus the Planck energy corresponds to the energy of 47 kg of car fuel, about a tankful.

Challenge 1630, page 1416: Not really, as the mass error is equal to the mass only in the Planck case.

Challenge 1631, page 1416: It is improbable that such deviations can be found, as they are masked by the appearance of quantum gravity effects. However, if you do think that you have a prediction for a deviation, publish it.

Challenge 1633, page 1417: There is no gravitation at those energies and there are no particles. There is thus no paradox.

Challenge 1634, page 1418: The issue is still being debated; a good candidate for a minimum momentum of a single particle is given by the $\hbar/R$, where R is the radius of the universe. Is this answer satisfying?

Challenge 1635, page 1418: The Planck acceleration is given by $a_{\text{Pl}} = \sqrt{c^7/\hbar G} = 5.6 \cdot 10^{51}\,\text{m/s}^2$.

Challenge 1636, page 1418: All mentioned options could be valid at the same time. The issue is not closed and clear thinking about it is not easy.

Challenge 1637, page 1419: The energy is the unification energy, about 800 times smaller than the Planck energy.

Challenge 1638, page 1419: This is told in detail in the section on maximum force starting on page 1458.

Challenge 1639, page 1424: Good! Publish it.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1640, page 1426: See the table on page 203.

Challenge 1641, page 1426: The cosmic background radiation is a clock in the widest sense of the term.

Challenge 1663, page 1441: For the description of nature this is a contradiction. Nevertheless, the term 'universe', 'set of all sets' and other mathematical terms, as well as many religious concepts are of this type.

Challenge 1666, page 1442: For concept of 'universe'.

Challenge 1670, page 1443: Plotinus in the *Enneads* has defined 'god' in exactly this way. Later, Augustine in *De Trinitate* and in several other texts, and many subsequent theologians have taken up this view. (See also Thomas Aquinas, *Summa contra gentiles*, 1, 30.) The idea they propose is simple: it is possible to clearly say what 'god' is *not*, but it is impossible to say what 'god' *is*. This statement is also part of the official *Roman Catholic Catechism*: see part one, section one, chapter one, IV, 43, found at www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/__PC.HTM. Similar statements are found in Judaism, Hinduism and Buddhism.

Certain legal scholars would also propose a different concept that fits the definition – namely 'administration': it is difficult to say what it is, but easy to say what it is not.

More seriously, the properties common to 'universe' and to 'god' suggest the conclusion that both are the same. Indeed, the analogy between the two concepts can be expanded to a proof. (This is left to the reader.) In fact, this might be the most interesting of all proofs of the existence of gods, as it lacks all the problems that the more common 'proofs' have. Despite its interest, this proof of equivalence is not found in any book on the topic yet. The reason is twofold. First, the results of modern physics showing that the concept of universe has all these strange properties are not common knowledge yet. Secondly, the result of the proof, the identity of 'god' and the universe – also called *pantheism* – is a heresy for most religions. It thus is an irony that the catholic catechism, together with modern physics, can be used to show that pantheism is a hidden aspect of christianity.

If one is ready to explore the identity of universe and 'god', one finds that a statement like 'god created the universe' translates as 'the universe implies the universe'. The original statement is thus not a lie any more, but is promoted to a tautology. Similar changes appear for many other – but not all – statements using the term 'god'. Enjoy the exploration.

Challenge 1671, page 1443: If you find one, publish it! And send it to the author as well.

Challenge 1673, page 1445: If you find one, publish it and also send it to the author.

Challenge 1677, page 1448: Any change in rotation speed of the Earth would change the sea level.

Challenge 1678, page 1449: Just measure the maximum water surface the oil drop can cover, by looking at the surface under a small angle.

Challenge 1679, page 1450: Keep the fingers less than 1 cm from your eye.

Challenge 1680, page 1456: As vacuum and matter cannot be distinguished, both share the same properties. In particular, both scatter strongly at high energies.

Challenge 1681, page 1459: Take $\Delta f \; \Delta t \geqslant 1$ and substitute $\Delta l = c/\Delta f$ and $\Delta a = c/\Delta t$.

Challenge 1697, page 1482: To the knowledge of the author, no such limits have been published.

Challenge 1698, page 1482: The system limits cannot be chosen in other ways; after the limits have been corrected, the limits given here should still apply.

Challenge 1700, page 1483: It is probably that they remain - but who knows for sure yet?

Challenge 1703, page 1497: The number of spatial dimensions must be given first, in order to talk about spheres.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Challenge 1704, page 1500: This is a challenge to you to find out and publish; it is fun, may bring success and would yield an independent check of the results of the section.

Challenge 1709, page 1512: The lid of a box must obey the indeterminacy relation. It cannot be at perfect rest with respect to the rest of the box.

Challenge 1710, page 1512: Of course not, as there are no infinite quantities in nature. The question is whether the detector would be as large as the universe or smaller. What is the answer?

Challenge 1714, page 1512: No. Time is continuous only if *either* quantum theory and point particles *or* general relativity and point masses are assumed. The argument shows that only the combination of both theories with continuity is impossible.

Challenge 1715, page 1512: Yes, as nature's inherent measurement errors cannot clearly distinguish between them.

Challenge 1716, page 1512: Of course.

Challenge 1717, page 1512: We still have the chance to find the best approximate concepts possible. There is no reason to give up.

Challenge 1718, page 1513: A few thoughts. A beginning of the big bang does not exist; something similar is given by that piece of continuous entity which is encountered when going backwards in time as much as possible. This has several implications.

— Going backwards in time as far as possible – towards the 'beginning' of time – is the same as zooming to smallest distances: we find a single strand of the amoeba.
— In other words, we speculate that the whole world is one single piece, knotted, branched and fluctuating.
— Going far away into space – to the border of the universe – is like taking a snapshot with a short shutter time: strands everywhere.
— Whenever we sloppily say that extended entities are 'infinite' in size, we only mean that they reach the horizon of the universe.

In summary, no starting point of the big bang exists, because time does not exist there. For the same reason, no initial conditions for particles or space-time exist. In addition, this shows there was no creation involved, since without time and without possibility of choice, the term 'creation' makes no sense.

Challenge 1719, page 1513: The equivalence follows from the fact that all these processes require Planck energy, Planck measurement precision, Planck curvature, and Planck shutter time.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

CREDITS

Since May 2007, the production and distribution of this text is generously supported by the Klaus Tschira Foundation.

Image credits

The photograph of the Ultra Deep Field project on page 1393 is courtesy of NASA. The copyright of the figure on page 1399 belongs to the M.C. Escher Heirs, c/o Cordon Art, Baarn, The Netherlands, who kindly gave permission for its use. The historical portraits of physicists in the text do not have copyright, except where mentioned. All drawings not explicitly mentioned are copyright © 1997 – 2009 by Christoph Schiller. If you suspect that a copyright is not correctly given or obtained, this has not done on purpose, and you are kindly asked to contact the author.

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



NAME INDEX

A

AAPT

Page numbers in *italic* typeface refer to pages where the person is presented in more detail.

A
AAPT 1018
Abbott, T.A. 943
Abdalla, M.C.B. 1527
Abe, E. 945
Abe, F. 335, 1376
Abramowicz, M.A. 652
Abrikosova, I.I. 1191, 1368
Acef, O. 936
Ackermann, Peter 953
Ackermann, Rudolph 363
Adachi, S. 346
Adams, Douglas 864, 1346, 1441
Adelberger, E. 653
Adelberger, E.G. 342
Adenauer, Konrad 164, 491, 846
Adler, C.G. 638
Advantest 676
Aedini, J. 1101
Aetius 90, 337, 564, 647
Aflatooni, K. 1104
Aguirregabiria, J.M. 941, 959
Aharonov, Y. 1103
Ahlgren, A. 334, 1365
Ahluwalia, D.V. 1523
Ahmad, Q.R. 635
Aichelburg, P.C. 651
Aigler, M. 60
AIP 140, 1197, 1391
Aitken, M.J. 945
Ajdari, A. 945
Akama, K. 1524
Akerboom, F. 938
Åkerman, N. 344
Al-Dayeh, M. 942
al-Farisi, Kamal al-Din 748
al-Hadi al-Hush, Ramadan 874
Alanus de Insulis 604
Alber, G. 1108
Albert, David Z. 1108
Albertus Magnus 1295
Albus, Margot 1365
Alcubierre, M. 643
Alder, Ken 147, 342, 394
Aleksandrov, D.V. 1382
Alexandrov, P.S. 1527, 1530
Alhazen 936
Ali, A. 1526
Alighieri, Dante 142
Allen, L. 938
Allen, Les 938
Allen, Woody 571
Aloisio, R. 1525
Alpher, R.A. 1374
Alsdorf, D. 344
Alspector, J. 633
Altman, S.L. 951
Altshuler, E. 352
Altshuler, Ernesto 303, 395
Alvarez, E. 1532
Alväger, T. 633
Amaldi, U. 1376, 1377, 1526
Amati, D. 1523
Amelino-Camelia, G. 1523, 1525, 1526, 1528, 1529
Amenomori, M. 1373
Amos, Brad 729, 971
Ampère, André-Marie 686, 693
Amsler, C. 1375
Amundsen, Roald 142, 341
An, K. 348, 1369
Anaxagoras 862, 874
Anders, S. 342
Anderson 552
Anderson, Carl 1049, 1229
Anderson, I.M. 646
Anderson, J.D. 639
Anderson, J.L. 646
Anderson, M.H. 1102
Anderson, R. 339
Andreotti, B. 352
Andres, M.R. 1108
Andrews, M.R. 1102
Angell, C.A. 348
Aniçin, I.V. 343
Anonymous 193
Anton, A. 1101
Antonini, P. 634, 635
Appleton, Phil 752, 971
APS 1197, 1391
Aquinas, Thomas 331, 859, 948, 1069
Arago, Dominique-François 684, 743
Araki, T. 1367
Archimedes 91
Argyres, P.C. 1377, 1527
Aripov, Otanazar 874
Aristarchos 338, 632
Aristarchos of Samos 116, 126, 338, 403
Aristotle 45, 52, 144, 336, 632, 855, 858, 1347, 1378, 1496, 1499, 1530

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

A
ARLT

Arlt, J. 938
Armstrong, J.T. 336
Armstrong, Neil 937
Arndt, M. 1102, 1108
Arnowitt 559
Aronson, Jeff 391
Aronson, Jeff K. 952
Arseneau, Donald 391
Ascher, Marcia 828
Ashburner, J. 947
Ashby, M.F. 348
Ashcroft, Neil 793
Ashida, H. 330
Ashkin, A. 938
Ashkin, Arthur 746
Ashtekar, A. 640, 653, 1521, 1524, 1528, 1532
Ashton, T. 1380
Asimov, I. 1378
Askin, A. 938
ASML 275
Aspect, A. 1105, 1108
Aspect, Alain 1083
Aspelmeyer, M. 1101
Aspinwall, P. 1523
Asterix 272
Astumian, R.D. 1363
Ata Masafumi 391, 977, 1114
Atomium 274
Atomium - SABAM 394
Audoin, C. 952
Augel, Barbara and Edgar 391
Augustin, Serge 762, 971
Augustine 649, 1535
Augustine of Hippo 694
Ausloos, M. 347
Autumn, K. 1366
Avenel, O. 1370
Avogadro, Amadeo 258
Avron, J.E. 942
Awschalom, D.D. 1108
Axel, Richard 1133
Axelrod, R. 331
Ayiomamitis, Anthony 69, 129, 143, 156, 170, 380, 393, 402, 663

B

Babinet, Jacques *910*
Babloyantz, A. 352
Bach, Michael 25, 392
Bachem 501
Bader, Richard F.W. 1099
Baez, John 391
Bagger, Jonathan 1377
Baggett, N. 633
Bagnoli, Franco 391
Bailey, J. 635
Bailey, J.M. 633
Balachandran, A.P. 1521
Balibar, FranÁoise 1099
Balibar, S. 348
ballonregister, nederlands 395
Balmer, Johann 1042
Bambi, C. 1529
Banach, Stefan 59, 60, 251
Banavar, J.R. 345
Banday, A.J. 650
Bandler, R. 332
Bandler, Richard 188, 332, 805, 839, 946
Barber, B.P. 337
Barberini, Francesco 252
Barberi Gnecco, Bruno 391
Barbosa, Lucas 392
Barbosa, Lucas V. 125, 392
Barbour, John 334
Barbour, Julian 650
Bardeen, J. 1368
Bardeen, John 1107, 1177
Barnett, S.J. 934
Barnett, S.M. 1103
Barnhill, M.V. 934
Barone, Éric 166, 394
Barrow, J.D. 650
Barson, Andy 743, 971
Bartel, Elmar 391, 1121, 1390
Bartocci, Umberto 447
Barton, G. 1368
Bartussek, R. 1363
Barwise, J. 950
Basieux, Pierre 948
Basri, G. 648
Bassler, K.E. 352
Batelaan, H. 1104
Bateman, H. 635
Batista-Leyva, A.J. 352
Batty, R.S. 347
Baudelaire, Charles *25*
Bauer, O. 938
Bauerecker, S. 943
Baumann, K. 1108
Bautista, Ferdinand 391
Baylor, D.A. 1100
Bb, Aa 1157, 1158, 1160
Beale, I.L. 935
Beaty, William 391
Bechinger, C. 1370
Becker, A. 648
Becker, J. 344
Becquerel, Henri *1224*
Bedford, D. 644
Beeksma, Herman 391
Beenakker, C.W.J. 936, 1109, 1529
Behroozi, C.H. 333, 634
Bekenstein, J.D. 652, 1371, 1530, 1531
Bekenstein, Jacob 300, 612, 1206, 1208
Bekenstein, Jacob D. 654
Belfort, François 391
Belic, D. 953, 1381
Belinfante, F.J. 1106
Bell, J.S. 1109
Bell, John 1092
Bellac, M. Le 935
Bellini, Giovanni 941
Bellizzi, M.J. 341
Belsley, M. 1105
Benbrook, J.R. 942
Bender, P.L. 646
Benjamin, J. 951
Benka, S. 337
Bennet, C.L. 340, 650
Bennet, S.C. 1376
Bennett, C.H. 945, 947, 1527
Bentley, W.A. 351
Benzenberg, Johann Friedrich 117
Berendsen, Marcel 86, 393
Berg, E. 942
Berg, H.C. 1379
Berger, Hans 808
Bergmann, L. 950
Bergmann, U. 1367
Bergquist, J. 953

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

B

BERING

Bering, E. 942
Bering, E.A. 942
Berkeley, George 857
Berlekamp, E.R. 949
Berlin, Brent 939
Berlin, Isaiah 1509
Berman, D.H. 347
Bernabei, Tullio 393
Bernard, C. 1376
Bernoulli, Daniel *260*, 286
Bernoulli, J. 325
Bernreuther, W. 1524
Bernstein, Aaron 737
Berry, M.V. 944, 1106, 1531
Berry, Michael 1106, 1310
Bertotti, B. 646
Bertulani, C.A. 1382
Besnard, P. 1363
Bessel 124, 1041
Bessel, Friedrich 1364
Bessel, Friedrich Wilhelm *126*, 586
Besso, Michele 447
Beth, R.A. 938
Bethe, H. 1373, 1374
Bethe, Hans *1241*, 1248
Bethke, S. 1375
Bethke, Siegfried 1268, 1392
Bettelheim, Bruno 946
Bettermann, D. 944
Beutelspacher, Albrecht 1096
Beuys, Joseph 808, 810, 871, 951
Bevis, M. 344
Beyer, Lothar 391
Bhalotra, S.R. 938
Bharucha, C.F. 1365
Bianco, C.L. 1372, 1529
Bielefeldt, H. 348
Bierce, Ambrose 1138
Bieri, Fritz 358, 395
Biggar, Mark 391
Bilaniuk, O.M. 637
Bilaniuk, O.M.P. 637
Bilger, H.R. 339
Billon, Robert 695, 970
Bimonte, G. 1521
BIPM 91
Biraben, F. 936
Bird, D.J. 953
Birkhoff 555
Bischoff, Bernard 354
Bizouard, C. 340
Bjorkholm, J.E. 938
Björk, G. 1101
Blaauwgeers, R. 1367
Bladerider International 263
Blagden, Charles 296
Blair, D.G. 953, 1528
Blair, David 643
Blanc, Christophe 195, 394
Blanché, Robert 949
Blandford, R. 651, 1522
Blandford, R.D. 644
Blankertz, B. 935
Blau, Stephen 424
Bliss, G.W. 943
Block, S.M. 1363
Bloser, P.F. 643
Blumensath, Achim 391
Boamfa, M.I. 943
Bocquet, Lydéric 349, 386
Bode, Johann Elert 174
Boebinger, G.S. 1367
Boer, Wim de 1297, 1377, 1392
Boersma, S.L. 1368
Boersma, Sipko 1189, 1191
Boethius 932
Bogusch, Stephan 393
Bohm, D. 1103, 1440, 1527, 1531
Bohm, David 1108
Bohr, Aage 1177
Bohr, N. 1099, 1102, 1103, 1470, 1528
Bohr, Niels 291, 408, 832, *977*, 977, 992, 1013, 1021, 1022, 1074, 1094, 1107, 1146, 1353, 1460
Boiron, D. 1105
Boiron, Denis 1058, 1114
Boiti, M. 248, 347
Bollinger, J.J. 1365
Boltzmann, Ludwig 199, *287*
Bombelli, L. 653, 1524, 1531
Bombelli, Luca 391, 1521
Bondi, H. 642
Bondi, Hermann 634
Bonner, Yelena 1412
Bonnor, W.B. 533, 645, 651
Boone, Roggie 391
Booth, T. 1366
Bordé, Ch.J. 1371
Borel, Emile 295, 351
Borelli, G. 332
Borgne, J.-F. Le 1104
Borgogelli Avveduti, Girolamo 1126
Born, M. 1369
Born, Max 254, 937, *981*, 984, 1100
Borucki, M.K. 1363
Bosch 82, 393
Bose, S.N. 1105
Bose, Satyenra Nath *1057*
Bouchiat 1279
Bouchiat, C.C. 1376
Bouchiat, M.A. 1376
Boughn, S.P. 636
Bour, L. 937
Bourbaki, N. 325
Bousso 1207
Bousso, R. 1207, 1371, 1527, 1529, 1532
Bouwmeester, D. 1106
Bowden, F.P. 344
Bower, B. 345
Bowlby, John 950
Boyce, K.R. 637
Boyda, E.K. 938
Boyer, T.H. 1368
Boyer, Timothy 1191
Brackenbury, J. 336
Brackenbury, John 86, 393, 1378
Bradley, C.C. 1102
Bradley, James *128*, 128, 403
Braginsky, V.B. 343, 644
Brahe, Tycho *142*, 143
Brahm, A. de *326*
Brahm, D.E. 652
Brahmagupta 875
Brandelik, R. 1376
Brandes, John 391
Brandt, E.H. 943
Brantjes, R. 379
Brattain, Walter 1177
Brault, J.W. 642

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

B

Braxmeier

Braxmeier, C. 633
Bray, H.L. 647
Brebner, Douglas 391
Brecher, K. 633
Brehme, R.W. 638
Brendel, J. 1101
Brennan, Richard 332
Brenner, M.P. 337
Brezger, B. 1108
Briand, J.P. 1199, 1370
Briatore, L. 502, 642
Briggs, F. 651
Bright, William 353
Brightwell, G. 1524
Brillouin, L. 351
Brillouin, Louis 939
Brillouin, Léon 290, 1044
Bringhurst, Robert 1364
Britten, R.J. 1383
Britten, Roy 1383
Broch, Henri 949
Brock, J.B. 939
Brody, A.L. 938
Broglie, L. de 1102
Broglie, Louis de *990*, 1019
Bronstein, M. 651
Bronstein, Matvey 603
Brooks, Mel 282
Brouwer, Luitzen 53
Brown, B.L. 938
Brown, J.H. 345
Brown, J.M. 637
Brown, Peter 391, 497
Brown, R. Hanbury 1100
Brown, Robert 287
Brown, S.L. 1305, 1392
Bruce, Tom 391
Bruckner, N. 1370
Brumberg 994
Brumberg, E.M. 1100
Brune, M. 1107
Brunetti, M. 1374
Brunner, H. 935
Brush, S. 340
Bruyn, A.G. de 651
Bryant, D.A. 1370
Bub, J. 1100
Buchanan, Mark 944
Buchmann, A.J. 1375
Buchmann, Alfons 391
Buck, Linda 1133
Bucka, H. 339
Bucka, Hans 122
Buckley, Michael 331
Buddakian, R. 945
Budney, Ryan 391
Bújovtsev, B.B. 330
Bundesamt für Kartographie und Geodäsie 122, 393
Bunn, E.F. 650
Bunsen, Robert 1041
Bunyan, Paul 347
Burbidge, G. 649
Burbridge, G.R. 951
Burgay, M. 647
Buridan, Jean 144, 341
Burke, D.L. 1369
Burša, Milan 335
Busch, Paul 1100
Busch, Wilhelm 1363
Busche, Detlev 334
Bush, J.W.M. 348
Bush, John 261, 394
Butikov, E.I. 1102
Butler, Samuel 805
Butoli, André 933
Buzek, V. 1106
Bäßler, S. 653
Böhm, A. 1376
Böhncke, Klaus 391
Börner, G. 648
Börner, H.G. 637

C

Caesar 268
Caianiello, E.R. 640, 1529
Cajori, Florian 353
Caldeira, A.O. 1107
Calder, Nigel 644
Caldwell, R. 336
Caldwell, R.L. 336
Caloz, C. 940
Calzadilla, A. 345
Camilo, F. 647
Campbell, D. 351
Campbell, D.K. 352
Candela, D. 1102
Cano, R.J. 1363
Cantarella, J. 1380, 1381
Cantarella, Jason 1326, 1327, 1392
Cantor, Georg *825*
Caplan, S.R. 1379
Caps, H. 349
Caraway, E.L. 942
Carducci, Giosuè *1610*
Carilli, C.L. 651
Carl Zeiss 122, 393
Carlip, S. 1371
Carlip, Steve 391, 497, 640, 650, 1458
Carlyle, Thomas *109*
Carmona, Humberto 944
Carneiro, S. 650
Carnot, Sadi *102*
Carr, Jim 391
Carroll, Lewis 949
Carroll, Lewis, or Charles Lutwidge Dogson 291
Carruthers, P. 1103
Carter 610
Carter, Brandon 951
Cartesius *54*
Casati, Roberto 337
Casimir, H.B.G. 1368
Casimir, Hendrik 1190
Cassini, Giovanni 403
Cassius Dio 175
Castagnino, M. 653
Cato, Marcus Porcius 1041
Cauchy, Augustin-Louis 213
Cavendish, Henry *147*
Caveney, S. 336
Caveney, Stanley 76, 393
Caves, C.M. 645
Cayley, Arthur 213, 883, 885
Ceasar, Gaius Julius 326
Cecchini, S. 1374
Celsius, Anders *918*
Center for Nanoscience, München 1391
CERN 442
Chahravarty, S. 1108
Chaineux, J. 354
Chan, M.A. 339
Chan, W.P. 1366
Chandler, Seth 125

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

C

CHANDRASEKHAR

Chandrasekhar, Subramanyan 869
Chang, H. 1105
Chang, I. 1101
Chang, J. 1381
Chang, P.Z. 943
Chantell, M. 1373
Chaplin, Charlie 717
Chapman, M.S. 1104
Charlemagne 326
Charpak, G. 953
Chatin, Jerome 1058, 1114
Chen, B. 1529
Chen, P. 1371
Cheseaux, Jean Philippe Loÿs de 586
Chiao, R. 939
Chiao, R.Y. 939, 940
Chiba, D. 945
Chibowski, L 1366
Childs, J.J. 348, 1369
Chinnapared, R. 651
Chmela, Harald 673, 676, 970, 1230, 1391
Chomsky, Noam 334, 845
Choquet-Bruhat, Yvonne 646
Christ, N.H. 1524
Christiansen, W.A. 1525, 1526
Christlieb, N. 343
Christodoulou, D. 652
Christou, A.A. 342
Chu, S. 938, 939, 1371
Chuang, I.L. 939
Chudnovsky, D.V. 954
Chudnovsky, G.V. 954
Chung, K.Y. 1371
Ciafaloni, M. 1523
Cicero, Marcus Tullius 1016
Cicero, Marcus Tullius 870
Cindric, Richard 472, 663
Ciufolini, I. 644, 646
Ciufolini, Ignazio 521, 525, 644
Clairon, A. 936
Clancy, E.P. 642
Clancy, Tom 346
Clanet, Christophe 386
Clark, R. 1373
Clarke, S. 333
Clarke, T. 1389
Clauser, J.F. 1109
Clausius, Rudolph *282*, 287, 598, 599, 1206
Clavius, Christophonius *66*
Cleobulus *55*
Clery, D. 1366
Clifton, R. 1100
Close, F. 1376
CNAM 120, 393
CNES 176
CNRS 293, 395
Cockcroft 1273
Codling, K. 953
Coehoorn, Reinder 945
Cohen, M.H. 636
Cohen, P.J. 948
Cohen, Paul 948
Cohen, Philip 941
Cohen-Tannoudji, C. 1100
Cohen-Tannoudji, G. 351
Cohen-Tannoudji, Gilles 291
Colazingari, Elena 391
Colella, R. 1370
Coleman-McGhee, Jerdome 349
Colladon, Daniel 267
Collins, D. 1106
Collins, J.J. 332
Columbus 601, 602
Colwell, Dave 1308, 1392
Commins, E.D. 1524
Compton, A.H. 339, 1100
Compton, Arthur 121, 998
Conde, J. 1532
Conkling, J.A. 335
Conroy, R.S. 938
Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers 393
Conti, Andrea 391
Conway, J. 651
Conway, J.H. 949
Conway, John 830, 966
Cooper, Heather 341
Cooper, J.N. 331
Cooper, L.N. 1368
Cooper, Leon N. 1176
Copernicus, Nicolaus 404, 951
Copperfield, David 786, 964
Corballis, M.C. 935
Corbin, V. 942
Cordero, N.A. 646
Coriolis, Gustave-Gaspard *100*, 117
Cornell, E.A. 333
Cornell, Eric 1178
Coron, N. 1382
Corongiu, A. 647
Corovic, Dejan 391
Correia, A. 1102
Cosman, E.C. 936
Costa, S.S. 637
Costa-Krämer, J.L. 1102
Costa-Krämer, José 1018
Costabel, Pierre 252
Costella, J.P. 637
Costella, John P. 1103
Couch, E. 651
Couder, Y. 948
Coule, D.H. 1525, 1526
Coulomb, Charles-Augustin de *678*
Courtial, J. 1103
Cowley, Les 938
Cox, A.N. 647
Coyne, G. 347
Coyne, George 347
Cramer, S.P. 1367
Craven, J.D. 343
Crawford, F. 647
Crede, V. 1376
Crescimanno, M. 934
Crespi, Roberto 391
Creutz, Michael 1375
Crinion, J.T. 947
Cronin, James 1279
Crookes, William *745*
Cross, R. 367
Crutchfield, J. 351
Crystal, David 353, 817
Cser, L. 1369
Cummer, S.A. 940
Curie, Marie 1177, 1224, 1355
Curie, Pierre 1224, 1355
Curio, G. 935
Curtis, Jan 1163, 1233, 1391
Curtis, L.J. 1104
Cuturela, Doru 1034, 1114

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

D

D'Amico

D
D'Amico, N. 647
Daffertshofer, A. 1106
Dahlman, John 391
Dalì, Salvador 1138
Dalibard, J. 1108
Dalton, John *771*, 1227
Dalton, K. 647
Dam, H. van 1428
Dambier, G. 1382
Damour 1211
Damour, T. 653, 1371
Damour, Thibault 628
Danecek, Petr 391
Dante Alighieri 142
Darius, J. 338
Darley, Vincent 392
Darre, Daniel 391
Darwin 841, 843, 856
Darwin, Charles 946, 1364
Das, A. 1524
Dasari, R.R. 348
Dauger, Dean 1022, 1114
Davidhazy, Andrew 45, 247, 261, 392, 763, 971
Davidovich, Lev 328
Davidson, C. 642
Davies, Paul 1207
Davis, Chandler 874
Davis, K.B. 1102
Davis, S.D. 347
Davson, H. 948
Davy, Humphry 685
Deaver, B.S. 921
Decker, Rick 947
Deerfield, David 1150, 1390
Degen, Carl Ferdinand 884
Dehant, V. 340
Dehmelt, H. 348, 944, 1381
Dehmelt, Hans 348, 943, 1104, 1381, 1524
Dehn, Max *60*, 1324
Dekker, J.P. 945, 1365
Delft University of Technology 996, 1114
DeMille, D. 1524
Demko, T.M. 339
Democritus 256, *257*, 328, 844, 855, 858, 950, 1133, 1293, 1347, 1451, 1501, 1520
Denardo, B. 1368
DeRaad, L.L. 933
Derjaguin, B.W. 1191, 1368
Desari, R.R. 1369
Descartes, R. 325
Descartes, René *54*, 365, 806, 951
Deser 559
Deshpande, V.K. 637
Deslattes, R.D. 637
Desloge, E.A. 638
Desmet, S. 933
Destexhe, A. 352
DeTemple, D.W. 954
Detweiler, S. 651
Deutschmann, Matthias 932
Dewdney, Alexander 72
Dewey, M.S. 637
DeWitt, B.S. 1521
DeWitt, C. 1109
DeWitt-Morette, Cecile 646
Dholakia, K. 938
Diana, princess of Wales 842
Dicke, R.H. 343, 644
Dicke, Robert H. 1103
Dickey, J.M. 648
Diehl, Helmut 63, 624
Dieks, D. 1106
Dieks, Dennis 1061
Diel, Helmut 393
Diel, Isolde 393
Diemer, T. 653
Dietl, T. 945
Dietrich, F. 944
Dietrich von Freiberg 938
Dietze, H. 634, 1380
Diez, C. Alvarez 1370
Diez, Ulrich 392
DiFilippo, F. 637
DiFilippo, Frank 391
Dill, L.M. 347
Dillard-Bleick, Margaret 646
Diner, S. 1521, 1527, 1530
Dio, Cassius 344
Diophantus of Alexandria 877
Dirac 851, 868, 1050, 1066, 1217
Dirac, P.A.M. 1101, 1369
Dirac, Paul 225, 325, 1008, 1047, 1369
Dirr, Ulrich 392
Disney, Walt 1125
Dittus, H. 647, 653
Diu, B. 1100
DiVicenzo, D.P. 1108
Dixon, Bernard 335, 1379
Di Iorio, Giorgio 193, 394
Dmitriyev, V.P. 1380
Dobra, Ciprian 391
Doe, Peter 1159, 1390
Dogarin, A. 939
Dolto, Françoise 1364
Domingos, Sarah 1163, 1390
Doplicher, S. 1523
Doppler, Christian *412*
Dorbolo, S. 349
Dorbolo, Stéphane 270
Dorda, G. 1368
Dorfi, E.A. 648
Dornhege, G. 935
Doroshkevich 575
Doroshkevich, A.G. 648
Dorsey, A.T. 1108
Douady, S. 352, 948
Dougherty, R. 334
Douglas, R. 947
Douma, Michael 771, 971
Doyle, Arthur Conan 250
Dragon, Norbert 391, 431, 432, 663
Dresden, M. 950
Drgnu23 766
Droste, J. 506, 642
Drude, Paul *775*
Drury, L.O'C. 1370
Druten, N.J. van 1102
Dubelaar, N. 379
Dubrulle, B. 344
Dudek, J. 1373
Duff, M.J. 639
Duguay 404
Duguay, M.A. 632
Duhem, Pierre 949
Dumont, Jean-Paul 331, 337, 353, 632, 647, 648, 950, 1378, 1530, 1531
Duncan, Dugald 241, 394

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

D

DURAN

Duran, E. 1106
Durben, D.J. 348
Durfee, D.S. 1102
Durieux, M. 350
Durkin, L.S. 1376
Dusenbery, David 337, 1379
Dutton, Z. 333, 634
Dwyer, J.R. 942
Dyson, F.W. 642
Dyson, Freeman 391
Dziedzic, J.M. 938
Díaz Navas, José Antonio 392, 731
Dürr, S. 1375

E

Earls, K. 336
Earman, John 334
Ebbinghaus, H.-D. 952
Ebstein, R.P. 951
Eccles, John 951
Eckhardt, B. 352
Eckstein, G. 635
Economou, E.N. 940
Eddington, A.S. 642
Eddington, Arthur *98*, 860, 950, 1451, 1501, 1527, 1531
Edelmann, H. 343
Edens, Harald 392
Edge, Ron 944
Edwards, B.F. 372
Edwards, R. 933
EFDA-JET 1252
Egan, Greg 1066, 1114
Egorov, A.E. 942
Egorov, A.I. 942
Egorov, Anton 779
Ehlers, J. 650
Ehrenfest, P. 638
Ehrenreich, H. 1529
Ehrenstein, W.H. 941
Ehrlich, G. 1370
Eigler, D.M. 941
Einstein, A. 350, 645, 649, 934, 1101, 1105, 1108
Einstein, Albert 24, 158, 161, 162, 201, 217, 219, 225, 287, *407*, 409, 410, 422, 438, 443, 447, 498, 501, 504, 513, 520, 552, 555, 579, 622, 628, 631, 633, 638, 640, 717, 810, 832, 874, 988, 989, 1004, 1006, 1036, 1044, 1057, 1184, 1355, 1364, 1396, 1441
Einstein, Eduard 504
Ekman, Walfrid *338*
Ekstrom, C.R. 1104
Elliot, Anne 1168, 1391
Ellis, D.G. 1104
Ellis, G.F.R. 642, 649, 650, 1526
Ellis, George 622
Ellis, J. 1525, 1526
Els, Danie 391
Elsevier, Louis 358
Elswijk, H.B. 348, 934
Elswijk, Herman B. 391
Elsässer, Martin 153, 392
Eltsov, V.B. 1367
Emelin, Sergei 391, 779, 971
Emerson, Ralph Waldo 243, 820
Empedocles 401
Emsley, John 351
Enders, A. 940
Engelmann, Wolfgang 334
Engels, F. 1100
Engels, Friedrich 186, 992, 1017
Engemann, S. 349
Englert, Berthold-Georg 1100
Enhag, Per 1382
Enquist, B.J. 345
Enss, Christian 350
Eötvös, R. von 343, 644
Epicurus 871, 872, 994, 996
Epikuros 871
Erdős, Paul 60, 875
Erlykin, A.D. 941
Erschow, A. 1106
Ertmer, W. 944
Erwin Sattler OHG 145, 394
Escher, C. 1365
Escher, Maurits 1399
Eshelby, J. 634, 1380
Etchemendy, J. 950
Etheridge, D.M. 1366
Etienne, B. 1367
Euclid 40, 1407
Eukleides 40
Euler, H. 1104, 1369
Euler, Hans 1049
Euler, L. 325
Euler, Leonhard 125, 175, *179*, 338, 542, 835, 880
Euler, M. 1384
Evans, J. 343
Evans, Philip 1163, 1391
Everitt, C.W. 921
Everitt, F. 653
Exploratorium 722, 749, 970, 1124, 1390
Exton, A. 651
Eötvös, Roland von 120, *518*

F

Fabeni, P. 940
Facchi, P. 1102, 1365, 1530
Facchi, Paolo 1365
Faestermann, T. 648
Fairbank, W.M. 934
Fairbanks, J.D. 921
Fairhust, S. 640
Faisst, H. 352
Falco, E.E. 650
Falk, G. 342, 641
Fang Lizhi 874
Fantoli, Annibale 347
Faraday, Michael *685*, 690, 692, 700
Faragó, B. 1369
Farinati, Claudio 391
Farley, F.J.M. 633
Farmer, J. 351
Farrant, Penelope 337
Fasching, G. 564
Fatio de Duillier, Nicolas 173
Faulkner, A.J. 647
Faust 1443
Faybishenko, B.A. 352
Fayeulle, Serge 344
Fearing, R. 1366
Febbraio, M. 1363
Fehr, C. 345
Fekete, E. 343, 644
Feld, M.S. 348
Fereira, P.G. 650

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

F

FERMANI

Fermani, Antonio 391
Fermi, E. 1109
Fermi, Enrico *1056*, 1240, 1355
Fernandez-Nieves, A 340
Fetzer, J. 1367
Few, A.A. 942
Feyerabend, Paul 844, 865
Feynman, Richard 557, 722, 1095, 1192, 1257
Feynman, Richard P. 849, 1101
Feynman, Richard ('Dick') Phillips *1008*
Fibonacci, Leonardo *323*, 328
Field, M.S. 1369
Field, Simon Quellen 697, 970
Figer, D. 647
Figueroa, D. 345
Filippov, T. 346
Fink, H.-W. 1365, 1370
Fink, Hans-Werner 348, 1151, 1197, 1390, 1391
Fink, T. 1389
Finkelstein, D. 942, 1524
Finkelstein, David 1409
Finkenzeller, Klaus 391
Finne, A.P. 1367
Firestone, R.B. 1106, 1381
Firpić, D.K. 343
Fischbach, E. 1100
Fischer, M.C. 1365
Fischer, Ulrike 391
Fisher, M.P.A. 1108
Fitch, Val 1279
Fitzgerald, George F. 421
Fizeau, Hippolyte 404
Flach, S. 352
Flachsel, Erwein 331
Flagstaffotos 746, 971
Flambaum, V.V. 1372
Flato, M. 952
Flavell, J.H. 807
Fließbach, Torsten 641
Flindt, Rainer 334
Flint, H.T. 1524
Floyd, R.M. 652
Fokas, A.S. 248, 347
Foldy, L.L. 1036, 1103, 1104
Foley, E.L. 1102
Fonseca, E.J.S. 1101
Foong, S.K. 1372
Ford, E.C. 643
Ford, L.H. 1219, 1220, 1373
Foreman, M. 334
Formalont, E.B. 645
Forsberg, B. 344
Forssman, Friedrich 1364
Fortes, L.P. 344
Fortey, Richard 946
Fortson, E.N. 1526
Foster, James 345, 641
Foteinopoulou, S. 940
Foucault, Jean Bernard Léon *119*
Fowler, E.C. 633
Fowler, L.A. 645
Fowler, W.A. 951
Fowler, Willy *869*, 951
Fox, D.W. 1372
Frackowiak, R.S. 947
Fraenkel, Adolf/Abraham 823
Francis, G.K. 951, 1379
Francis, George 1380
Frank, F.C. 634, 1380
Franke-Arnold, S. 1103
Franklin, Benjamin 251, *674*, 674
Frasinski, L.J. 953
Fraunhofer FIRST 721
Fraunhofer, Joseph 727, *1041*
Fray, S. 1370
Fredenhagen, K. 1523
Frederick, Ann 1364
Fredman, R.A. 647
Fredriksson, S. 1524
Freimund, D.L. 1104
French, A.P. 639, 941
Frenkel, J. 634, 1380
Frenzel 88
Frercks, J. 632
Frercks, Jan 404, 663
Fresnel, Augustin 234
Fresnel, Augustin Jean 727, *742*
Freund, Peter G.O. 1377
Friedberg, R. 1524
Friedman 1257
Friedman, A. 648
Friedman, David 178
Friedman, J.I. 1374
Friedman, J.L. 1521
Friedman, J.R. 1109
Friedmann, A. 648
Friedmann, Aleksander Aleksandrowitsch *580*
Friese, M.E.J. 938
Frisch, D.H. 636
Fritsch, G. 347
Fritsch, H. 1374
Fritzius, Robert 670, 970
Fritzsch, H. 1524
Fritzsch, Harald 1374
Frova, Andrea 335
Fu, J.H.G. 1381
Fuchs, Manfred 1156, 1390
Fukuda, Y. 635
Full, R. 336
Full, R.J. 1366
Full, Robert 86, 393, 1172
Fulle, Marco 28, 392, 510, 1237, 1391
Fulling, S.A. 1371
Fulling, Stephen 1207
Fumagalli, Giuseppe 337, 345, 950, 1099
Fundamentalstation Wettzell 393
Furrie, Pat 391
Furukawa Yoshinori 1198, 1391
Furukawa, Y. 1370
Fölsing, Albrecht 633
Föppl, H. 938
Füllerkrug, M. 942
Fürstenau, H. 1377, 1526

G

Gabor, Dennis 765
Gabrielse, G. 1105, 1381
Gabuzda, D.C. 637
Gadelka, A.L. 1527
Gadolin, Johan 1355
Gaensler, B.M. 648
Gaessler, W. 1525
Galajda, P. 938
Galante, A. 1525
Galilei, Galileo 39, 48, 69, 73,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

G

GALILEO

74, 116, 132, 146, 163, 166, 167, 252, 254, 256, 358, 368, 402, 739, 858, 863, 874, 980, 981
Galileo 116, 328
Galle, Johann Gottfried 1041
Galli, M. 1374
Gallivan, B.C. 948
Galois, Evariste 213
Galvani, Luigi 683
Gamow, G. 648, 1374
Gamow, George 574, 1236
Gans, R. 944
Garay, L. 1523
Garay, L.J. 1526
Garcia, N. 1102
Garcia-Ruiz, J.M. 948
García-Mochales, P. 1102
Gardner, Martin 366, 950, 1105
Garg, A. 1108
Garlaschelli, L. 949
Garret, Don 1530
Garrett, A. 337
Garwin, R.L. 953
Gasiorowicz, Stephen 1103
Gaspard, Pierre 288, 350
Gasparoni, S. 1101
Gastaldi, Luca 27, 59, 164, 392
Gauthier, N. 346
Gauß, Carl-Friedrich 543, 885, 1328
Ge, M.-L. 1522
Gearhart, R. 635
Gearloose, Ratchet 1125
Gehrels, N. 651, 1522
Geiger, Hans 1225
Geim, A.K. 943, 944, 1366, 1367
Geim, Andre 944, 1179, 1366
Gelb, M. 332
Gell-Mann, M. 1107, 1374
Gell-Mann, Murray 1074, 1095, 1257
Geluck, Philippe 895
Gemini Observatory/AURA 138
Geng, Tao 207
GEO 781, 971
GeoForschungsZentrum Potsdam 150
Georgi, H. 1377
Georgi, Renate 391, 951
Gerlach, W. 1103
Gerlach, Walther 1025
Geroch, R. 652
Geroch, Robert 621, 1208
Gesellschaft, Deutsche Physikalische 944
Gesellschaft, Fraunhofer 656
Ghahramani, Z. 345
Ghavimi-Alagha, B. 341
Ghirardi, G.C. 1371
Giacosa, F. 1376
Gibbons, G.W. 639, 1371, 1528
Gibbons, Gary 391, 497, 509, 639, 1461
Gibbs, J. Willard 472
Gibbs, J.W. 639
Gibbs, Josiah Willard 1053
Gibbs, P. 1522, 1531
Gibbs, Phil 937, 1417, 1502
Gide, André 548
Giessibl, F. 1367
Giessibl, F.J. 348
Gilbert, William 671
Gilles, G.T. 935
Gilligan, James 344
Giltner, D.M. 634
Giovannini, G. 1374
Gisin, N. 1101, 1106
Giulini, D. 649
Glanz, J. 1101
Glassey, Olivier 391
Glattli, D.C. 1367
Glatzel, P. 1367
Glatzmaier, G.A. 935
Glauber, R.J. 1101
Glauber, Roy 1010
Gleiter, H. 945
Gmelin 1382
God, A. 1373
Goenner 530
Goenner, Hubert 641
Gold, Tommy 234
Goldhaber, A.S. 933
Goldman, V.J. 1367
Goldsmith, D. 942
Goldstein, Herbert 345
Goles, E. 352
Golestanian, R. 1369
Golubitsky, M. 332
Gonshor, H. 949
González, Antonio 391
González-Herráez, M. 939
Gooch, Van 50
Good, R.H. 638
Gordon, A. 942
Goriely, A. 349
Gossard, A.C. 1367
Gottfried, Kurt 1108, 1374
Goudsmit, S. 1103
Goudsmit, Samuel 1035
Gould, Andrew 535
Gould, P.L. 1104
Gould, R. 1106
Gour 1194
Gour, G. 1369
Gracovetsky, Serge 109, 338
Graela 1163, 1390
Graham, Geoff 1364
Graham, George 695
Graham, Neill 1109
Grahn, Alexander 392
Grandjean, F. 933
Graner, F. 344
Grant, E. 940
Grassmann, Hermann Günther 886
Graves, John 885
Graw, K.-U. 385
Gray, C.G. 345, 373, 1103
Gray, Theodore 1352, 1392
Grebe 501
Grebe-Ellis, J. 937
Greegor, R.B. 940
Green, A.J. 648
Green, M.B. 1521
Greenberg, O.W. 1105–1107
Greenberg, Oscar 1073
Greenberger, D.M. 1106
Greenbergest, T.V. 1106
Greene, Brian 1472, 1529, 1532
Greenland, P.T. 1382
Greenler, R. 937
Greenler, Robert 937
Greenside, Henry 930

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

G

GREENSTEIN

Greenstein, J.L. 642
Gregori, A. 1532
Gregori, Andrea 1511
Gregorio, Enrico 392
Gregory, R. 1524
Greiner, J. 653, 1371
Greiner, Jochen 391, 1212
Greiner, Walter 1375
Griessen, R. 945, 1365
Griffin, Scott 1390
Griffith, Simon 1169, 1391
Griffith, W.C. 1526
Griffiths, D.J. 943
Grillo, A.F. 1525
Grimaldi, Francesco 244, 741
Grinder, John 188, 332
Grindlay, J.E. 643
Grinstein, G. 1108
Groenendijk, Max 45, 392
Groenzin, H. 1367
Groot, D.G. de 945, 1365
Gross, B. 936, 1381
Gross, D.J. 1523
Gross, David 1269
Gross, R.S. 340
Grossmann, A. 347
Grotewohl, E. 1367
Grotz, K. 1377
Gruber, C. 636
Gruber, Christian 429
Gruber, R.P. 652
Grumman, Northrop 1157
Grünbaum, Branko 346
Guglielmini, Giovanni Battista 116
Guinea, F. 1366
Guiragossian, Z.G.T. 634
Gunzig, E. 1521, 1527, 1530
Guo, W. 1368
Guo, Wei 1187
Gupta, R. 1375
Gurevich, A.V. 942
Gutfreund, Hanoch 633
Guth, A. 650
Guth, Alan 598
Gutierrez, G. 345
Gutiérrez-Medina, B. 1365
Guy, R.K. 949
Gácsi, Zoltán 391
Gál, J. 936
Gödel, Kurt 845, 948
Göklü, E. 634
Günther, B. 334

H

Haake, F. 1108
Haas, Arthur Erich 980
Haas, W.J. de 934
Haas, Wander Johannes de *687*
Haber, John 391
Hackermüller, L. 1102
Hackermüller, L. 1108
Hadamard, Jacques 951
Haddock, Steve 1165, 1391
Hadley, M. 653
Haeckel, Ernst 838
Haerendel, G. 938
Hafele 502
Hafele, J.C. 635, 642
Hagen, J.G. 339
Hagen, John 121
Hahn, Otto 1240
Haidinger, W.K. 936
Haidinger, Wilhelm 730
Haigneré, Jean-Pierre 176
Hain, Tim 393
Hajnal, A. 1105
Haken, Hermann 1184
Hakonen, P.J. 953
Halberg, F. 334, 1365
Hales, Tom 1197
Haley, Stephen 391, 786
Hall, D.B. 636
Hall, Edwin 1174
Hallam, Tony 945
Halley, Edmund 155, 403
Halliday, A.N. 1373
Halliday, David 349
Halliwell, J.J. 334
Halvorson, H. 1100
Hamblyn, Richard 942
Hamilton 880
Hamilton, William 325, 821
Hamilton, William Rowan *878*
Hammerl, German 394
Hammond, R.T. 653
Hammond, T.D. 1104
Hanbury Brown, Robert 1003
Hancock, Lee 1168, 1391
Hancock, M.J. 348
Hanneke, D. 1105
Hannout, M. 1103
Hanns Ruder 431
Hanzlik, Marianne 685, 970
Harari, H. 1524
Hardcastle, Martin 391
Hardin, C.L. 939
Hardy, G.H. 952
Hardy, Godfrey H. *152*, 840
Hare, Trent 394
Haring, Bas 946
Harlen, V. 947
Haroche, S. 1108, 1109
Haroche, Serge 1080
Harrington, D.L. 1365
Harrington, R.F. 934
Harriot, T. 325
Harris, S.E. 333, 634
Hart, J.C. 951
Hartle, J.B. 1531
Hartman, W.K. 342
Hartmann, D. 653, 1371
Hartung, R.W. 1106
Harvey, A. 636, 649
Hasenöhrl, F. 638
Hasenöhrl, Friedrich 447
Hasha, A.E. 348
Hashimoto, H. 1380
Hasselberg, Ernst von 835
Hatcher, W.S. 948
Hatfield, Brian 646
Hattori, T. 1524
Haubrich, D. 944
Hausch, T.W. 936, 1381
Hausherr, Tilman 391, 964
Haverkorn, M. 648
Hawking, S. 1526
Hawking, S.W. 1371, 1522, 1531
Hawking, Stephen 493, 591, 613, 617, 622, 649, 1208
Hawkins, Daniel 66, 362, 395
Hayasaki, Y. 1369
Hayashi, H. 1366
Hayes, Allan 391
Hays, J.D. 340

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

H

HAYWARD

Hayward, S.A. 640
Heß, Viktor *1229*
Heath, T. 1523
Heath, Thomas 338
Heaviside 706, 883
Heber, U. 343
Heckel, B. 653
Heckel, B.R. 342
Heckenberg, N.R. 938
Hediger, Heini 335
Heering, Peter von 663
Heflinger, L.O. 943, 944
Hegel, Friedrich 1517
Hegerfeldt, G. 1109
Hegerfeldt, Gerhard 1084
Heinzen, D.J. 1365
Heisenberg 851
Heisenberg, W. 1104, 1369, 1470, 1522
Heisenberg, Werner 262, 291, 740, 981, *984*, 984, 1021, 1049, 1228
Hell, S.W. 941
Hell, Stefan 767, 971
Heller, Carlo 49
Heller, E. 346
Hellinger, Bert 344, 840, 873, 1364
Hellund, E.J. 1523
Hellwege, K.-H. 950
Helmholtz 727
Helmholtz, Hermann von 102, *281*, *760*, 872
Helmond, Tom 391, 497
Helmont, Johan Baptista van 285
Hembacher, S. 348
Hemley, R. 1366
Henbest, Nigel 341
Henderson, Paula 391
Henk Tennekes 43
Henley, E.M. 1375
Henon, M. 344
Henson, Matthew 376
Hentig, Hartmut von 11
Heracles 565
Heraclitus *24*
Heraclitus of Ephesus 33, 209, 577
Heras, J.A. 934
Herbert, Wally 341
Hergerfeldt, G.C. 1108
Hermann, Ludimar 760
Hermes, H. 952
Hernandez, A. 941, 959
Hernandez, L. 1532
Heron of Alexandria 266
Herrmann, F. 349
Hersch, R. 948
Hersch, Reuben 824
Herschel, John 586
Herschel, William 131, 727
Hertz 706, 883
Hertz, H.G. 337
Hertz, Heinrich 199, 473, 1004, 1047
Hertz, Heinrich Rudolf *184*, *724*
Hertz, J. 810
Hertzlinger, Joseph 392
Hesiod 572
Hess, Victor 1030
Hestenes, D. 344, 635
Heumann, John 391
Hewett, J.A. 342
Hewitt, Susan 1378
Hey, J.D. 1104
Hicks, K. 1376
Hietarinta, J. 347
Hietarinta, Jarmo 242, 248, 249, 392
Higashi, R. 953
Higgs, P.W. 1377
Higgs, Peter 1285
Hilbert, David 201, 219, 548, 551, *833*, 833, 845, 875, 1442, 1513
Hilborn, R. 1106
Hilborn, R.C. 1531
Hiley, B.J. 1527
Hilgenfeldt, S. 337
Hilgevoord, Jan 1100
Hilico, L. 936
Hill, E.L. 1524
Hiller, R.A. 945
Hillery, M. 1106
Hillman, Chris 391
Hillman, L. 1525
Hillman, L.W. 1526
Hinshaw, G. 650
Hinz, Wolfgang 726, 971
Hipparchos 123, 403
Hirano, M. 344
Hirota, R. 248, 347
Hirshfeld, A.C. 1381
Hirshfield, Stuart 947
Hirth, J.P. 634, 1380
Hirzebruch, F. 952
Hitachi 1020, 1114
Hitler, Adolf 768
Hobbes, Thomas 1134
Hobbs, G. 647
Hodges, L. 343
Hodgkin, A.L. 240, 346
Hoeher, Sebastian 349
Hof, B. 352
Hoffer, Eric 1488
Hogan, C.J. 1378, 1388
Hogan, Thomas 743, 971
Hogervorst, W. 1105
Hohenstatt, M. 348, 944
Holdin, P. 1380
Hollander, E. 349
Holst, Gilles 1176
Holstein, B.R. 646
Holt, R.A. 1109
Hołysz, L. 1366
Holzmüller, G. 644
Hones, Bill 944
Hong, C.K. 1105
Hong, F.-L. 953
Honner, John 1528
't Hooft, Gerard 840, 1207, 1269, 1277, 1296, 1409, 1506, 1524, 1526
Hooke 152
Hooke, Robert *143*, 226
Hoppeler, R. 1105
Horace, in full Quintus Horatius Flaccus 185, 498
Horgan, John 949, 1373
Hornak, Joseph 1391
Hornak, Joseph P. 1223
Hornberger, K. 1108
Horne, M.A. 1109
Horowitz, G.T. 1531, 1532
Horsburgh, Steven 671, 673,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

H

HortNET

970
HortNET 1392
Horváth, G. 936
Hosoi, A.E. 348
Hoste, J. 1380
Houck, A.A. 939
Houdini, Harry 949
Houtermans, Friedrich 575, 1249
Howard, Luke 776
Howell, J.C. 1106
Hoyle, C.D. 653
Hoyle, F. 649, 951
Hoyle, Fred 589, 649, *868*, 868, 1251, 1256, 1452
Hoyt, S. 1103
Hradil, Z. 1365
Hsich, T. 1366
Htun, Bo Bo 874
Hu, Z. 944
Huang, Kerson 1375
Hubble, Edwin *574*
Huber, A. 936, 1381
Huber, Daniel 391
Hudson, R.P. 350
Huff, D. 1107
Hughes, R.J. 647
Huiberts, J.N. 945, 1365
Huisken, G. 640
Hulet, R.G. 1102
Hulet, Rand 1178
Hulse, Russel 645
Humboldt, Alexander von 963
Humphreys, R. 340
Humphreys, W.J. 351
Hunklinger, Siegfried 350
Hunter, D.J. 336
Huppertz, H. 945
Hurwitz, Adolf 885
Huxley, A.F. 240, 346
Huygens, Christiaan *93*, 144, 145, 235, 403, 726
Hypatia 817, 844, 874
Hänggi, P. 1363
Hänsch, T.W. 1370
Höfner, H. 938
Hörnchen, Ingrid 395
Hüsler, Cédric 312, 395

I
IBM 259
Ibn al-Haytham 936
Icke, Vincent 1100
IEEE 756
Ifrah, G. 323
Ikeda Kikunae 1133
Illich, Ivan 869, *927*, 928, 929
Ilmanen, T. 640
Imae, Y. 337
Imbrie, J. 340
Inaba Hideaki 1172
Inaba, H. 1366
Indermühle, A. 1366
INFN 532
Ingram, Jay 347
INMS 49
Inquisition 253
International Tennis Federation 26, 392
Inverno, Ray d' 640, 641, 1528
Iorio, Giorgio di 1015, 1114
Irving, Washington 848
Irwin, Jim 937
Isham, C.J. 1522
Israel 610
Itano, W.M. 944, 1107, 1365
Itano, Wayno 1141
Itoh, T. 940
Ivanov, Igor 391
Ives, H.E. 633
Ivry, R.B. 334, 1365, 1527

J
Jackson, J.D. 933, 934
Jackson, L. 946
Jacobi, Carl 200
Jacobs, J.P. 1526
Jacobson, J. 1101
Jacobson, T. 640, 1380, 1528
Jacobson, Ted 1319
Jaeger-LeCoultre 114, 394
Jaekel, M.-T. 1522, 1528
Jaencke, Peter 950
Jaffe, R.L. 1376
Jahn, O. 346
Jalink, Kim 391
James, M.C. 343
Jamil, M. 391
Jammer, M. 341
Jammer, Max 1099, 1528
Janek, Jürgen 391
Janssen, Jules 1041
Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency 393
Jarlskog, C. 1377
Jarlskog, Cecilia 1281
Jauch 1417
Jauch, W. 1525
JAXA 120, 393
Jeanloz, R. 935
Jeffreys, Harold 122
Jeltes, T. 1105
Jen, E. 351
Jennings, G.M. 347
Jensen, D. 1381
Jensen, Hans 353
Jensen, P. 950
Jentschel, M. 637
Jeon, H. 933, 1377
Jerauld, J. 942
Jerie, M. 654
Jesus 268
Jetzer, P. 647
Jiang, D. 1366
Jiang, Z. 1367
Jin, Deborah 1178
Jin, Y. 1367
Johansson, Mikael 391
John Paul II 253
Johnson, Ben 75, 335
Johnson, George 1374
Johnson, Samuel 319, *632*, 908, *927*, 1521
Johnston, K.J. 336
Joliot, Frédéric 1241
Joliot-Curie, Irène 1241
Jones, Christopher 742, 971
Jones, Gareth 953
Jones, H. 325
Jones, P.D. 945
Jones, Quentin David 391
Jones, T.B. 943, 944
Jones, Tony 952
Jones, Vaughan 1325
Jong, Johan de 285, 395
Jong, Marc de 391
Joos, E. 1107, 1372

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Joos, Erich 1107
Jordan, D.M. 942
Jordan, P. 1377
Jordan, Pascual 981, 984, 1287
Joseph Bohm, David *1083*
Jost, Klaus 676, 970
Joule, James 281
Joule, James P. 102
Joule, James Prescott *281*
Joutel, F. 342
Jouzel, J. 340, 1366
Jouzel, Jean 130, 393
Joyce, James 1082, 1257
Jozefowski, L. 936
Ju, L. 953, 1528
Judson, Olivia 1527
Julien, L. 936
Justice, B.J. 940
Juszkiewicz, R. 650
Jönsson, C. 1102
Jönsson, Claus 1019, 1020, 1114
Jürgens, H. 307
Jürgens, Hartmut 334
Jüstel, T. 1369

K

Köppe, Thomas 391
Kaaret, P. 643
Kac, Victor 894
Kadanoff, L.P. 352
Kalbfleisch, G.R. 633
Kalckar, Jørgen 526
Kamerlingh Onnes, Heike 1176
Kamiya, K. 383
Kanada Yasumasa 954
Kanecko, R. 344
Kanno, S. 1372
Kant, Immanuel 161, 564, 574, 647, 772, 822
Kantor, Yakov 930
Kapitsa, Pyotr 1177
Kapitza 1050
Kapuścik, E. 635
Kara-Ivanov, M. 1379
Kardar, M. 1369
Karl, G. 345, 373, 1103
Karlhede, A. 653
Karliner, M. 1530
Karolyhazy, F. 1525, 1526
Karstädt, D. 350
Kasparian, J. 1369
Kasparov, Gary 1120
Katori, H. 953
Katsuura, K. 1524
Kauffman, L.H. 951
Kauffman, Lou 1326
Kaufmann, W.J. 647
Kawagishi, I. 337
Kawamura, M. 1379
Kay, B.S. 1220, 1373
Kay, Paul 939
Kayser, R. 649
Keating 502
Keating, R.E. 636
Keesing, R.G. 333, 953
Keller, C. 1102
Keller, Evan 696, 970
Keller, Joseph 1044
Keller, Wilfred 967
Kells, W. 1381
Kelly, K.L. 937
Kelu, Jonatan 391
Kelvin, William *281*
Kemp, David 234
Kempf, A. 1523
Kempf, Achim 1529
Kempf, Jürgen 334
Kendall 1257
Kendall, H.W. 1374
Kenderdine, M.A. 337
Kendrick, E. 344
Kennard, E.H. 331, 1522
Kennedy, R.J. 633
Kenneth, O. 1368
Kenny, T. 1366
Kepler 152
Kepler, Johannes *142*, 151, 152, 586, 745, 1197
Kerr, John *732*
Kerr, R.P. 651
Kerr, Roy 610
Kerschbaum, Franz 1169, 1391
Kerswell, R. 352
Kesel, A.B. 1366
Kessler, E.G. 637
Kessler, Raphael 312, 395
Kettering, C.F. 933
Ketterle, W. 1102
Ketterle, Wolfgang 1178, 1392
Keyence 56, 393
Khallikan, Ibn *356*
Khan, S. 1379
Khotkevich, V.V. 1366
Kidd, R. 1101
Kielpinski, D. 1107
Killing, Wilhelm 892
Kilmister, C.W. 638
Kim Song-Man 874
Kim, P. 1367
Kimble, H.J. 944
King, B.E. 1107
King, Henry C. 937
Kinoshita, T. 1105
Kippenhahn, R. 1373
Kirby, Jack 393
Kirchhoff, Gustav 1041
Kirchner, E.J.J. 937
Kirchner, Eric 739, 971
Kirchoff, Gustav 235
Kiss, Joseph 391
Kistler 268
Kistler, S.F. 349
Kitaoka Akiyoshi 23, 25, 330, 392
Kitaoka, A. 330
Kitaoka, Akiyoshi 331
Kittinger 502, 641
Kittinger, Joseph 498
Kivshar, Y.S. 352
Kjellman, J. 633
Klapdor, H.V. 1377
Klauder, J.R. 1101
Klauder, John 641
Klebanov, I. 1530
Klein, Felix 834
Klein, Oskar 1049
Kleinert, F. 950
Klempt, E. 1376
Kleppner, Daniel 645
Klett, J.D. 1381
Klich, I. 1368
Klitzing, Klaus von 1178
Kloor, H. 1100
Klose, S. 653, 1371
Kluge, Stefan 700, 970
Kneib, J.-P. 1104

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

K

Knie

Knie, K. 648
Knop, R.A. 647
Knuth, D. 949
Knuth, Donald 830
Knutsen, H. 648
Kobayashi, H. 1365
Koblenz, Fachhochschule 40
Koch, G.W. 347
Koch, Robert 870
Kochen 1092
Kochen, S. 1109
Kockel, B. 1104, 1369
Koecher, M. 952
Koeman, N.J. 945, 1365
Kogut, A. 650
Kohlrausch, Friedrich 950
Kohshima, S. 1365
Kolberg, Ulrich 392, 1320, 1392
Koltenbah, B.E.C. 940
Konishi, K. 1523
Kontorowa, T. 634, 1380
Kooijman, J.D.G. 369
Koolen, Anna 391
Koomans, A.A. 348, 934
Kopeikin, S.M. 645
Kopeikin, Sergei 391
Kopnin, N.B. 1367
Korschinek, G. 648
Korteweg 241
Kosack, Joe 1305, 1392
Kostiuk, L.W. 935
Kostner, Andreas 1168, 1391
Kostro, L. 639, 640
Kotowski, Mirjana 971
Koul, R.K. 1531
Kovetz, A. 943
Kovtun, P. 1530
Kowalski, L. 941
Kozhekin, A.E. 939
Krachmalnicoff, V. 1105
Kramer, D. 945
Kramer, M. 644, 647, 1528
Krauledat, M. 935
Krehl, P. 349
Krehl, Peter 274
Kreimer, D. 1532
Kreimer, Dirk 1202, 1370, 1509
Krenn, G. 1365
Kreuzer 507
Kreuzer, L.B. 643
Krexner, G. 1369
Krider, E.P. 933
Krijn, Marcel 391
Krisher, T.P. 639
Krishnan, B. 640
Krívchenkov, V.D. 330
Krogh, A. 810
Kronig, Ralph 1035
Krotkow, R. 343, 644
Krumm, P. 644
Krusius, M. 1367
Kruskal, M.D. 346
Kruskal, Martin 242, 830
Kryowonos, A. 1103
Królikowski, Jarosław 391
Kröner 560
Kröner, Ekkehart 640, 647
Krüger, Reinhard 848
Kubala, Adrian 391
Kublenz, Kay 785, 971
Kuchiev, M.Yu. 1372
Kuchiev, Michael 1216
Kudo, S. 337
Kuerti, G. 940
Kumaradtya, K.K. 651
Kurizki, G. 939
Kurn, D.M. 1102
Kuroda, Paul 1244
Kurths, Jürgen 342
Kusch, K. 946
Kusch, S. 946
Kusner, R. 1381
Kusner, R.B. 1380
Kuzin, Pavel 391
Kuzmich, A. 939
Kuščer, I. 1103
Kvale, E.P. 339
Kwait, P.G. 939
Kwiat, P.G. 940
Kwok, D.Y. 935
Kötter, K. 352
Kötter, Karsten 305, 395
Künzle, H.P. 651
Küstner, Friedrich *124*, 340

L

La Caille 144
LaBarbera, M. 1381
Lachièze-Rey, M. 650
Laer Kronig, Ralph de 1287
Lafrance, R. 1372
Lagrange 205
Lagrange, Joseph 880
Lagrange, Joseph Louis 197
Lagrangia, Giuseppe Lodovico *197*
Lai, A. 940
Lalande 144
Laloë, F. 1100
Lamas-Linares, A. 1106
Lamb 517
Lamb, Frederick 652
Lamb, Willis 1191
Lambeck, K. 339
Lambert, Johann 544
Lambert, S.B. 340
Lambrecht, A. 1368
Lamoreaux 1191
Lamoreaux, S.K. 1368, 1526
Lancaster, George 345
Landau, L. 647
Landau, Lev 328
Landauer, R. 947
Landauer, Rolf 351
Landolt-Börnstein 950
Lang, K.R. 83
Lang, N.D. 941
Langacker, P. 1376
Lange, B. 639
Langel, R.A. 1100
Langevin, Paul 448
Laplace, Pierre 604
Laplace, Pierre Simon *158*
Larousse, Pierre 949
Larraza, A. 1368
Larsen, J. 340
Laskar, J. 343
Laskar, Jacques 174
Laskkar, J. 342
Lasota, J.P. 652
Latham, J. 942
Laue, Max von 454
Laugerette, F. 1363
Laughlin, R.B. 1367
Laughlin, Robert 1178
Laveder, Laurent 176, 394, 750,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

L

LAVENDA

971
Lavenda, B. 351
Lavenda, Bernard 1530
Lavinsky, Rob 1155–1160, 1164, 1167, 1390
Lavoisier, Antoine 874
Lavoisier, Antoine-Laurent *92*
Lawrence, Ernest 1356
Laws, Kenneth 352
Lawson, J.D. 1374
Lawson, John 1253
Leach, J. 1103
Lebedew, P. 937
Lebedew, Pyotr/Peter 746
Leblanc, J. 1382
Lecar, M. 344
Ledingham, K.W.D. 1377
Ledingham, Ken 1288
Ledoux, Joseph 947
Lee Tsung-Dao 1277
Lee, David M. 1177
Lee, J. 1524, 1531
Lee, S.J. 341
Lee, T.D. 1524
Leeuwenhoek, Antoni van *740*
Lega, Joceline 352
Legendre, A. 325
Leggett, A.J. 1107, 1108
Lehmann, Paul 326, 354
Leibfried, G. 634, 1380
Leibniz 99, 152, 194, 200, 1442
Leibniz, G. 325
Leibniz, Gottfried 197
Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm 333
Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm *79*
Leica Geosystems 56, 393
Leidenfrost, Johann Gottlieb 268
Leiderer, P. 1370
Lemaître, Georges A. *580*
Lenin 685, 1408
Lennard, J. 326
Lennerz, C. 375
Lennie, P. 941
Lense, J. 644
Lense, Josef 520
Lenstra, J.K. 1105
Leon, J.-P. 248, 347
Leonardo da Vinci 1023
Leonardo of Pisa *323*
Leone, F.C. 940
Lepak, J. 934
Leppmaier, Max 1370
Lerner, L. 645
Lesage, G.-L. 343
Lesage, Georges-Louis 173
Leschiutta, S. 502, 642
Leucippus 858, 1293, 1347
Leucippus of Elea *257*
Leutwyler, H. 1374
Leutwyler, K. 346
Levi-Civita, Tullio 548
Levitov, L. 1109
Levy, S. 1380
Lewallen, Charles 140, 394
Lewis, G.N. 637
Le Verrier, Urbain 158
Li, K. 940
Li, Y-Q. 1529
Li, Y.C. 943
Liang, Y. 1366
Libbrecht, Kenneth 306, 392
Libby, Willard 1236
Lichtenberg, Georg Christoph *39*, *869*, 1485
Lie, Sophus 891, *901*
Liebscher, Dierck-Ekkehard 634
Lieu, R. 1525, 1526
Lie groups, non-linear 901
Lifshitz, E. 647
Lifshitz, E.M. 1191, 1368
Light, Michael 1374
Lille, Alain de 604
Lilley, Sam 641
Lim Tee Tai 270, 271, 392
Lim, T.T. 349
Lincoln, Abraham 874
Lindblad, G. 1107
Linde, Johan 392
Lindh, A.G. 643
Linfield, R.P. 636
Lingelbach, B. 941
Lingelbach, Elke 760
Lintel, Harald van 391, 429
Lipperhey, Johannes *739*
Lissauer, J.J. 353
Liu Gang 874
Liu, C. 333
Livingston, William 938
Llewellyn Thomas 1035
Lloyd, S. 1109, 1527
Lloyd, Seth 350, 1441
Lockwood, E.H. 346
Lockyer, Joseph 1041
Lodge, Oliver *121*
Logan, R.T. 639
Lohse, D. 337
Lohse, Detlev 134, 393
Loidl, J. 938
Loll, R. 1523
Lombardi, Luciano 391
Lombardo, F. 653
Longair, M. 648
Longo, M. 933, 1377
Lorentz, H.A. 635
Lorentz, Hendrik Antoon 1459
Lorentz, Hendrik A. 689
Lorentz, Hendrik Antoon *418*, 421
Lorimer, D.R. 645, 647
Losch, F. 935
Loschmidt, Joseph *251*
Loss, D. 1108
Lothe, J. 634, 1380
Loudon, Rodney 1100
Louisell, W.H. 1103
Lovell, Jim 937
Lovász, P. 1105
Low, R.J. 638
Lu, F. 935
Luca Bombelli 391
Lucretius *45*, 258, 1531
Lucretius Carus, Titus 45, 258, 1531
Ludvigsen, Malcolm 641
Lui, A.T.Y. 1100
Luke, Lucky 272, 415
Luminet, J.-P. 650
Lundeen, J.S. 1101
Lundmark, K. 648
Lundmark, Knut 574
Luo, J. 935
Lutes, G.F. 639
Luzio, E. 1525

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

L
LYNCH

Lynch, D.K. 941
Lynch, David 1167
Lyne, A.G. 647
Lämmerzahl, C. 647, 653, 1371
Lévy-Leblond, J.-M. 935
Lévy-Leblond, Jean-Marc 107, 173, 330, 933, 1099
Lüders, Klaus 330
Lühr, H. 935
Lüthi, D. 1366
Lüthi, Dieter 1173, 1391
Lüthi, Thomas 193, 394, 1165, 1391
Lütjens, Jörn 366, 395

M
M.C. Escher Heirs 1399
Maan, Jan Kees 944
MacCallum, M.A.H. 651
Macdonald, A. 652
MacDonald, G.J.F. 339
Macdonald, Malcolm Ross 946
MacDougall, Duncan 338
MacDougalls, Duncan 110
Mach, Ernst *94*, 601
Macmillan, R.H. 346
Macrobius 648
Maddox, J. 1531
Madelung, O. 950
Madison, K.W. 1365
Maekawa, Y. 337
Maeterlink, Maurice *601*, 861
Maffei, Paolo 647
Maffi, Luisa 939
Magariyama, Y. 337
Maggiore, M. 1523
Magueijo, J. 1525, 1529
Magyar G. 1185
Magyar, G. 1369
Mahoney, Alan 391
Mahowald, M. 947
Mahrl, M. 352
Maiman, Theodore 1184
Main, Peter 944
Mainwaring, S.R. 635
Mainzer, K. 952
Majid, S. 1522, 1531
Major, S.A. 1532
Maldacena, J. 1532
Maleki, L. 639
Malik, J. 1378
Malin, D. 83
Mallat, Stéphane 347
Malley, R. 344
Malus, Louis 728
Manchester, R.N. 647
Mandel, L. 1101, 1105, 1185, 1369
Mandelbaum, G. 1524
Mandelbrot, Benoît 58, 250
Mandelstam, Stanley 345
Manly, Peter 937
Mann, A. 1368
Mann, A.K. 1376
Mann, J.C. 1367
Mannhart, J. 348
Mao, Y. 1389
Marciano, W.J. 1376
Marcus, Richard 332
Marey, Etienne-Jules 1310
Mariano, A. 1102
Maricourt, Pierre de 684
Maris, H. 348, 1368
Maris, Humphrey 1187, 1390
Mark, Martin van der 296, 391
Markow, T.A. 1379
Markus, M. 352
Marmo, G. 1521
Marques, F. 1382
Marqués, M. 1102
Marsaglia, G. 344
Marsh, N.D. 648
Martikainen, J.E. 953
Martin, A. 345, 1366
Martin, S. 945
Martina, L. 248, 347
Martini, K.M. 1102
Martos, Antonio 391, 392, 726, 750, 971
Martz, Paul 251, 394
Martínez, E. 352
Marx, Groucho 320, 1468
Marzke, R.F. 652
Mashhoon, B. 644
Mason, W.P. 634, 1380
Masood-ul-Alam, A.K.M. 651
Massa, C. 639
Massa, Corrado 391, 497, 1458
Massar, S. 1106
Masterson, B.P. 1376
Masudi, Ibn 356
Matsas, G.E.A. 636, 637
Matsukura, F. 945
Mattheck, Claus 1100
Matthews, R. 343
Matthews, Robert 966
Matthews, W.N. 638
Mattick 404
Mattick, A.T. 632
Mattick, Tom 405, 663
Maupertuis, Pierre Louis Moreau de *116*
Maus, S. 935
Maus, Stefan 699, 970
Mavromatos, N.E. 1525, 1532
Maxwell 680, 851, 883
Maxwell, D. 1380
Maxwell, James Clerk 421, *706*, 1343
Mayer, A.R. 1365
Mayer, Julius Robert 102, *281*
Mayer, N.J. 946
Maynard, Finian 41
Mayné, Fernand 391
Mayr, Peter 391
Mays, D.C. 352
Mays, David 304, 395
Mazur 610
Mazur, P.O. 651
McClure-Griffiths, N.M. 648
McCoy, Ray 108, 393
McCrone, J. 1364
McCullogh 940
McCuskey, S.W. 940
McDonald, K.T. 644
McGowan, R.W. 634
McGuire, Bill 945
McInerney, J.O. 1363
McKellar, B.H.J. 637
McKellar, Bruce H.J. 1103
McKenna, P. 1377
McLaughlin, M.A. 647
McLaughlin, William 331
McLean, H. 336
McMahob, T.A. 347
McMillen, T. 349

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

M

McNamara

McNamara, Geoff 643
McNamara, J.M. 1105
McNaught, Robert 87, 393
McQuarry, George 391
McTaggart 840
Mead, C.A. 1522, 1528, 1530
Mechelli, A. 947
Medenbach, Olaf 335
Medien Werkstatt 393
Meekhof, D.M. 1107, 1376
Meetz, Kurt 935
Meijaard, J.P. 369
Meitner, Lise 1240, 1357
Melo, F. 352
Melzner, F. 938
Mende, P.F. 1523, 1532
Mende, Paul 1510
Mendeleyev, Dmitriy Ivanovich 97, 1357
Mendes, O. 943
Mendoza, E. 352
Mensky, M.B. 1099
Menten, K.M. 651
Merckx, Eddy 103
Mermin, David 757, 793
Merrit, John 391
Mertens, K. 352
Meschede, D. 944
Metha, A. 941
Mettler-Toledo 97, 393
Mettrie, J. Offrey de la 309
Mewes, M.-O. 1102
Meyenn, K. von 1103
Meyer, C.A. 1376
Meyer, D. 1524
Miákishev, G.Ya. 330
Michaelson, P.F. 921
Michel, Stanislav 99
Michelangelo 328
Michell, J. 651
Michell, John *147*, 604
Michelson 475
Michelson, A.A. 635
Michelson, Albert *121*, 802
Michelson, Albert Abraham *418*
Micro Crystal 392
Microcrystal 228
Miescher, Friedrich *1149*
Mikiewicz, M. 1373
Mikkola, Seppo 342
Milankovitch, Milutin *128*
Millerd, Tiffany 1391
Millikan 964, 1230
Milonni, P.W. 1101, 1368
Milton, K.A. 933
Mineral, Trinity 1157
Mineyev, A. 347
Minkowski, Hermann *422*, 422
Minnaert, Marcel 939
Mirabel, I.F. 334, 637
Mirsky, S. 367
Misawa, H. 1369
Mishra 463
Mishra, L. 639
Misner 559
Misner, C. 1528
Misner, C.W. 1106, 1521
Misner, Charles 638
Mission, G.P. 936
Mitchell, Edgar 1188
Mitchell, M.W. 1101
Mitskievic, N.V. 651
Mittelstaedt, H. 650
Mittelstaedt, M.-L. 650
Mlynek, J. 633
Moalic, J.-P. 1382
Mock, J.J. 940
Mohazzabi, P. 343, 641
Mohideen 1191
Mohideen, U. 1368
Mohr, P.J. 954, 1375
Mokros, Nicolai 431, 432, 663
Molière 870
Monitz, E.J. 337
Monken, C.H. 1101
Monnin, E. 1366
Monroe, C. 1107, 1108
Montgomery, H. 935
Montgomery, R. 1379
Montie, E.A. 936
Montmayeur, J.P. 1363
Montonen, C. 1531
Montonen, Claus 719, 1299
Moody, Robert 894
Mooij, J.E. 1109
Moon, F.C. 943
Moore, C.P. 651
Moore, Henry 542
Moore, J.A. 345
Moortel, Dirk Van de 391, 657
Moothoo, D.N. 938
Moreau de Maupertuis, Pierre Louis *116*
Moreira, N. 345
Morgado, E. 334
Morgado, Enrique 51, 393
Morin, B. 1379, 1380
Morin, Bernard 1314
Morlet, J. 347
Morley, E.W. 635
Morley, Edward William 418
Morozov, S.V. 1366, 1367
Morrow, P.R. 1365
Morré, D.J 1365
Moscow State Circus 30, 392
Moser, Lukas Fabian 391
Moses Maimonides 1401
Mottelson, Ben 1177
Mozart 872, 1133
Mozurkewich, D. 336
MPI-Chemie, Mainz 781, 971
Mugnai, D. 940, 941
Mukharsky, Yu. 1370
Mullarkey, M. 1363
Muller, R.A. 346
Mulligan, J.F. 337
Mullins, O.C. 1367
Munk, W.H. 339
Munroe, Randall 704, 970
Munzner, T. 1380
Muramoto, K. 337
Murata, Y. 344
Murdock, Ron 391
Mureika, J.R. 344
Murillo, Nadia 391
Murphy, R. 325
Murray, C.D. 342
Murray, J.J. 635
Musil, Rober 585
Musiol, Gerhard 944
Muskens, O. 346
Mutti, P. 637
Muynck, Wim de 391
Myatt, C.J. 1107
Myers, E.G. 637

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

M

MYERS

Myers, R.C. 1372
Måløy, K.J. 352
Møller, Christian 638
Méndez, F. 1525
Möllmann, K.-P. 350
Möllmann, Klaus-Peter 279, 395
Müller, Frank 58, 393
Müller, G. 352
Müller, Gerhard 311, 312, *395*
Müller, H. 633
Müller, J. 653
Müller, K.-R. 936

N

Nagano, M. 654
Nagaoka Hantaro 1022
Nagaoka, H. 1102
Nairz, O. 1102
Nakahara, Mikio 952
Nakazato, H. 1365
Namba, K. 337
Namiki, M. 1365
Namouni, F. 342
Namouni, Fathi 391
Nanopoulos, D.V. 1525
Nanosurf 258
Nansen, Fridtjof 338
Napiwotzki, R. 343
Naples zoo 56, 393
Napoleon 158
Narison, Stephan 1375
Narlikar, J.V. 649
NASA 539, 1537
Nassau, K. 89
Nassau, Kurt 1163
Natarajan, V. 637
National Academy of Sciences 1175
Naudin, Jean-Louis 698, 970
Nauenberg, M. 341, 1374
Navier, Claude *262*
Neddermeyer, Seth 1229
Needham, Joseph 345
Neidhart, B. 943
Nelson, A.E. 342
Nemiroff, R.J. 644
Nesvizhevsky, V.V. 1371
Neto, A.C. 1366
Neuhauser, W. 348, 944
Neuhauser, Werner 260, 394
Neukammer, J. 1104
Neukirch, J. 952
Neumaier, Heinrich 391, 497
Neumann, Dietrich 154, 342
Neumann, John von 1075, 1091
Neumann, János von *1091*
Neuss, H. 938
Neve, Erik de 1315
New, M. 945
Newcomb, Simon 158, 342
Newell, D.B. 1375
Newman, E.T. 651
Newton 152, 333, 919, 1011
Newton, Isaac *39*, 52, 116, 143
Nez, F. 936
Ng, Y.J. 1428, 1523, 1525, 1526, 1528
Nicolai, H. 646
Nicolis, Grégoire 350
Niederer, U. 218, 346
Nieminen, T.A. 938
Nienhuis, G. 1103
Niepraschk, Rolf 392
Nieto, L.M. 646
Nieto, M.M. 1103
Nietzsche, Friedrich 483
Nieuwpoort, Frans van 391
Nieuwstadt, F.T.M. 352
Nieves, F.J. de las 340
Nightingale, J.D. 345, 641
Nimtz, G. 940
Nimtz, Günter 757
Nio, M. 1105
Niobe 1357
Niot, I. 1363
Nishida, N. 1369
Niu, Q. 1365
Nobel, Alfred 1357
Nobel, P. 348
nobodythere 1305, 1392
Noda, Claro 395
Noecker, M.C. 1376
Noether, Emmy *219*
Nogueira, Zé 1316, 1392
Nojiri, S. 1379
Nollert, H.-P. 1372
Nolte, John 332
Nonnius, Peter *66*
Noppeney, U. 947
Nordmeier, V. 944
Nordström, Gunnar 610
Nordtvedt, Kenneth 653
Nordvik, Terje 752, 971
Norrby, L.J. 1365
Northwestern University 53, 82, 393
Novikov 575
Novikov, I.D. 648
Novikov, Igor 640, 651, 1371
Novikov, V.A. 345, 373, 1103
Novoselov, K.S. 1366, 1367
Nutsch, W. 1379
Nuñes, Pedro *66*
Nylander, Paul 308, 395

O

O'Connell, Sanjida 946
O'Dempsey, T. 1381
O'Doberty, J. 947
O'Keefe, R. 341
Oberdiek, Heiko 391
Oberquell, Brian 391
Observatoire de la Côte d'Azur 539
Occam, William of 1501
Ockham, William of 1501
Odom, B. 1105
Odysseus 968
Oersted 685
Oersted, Hans Christian 685
Oey, M.S. 648
Offner, Carl 391
Offrey de la Mettrie, J. 309
Ohanian, H.C. 639
Ohanian, Hans 467
Ohm, Georg Simon *703*
Ohmiya, A. 1367
Ohno, H. 945
Ohno, Y. 945
Ohtani, K. 945
Okhapkin, M. 634, 635
Olbers, Wilhelm 586
Olive, D. 1531
Olive, David 719, 1299
Olum, K.D. 643

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Omiya, T. 945
Oostrum, Piet van 391
Opalsnopals 1169, 1391
Oppenheimer, J. 1523
Oppenheimer, R. 651
Oppenheimer, Robert 202, *606*, 874
Orban, F. 933
Origone, Simone 166, 394
Orlando, T.P. 1109
Orlitzky, A. 1105
Ormos, P. 938
Ortlepp, Christine 1328, 1392
Osewold, Daniel 663
Osheroff, Douglas D. 1177
Osserman, Bob 597
Osterle, Fletcher 702
Otto von Bismarck 837
Otto, Rudolf *872*, 872, 1452
Ou, Z.Y. 1105
Oughtred, W. 325
Overhauser, A.W. 1370
Ovidius, in full Publius Ovidius Naro 406, 1139

P

Pádua, de 1005
Packard, R.E. 1370
Padgett, M. 1103
Padgett, M.J. 938
Padgett, Miles 938
Padmanabhan, T. 1522, 1530
Paffuti, G. 1523
Page, Don 391, 1215
Page, Janet 392
Pagliarin, A. 1374
Pahaut, Serge 391, 1039
Paine, Thomas 848
Pais, A. 346, 949
Palmer, R. 810
Pan, J.-W. 1101
Panov, V.I. 343, 644
Papadopoulos, J.M. 369
Papapetrou, A. 637
Papini, G. 1102, 1529
Pappus 91
Parazzoli, C.G. 940
Park, David 330, 936
Parker, Barry 648
Parker, D.E. 945
Parks, David 86, 391, 393
Parlett, Beresford 31
Parmenides 24, 80, 1502
Parmenides of Elea 23
Parrott, S. 943
Pascal, Blaise *999*
Pascazio, S. 1102, 1365, 1530
Pascazio, Saverio 391, 1141, 1365, 1458
Paschotta, Rüdiger 233, 394, 727, 971
Pasi, Enrico 391
Passilly-Degrace, P. 1363
Pati 1296
Pati, J.C. 1524
Patris, B. 1363
Paul, H. 1101, 1369
Paul, T. 347
Paul, W. 637
Paul, Wolfgang 1228
Pauli, Wolfgang 438, 646, 841, 984, 1009, *1035*, 1050, 1065, 1105, 1106, 1275
Pauling, Linus 1364
Paulsen, C. 1108
Paulus of Tarsus 845
Pauw, J.L. van der 703
Pavlis, E.C. 644
Pavão, A.C. 943
Pazzi, G.P. 940
Peano, G. 325
Pearson, T.J. 636
Peary, Robert 142, 341, 376
Pěč, Karel 335
Pecharsky, Vitalij 945
Peeters, Bert 391
Pegna, Guido 725, 970
Peirce, Benjamin 888
Peirce, Charles *817*, 844
Peitgen, H.-O. 307
Peitgen, Heinz-Otto 334
Pekár, V. 343, 644
Pello, R. 1104
Pelt, J. 649
Pelt, Jaan 595
Pempinelli, F. 248, 347
Pendry, J. 940
Pendry, J.B. 940
Pendry, John 755, 756
Peng, J.L. 944
Pennsylvania Game Comission 1305, 1392
Penrose, R. 636, 640, 652, 1106
Penrose, Roger 493, 611, 617, 650, 949
Penzias, Arno 575
Pepper, M. 1368
Perc, M. 338
Peredo, M. 1100
Pereira, Silvania 1114
Perelman, Yakov 246, 330
Peres, A. 651, 1523
Peres, Asher 1100
Peres, N.M. 1366
Perini, Romano 391
Perkins, D.H. 635
Perlman, E. 651
Perot 501
Perrin, A. 1105
Perrin, J. 350, 1102
Perrin, Jean *288*, 350, 388, 1022
Perros, Georges 1134
Persius 862
Pešić, P.D. 649, 1364
Peters, A. 633, 1371
Petersen, Nicolai 970
Peterson, Peggy 71, 393
Petit, J.-P. 1380
Petit, J.R. 1366
Petit, Jean-Pierre 931
Pfenning, M.J. 1220, 1373
Pfister, Herbert 650
Pflug, Hans 1128
Philips 670
Phillips, A. 1380
Phillips, Gregory 1167, 1391
Phillips, Melba 874
Phillips, R.J. 342
Philpott, R.J. 638
Piaget, J. 807
Piaget, Jean 332, *807*, 807
Piatek, M. 1380
Picasso, Pablo 717, 813, 864
Piccard, Auguste *267*
Picciotto, R. de 1367
Pieranski, P. 1380
Pietralla, Martin 729, 971

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

P

PIETRZIK

Pietrzik, Stefan 380, 393
Pikler, Emmi 331
Pikovsky, Arkady 342
Pimpinelli, A. 1370
Pines, David 1177
Pinker, Steven 334, 947
Pinkse, P. 1104
Pinno, F. 350
Pinno, Frank 395
Pinto, Fabrizio 1191
Piper, M.S. 533, 645
Piraino, S. 643
Piran, T. 1526
Pirozerski, Alexei 779, 971
Pitnick, S. 1379
Pittacus 1492
PixHeaven.net 176, 750
Planck, M. 1522, 1530
Planck, Max 287, 289, 438, 451, 455, 473, *768*, 768, 977, 979, 1000, 1005, 1036, 1099, 1455
Planemad 1164, 1391
Plastino, A. 1106
Plastino, A.R. 1106
Plato 257, 314, 589, 1364, 1429, 1451, 1502, 1520, 1531
Plinius, in full Gaius Plinius Secundus 330
Plisson, Philip 29, 392
Plotinus 1535
Plunkett, Altus 1167, 1391
Plutarchus 190
PNAS 1328
Podolsky, B. 1108
Pohl, Robert 330
Pohl, Robert O. 330
Pohlad, Bob 312, 395
Poincaré, Henri 132, *409*, 409, 420, 421, 448, 498, 515, 872, 1005
Poincaré, J.H. 637
PoincarÈ, Henri 1101
Poinsot, Louis 121
Poisson, Denis *742*
Poisson, Siméon-Denis *149*
Polchinski, J. 1531, 1532
Polder, D. 1368
Politzer, David 1269
Polster, B. 350
Pompeius, Gnaeus 190
Pontecorvo, Bruno 1285
Popescu, S. 1106
Popov, V.S. 1376
Popper, Karl 849, 949
Possenti, A. 647
Pound 501
Pound, R.V. 642
Povh, Bogdan 1373
Povinelli, D.J. 869
Powell, Cecil 1229
Powell, R. 1363
Powell, Richard 573, 576, 663
Poynting, J.H. 938
Poynting, John Henry 714
Pradl, O. 633
Prakash, A. 651
Prentis, J.J. 1101
Prentiss, M. 938
Preparata, G. 1372, 1529
Prestel, A. 952
Preston, Tolver 448
Preston-Thomas, H. 350
Pretto, Olinto De 408, 447, 633
Prevedelli, M. 936, 1381
Prewitt, O. 1107
Price, C.J. 947
Price, R.H. 96
Prigogine, Ilya 278, 311, 650, 1135
Primas, L.E. 639
Prince, G.E. 654
Pritchard, Carol 391
Pritchard, D.E. 637, 1104
Pritchard, David 443, 1039
Proença, Nuno 391
Prometheus 1359
Protagoras 919
Prout, William 1227
Provero, P. 1523
Pruppacher, H.R. 1381
Pryce, M.H.L. 637
Przybyl, S. 1380
Pslawinski 1163, 1391
Ptolemy 69
Purcell, E. 1379
Purves, William 391
Putkaradze, V. 352
Putkaradze, Vakhtang 310, 395
Putterman, E. 1379
Putterman, S.J. 337
Pythagoras 243, 832, 833, 1527
Pyykkö, P. 1365
Pádua, S. de 1101
Päsler, Max 345
Pérez-Mercader, J. 334
Pérez-Penichet, C. 352
Pérez-Rodriguez, L. 1367

Q

Quinlan, G.D. 343

R

Röngten, Conrad 1224
Raby, S. 1377
Radzikowski, M. 1220, 1373
Ragazzoni, R. 1525, 1526
Rahtz, Sebastian 391
Raimond, J.-M. 1109
Rainville, S. 637
Raizen, M.G. 1365
Raizen, Mark 1141
Rajaraman, R. 1378
Rakov, V.A. 942
Ramaccini, F. 949
Ramakrishna, S.A. 940
Ramanujan, Srinivasa 152
Ramberg 1060
Ramberg, E. 1105
Rambo, K.J. 942
Ramos, O. 352
Ramsey, N.F. 1524
Randi, James 29, 949, 950, 1378
Randjbar-Daemi, S. 1526
Ranfagni, A. 940, 941
Rankl, Wolfgang 391
Rao, S.M. 1365
Rao, S.R. Madhu 658
Rappmann, R. 947
Rasio, F.A. 645
Rassoul, H.K. 942
Rawdon, E. 1380
Rawlins, D. 341
Rawlinson, A.A. 637
Raymer, D.M. 1381
Raymer, M.G. 1522

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

R

RAYMER

Raymer, Michael 1401
Raymond Smullyan 845
Raymond, D.J. 638
Raymond, David 930
Raz, O. 1379
Readhead, A.C.S. 636
Reball, Siegfried 944
Rebka 501
Rebka, G.A. 642
Recami, E. 637
Recorde, R. 325
Recorde, Robert *324*
Rector, J.H. 945, 1365
Redondi, Pietro 39, 252, 391
Rees, W.G. 330
Refsdal, S. 649
Regan, B.C. 1524
Regge, Tullio 1265
Regiomontanus, J. 325
Řeháček, J. 1365
Reichert, Alfons 1169, 1391
Reichert, J. 936, 1381
Reichl, Linda 349, 351, 945, 1107
Reimers, D. 343
Reinhardt, Joseph 1232, 1391
Reissner, Hans 610
Remmert, R. 952
Rempe, G. 1104
Renaud, S. 1522, 1528
Renselle, Doug 391
Reppisch, Michael 391
Resnick, Robert 349
Revzen, M. 1368
Reynolds, Osborne 937
Reznik, B. 1523
Rhodes, C. 1370
Ricci-Cubastro, Gregorio *548*
Richard, J. 1104
Richards, P.G. 943
Richardson, Lewis Fray *58*
Richardson, Robert C. 1177
Richtmeyer, F.K. 331
Rickwood, P.C. 335
Ridgeway, S.L. 944
Rieder, Heinz 358, 395
Rieflin, E. 336
Rieger, E. 938
Rieke, F. 1100
Rieker Electronics 82, 393
Riemann, Bernhard *561*, *730*
Rigor, I.G. 945
Rikken, G.L.J.A. 1366
Rikken, Geert 945, 1175, 1366
Rimini, A. 1371
Rinaldo, A. 345
Rindler, W. 635, 636, 1106
Rindler, Wolfgang 634, 640, 641, 646, 935, 1528, 1529
Rindt, Jochen *40*
Rith, Klaus 1373
Ritter, Johann Wilhelm *727*
Ritz 633
Rivas, M. 941
Rivas, Martin 391
Rivera, A. 352
Robbins, J.M. 1106, 1531
Roberts, J.E. 1523
Roberts, M. 1369
Roberts, P.H. 935
Robertson, H.P. 580
Robertson, Will 392
Robinson 610
Robinson, D.C. 651
Robutel, P. 342
Rodgers, P. 944
Rodgers, Tony 32, 392
Rodin, Auguste 145
Rodrigues, W.A. 942
Rodríguez, L.F. 334, 637
Rogach, Andrey 1166, 1391
Roger, G. 1108
Rohrbach, Klaus 340
Rohrlich, F. 943
Roll, P.G. 343, 644
Romalis, M.V. 1526
Roman, T.A. 1219, 1373
Romanowicz, B. 935
Rømer, O.C. 632
Rømer, Ole C. *403*
Romer, R.H. 381
Roorda, A. 941
Roorda, Austin 763, 764, 971
Rosek, Mark 394
Rosen, N. 1108, 1523
Rosenblum, Michael 342
Rosenfeld 1013, 1438
Rosenfeld, L. 1102, 1526
Ross, S.B. 1524
Rossi, B. 636
Rosu, H. 1371
Rothbart, G.B. 634
Rothenstein, B. 635
Rothman, T. 650, 1526
Rottmann, K. 638
Roukema, B.F. 650
Rousset, Sylvie 395
Rovelli, C. 1521, 1523
Roy 1191
Roy, A. 1368
Royal Philips Electronics 1223
Rozental, I.L. 654
Rubbia, Carlo 1277
Ruben, Gary 391
Rubinstein, J. 942
Rubinsztein-Dunlop, H. 938
Rucker, Rudy 825, 826, 948, 952
Ruder, H. 653
Rudolff, C. 325
Rudolff, Christoff 353
Rueckner, W. 933
Rueckner, Wolfgang 676, 770, 970
Ruff, G.A. 1104
Ruffini 1211, 1212
Ruffini, R. 639, 642, 651, 652, 1371, 1372, 1529
Ruffini, Remo 353, 641, 1529
Ruga, Spurius Carvilius 320
Rugel, G. 648
Ruggieri, R. 941
Ruggiero, M.L. 638, 645
Ruhlen, Merritt 818
Ruina, A. 369
Ruiz-Morales, Y. 1367
Ruppel, W. 342, 641
Rusby, R.L. 350, 953
Rusby, Richard 953
Ruschewitz, F. 944
Russel, J.S. 346
Russell, Bertrand 455
Russell, Betrand 198
Russell, John Scott *240*
Russer, P. 940
Russo, Lucio 330
Rutherford 1235

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

R

RUTHERFORD

Rutherford, Ernest 30, *1225*, 1227, 1359
RWE 277, 394
Rybicki, G.R. 636
Rydberg, Johannes 1043
Régnier, Gilles 158, 394
Rüffer, U. 1379

S

S.R. Madhu Rao 391
Saa, A. 943
SABAM 274
Sabbadini, Roger 1124, 1390
Sackett, C.A. 1102, 1107
Sacks, Oliver 947
Sackur, Otto 1053
Sade, Donatien de 185, *1303*
Sagan, Carl 1526
Sagan, Hans 907
Sagnac, Georges 121
Sahl, Mort 870
Saitou, T. 1366
Sakar, S. 1525
Sakharov, A.D. 1524, 1529, 1530
Sakharov, Andrei 874, 1253, *1412*, 1468, 1469
Salam 1296
Salam, A. 1524
Salam, Abdus 1100
Salamo, G. 937
Salditt, T. 941
Sale, Jeff 1124, 1390
Salecker, H. 1514, 1522
Salingaros, N. 934
Sally, P. 952
Salman Salman 874
Salmonson, J.D. 1372
Samarski, Wassily 1360
Sami Kilani 874
Saminadayar, L. 1367
Samuel, S. 645
San Diego State University 1124, 1390
Sanchez, N.G. 1532
Sanctorius 95
Sander, C. 1377
Sands, Matthew 330, 647, 957, 1521
Sanger, Frederick 1177
Santander, M. 646
Santangelo, A. 643
Santini, P.M. 248, 347
Santorio Santorio 95
Saráeva, I.M. 330
Sarazin, X. 1373
Sasaki, N. 1367
Sassen, K. 938
Sastry, G.P. 636
Satake Ichiro 900
Sattler OHG, Erwin 394
Sattler-Rick, Stephanie 394
Sauer, J. 375
Sauerbruch, Ferdinand 386
Saupe, D. 307
Saupe, Dietmar 334
Saussure, Ferdinand de *817*
Savela, Markku 210, 394
Scagell, Robin 151, 394
Scarcelli, G. 634
Schadwinkel, H. 944
Schaefer, B.E. 633, 634, 1525
Schaerer, D. 1104
Scharein, Robert 1323, 1326, 1392
Scharlau, B. 944
Scharmann, Arthur 652
Scharnhorst, K. 1368
Schata, P. 947
Schedin, F. 1366
Scheer, Elke 941
Schelby, R.A. 939
Schellekens, M. 1105
Schiff, L.I. 934
Schild, A. 1524
Schiller, Britta 391, 392
Schiller, C. 348, 639, 934, 1521, 1527, 1528, 1530
Schiller, Christoph 214, 395, 639, 663, 971, 1114, 1392, 1537
Schiller, Friedrich 994
Schiller, Isabella 391
Schiller, P. 634, 1380
Schiller, Peter 391
Schiller, S. 633–635
Schiller, Stephan 391, 418, 419, 663
Schilthuizen, Menno 946
Schirotzek, Andre 1316, 1392
Schlegel, K. 942
Schleich, W.P. 1107
Schlichting, H.-J. 375
Schlichting, H.J. 944
Schlichting, Joachim 784, 971
Schmidt, Klaus T. 336
Schmidt, M. 1372
Schmidt, T. 352
Schmidt-Nielsen, K. 351
Schmiedmayer, J. 1104
Schneider, Jean 345
Schneider, M. 653
Schneider, P. 650
Schneider, Wolf 354
Schoeck, Helmut 951
Scholz, Christoph 1373
Schooley, J.F. 350
Schramm, Herbert 652
Schramm, T. 649
Schrieffer, J. Robert 1176
Schrieffer, J.R. 1368
Schroeder, Daniel 736, 970
Schrödinger 754, 851
Schrödinger, E. 1103
Schrödinger, Erwin 991, *1030*, 1149, 1490
Schubert, Max 1100
Schucking, E. 636, 649, 1103
Schulte 88
Schultz, Charles 1511
Schultz, S. 939
Schunck, N. 1373
Schurig, D. 940
Schuster, S.C. 1379
Schutz, B.F. 645
Schutz, Bernard 641
Schwab, A.L. 369
Schwab, Arend 369
Schwab, K. 1370
Schwartz, Richard 331
Schwartzenberg, Susan 722, 749, 970
Schwarz, J.H. 1522, 1531
Schwarzschild 501
Schwarzschild, Bertram 1369
Schwarzschild, Karl *506*
Schwenk, Jörg 1096
Schwenk, K. 352

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

S

SCHWENKEL

Schwenkel, D. 349
Schwinger, Julian *849*, 933, 1028, 1029, 1100
Schwob, C. 936
Schäfer, Andreas 1375
Schäfer, C. 950
Schäfer, G. 653
Schön, M. 1522, 1530
Schönenberger, C. 348, 934
Schörner, E. 375
Sciama, D.W. 650
Sciama, Dennis 602, 650
Science 130
Science Photo Library 86
Science/AAAS 393
Scime, E.E. 372
Scott, G.G. 933
Scott, Jonathan 391
Scott, W.T. 943
Scriven 268
Scriven, L.E. 349
Seaborg, Glenn 1360
Searle, Anthony 431
Seeger, A. 634, 1380
Seeger, J. 941
Segev 743
Segev, M. 937
Segev, Mordechai 937
Segrè, Gino 350
Seidenfaden, Eva 752, 971
Seidl, T. 1366
Seielstad, G.A. 636
Selig, Carl 633
Selmer 1166, 1391
Sen, A. 1532
Send, W. 1378
Send, Wolfgang 1378
Seneca, Lucius Annaeus 619
Serena, P.A. 1102
Settles, Gary 247
Sexl, R.U. 651
Sexl, Roman *61*, 624
Shabanov, G.D. 942, 943
Shabanov, Gennady 779
Shackleton, N.J. 340
Shakespeare, William 29, 1176, 1498, 1514
Shalyt-Margolin, A.E. 351, 1529
Shandro, Marc 1164, 1391
Shankland, R.S. 940
Shapere, A. 1379
Shapiro, A.H. 338
Shapiro, Arnold 1314
Shapiro, Asher 118
Shapiro, I.I. 646
Shapiro, Irwin I. 535
Sharkov, I. 1369
Sharp, Nigel 1042, 1114
Shaw, George Bernard 840, 1016
Shaw, R. 636
Shea, J.H. 641
Sheldon, E. 636
Sheldon, Eric 391
Shen, A.Q. 349
Shen, Amy 274, 275, 394
Sheng, Z. 349
Shephard, G.C. 346
Shepp, L. 1105
Sherman, Jeff 1168, 1391
Sherrill, B.M. 1382
Shih, M. 937
Shih, Y. 634
Shimony, A. 1109
Shinjo, K. 344
Shirham, King 37
Shockley, William 1177
Short, J. 953
Shulman, Polly 948
Shupe, M.A. 1524
Siart, Uwe 392
Siche, Dietmar 256, 394
Siegenthaler, U. 1366
Sierra, Bert 391
Sigwarth, J.B. 343
Silchenko, Artem 1311, 1392
Silk, J. 650
Sillett, S.C. 347
Silva 40
Silverman, M. 336
Silverman, M.P. 1104
Silverman, Mark 1050
Silverman, Mark P. 1104
Simon, C. 1106
Simon, Julia 391
Simon, M.D. 943, 944
Simon, M.I. 336
Simon, R.S. 636
Simoni, A. 1521
Simonson, A.J. 380
Simplicius 314, 1499
Simpson, A.A. 1363
Simpson, N.B. 938
Singh, C. 338
Singh, T.P. 652
Singhal, R.P. 1377
Singleton, D. 941
Singleton, Douglas 391
Sirlin, A. 1376
Sissa ben Dahir 37
Sitter, Willem de 539, 584
Sitti, M. 341
Sitti, Metin 140
Sivardière, Jean 935
Skrbek, L. 1367
Slabber, André 391
Slavnov, A.A. 1532
Sloterdijk, Peter 1248
Smale, A.P. 643
Smale, S. 1379
Smale, Stephen 1314
Smirnov, B.M. 942
Smith, D.E. 1381
Smith, D.R. 939, 940
Smith, David 939
Smith, George 354
Smith, J.B. 636
Smith, J.F. 1108
Smith, S.P. 938
Smith, Warren J. 942
Smolin, L. 1378, 1523, 1525, 1529
Smoluchowski, Marian von 287
Snider, J.L. 642
Snow 1060
Snow, G.A. 1105
Snyder, H. 651
Snyder, H.S. 1523
Snyder, Hartland 606
Socha, J.J. 1381
Socha, Jake 1330, 1390
Socrates 314, 1520
Soddy 1235
Soffel, M. 653
Soffer, B.H. 941

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

S

SOKOLOVSKII

Sokolovskii, B.Yu. 943
Soldner 533, 534
Soldner, J. 343, 643
Soldner, Johann 162, 512
Solomatin, Vitaliy 391
Solomon, R. 952
Sommerfeld, Arnold *754*, 939, 1045–1047, 1050
Son, D.T. 1530
Sonett, C.P. 339
Song, K.-Y. 939
Song, X.D. 943
Song, Y.S. 341
Sonoda, D.H. 650
Sonzogni, Alejandro 1391
Sorabji, R. 1524
Sorkin, R.D. 1521, 1524, 1531
Sossinsky, Alexei 1381
Sotolongo-Costa, O. 352
Soukoulis, C.M. 940
Sparenberg, Anja 945, 1366
Sparnaay, M.J. 1368
Sparnaay, Marcus 1191
Specker 1092
Specker, E.P. 1109
Speleoresearch & Films/La Venta 61, 393
Spence, J.C.H. 348
Spencer, R. 334, 1365, 1527
Spicer, G. 1379
Spiderman 272
Spieker, H. 940
Spinelli, Matthew 84, 393
Spinoza, B. 1530
Spinoza, Baruch 1530
Spiropulu, M. 342
Spitzer, Manfred 947
Sreedhar, V.V. 346
Sriramkumar 1194
Sriramkumar, L. 1369
Srygley, R.B. 1378
Srygley, Robert 1304, 1392
Stachel, John 640
Staff, National Research Council 942
Stairs, I.H. 645, 647
Stalla, Wolfgang 271
Starinets, A.O. 1530
Stark, Johannes *413*
Starr, A.F. 940
Stasiak, A. 1380
Stedman, G.E. 339, 635, 953
Stegeman, George 937
Steinberg, A.M. 939, 940, 1101
Steiner, Kurt 349
Steinhaus 966
Stengel, Ingrid 334
Stepanov, S. I. 942
Stepanov, S.I. 942
Stephenson, G. 638
Stephenson, G.J. 637
Stephenson, Richard 339
Stern, O. 1103
Stern, Otto *1025*
Sternlight, D.B. 341
Stettbacher, J.K. 946
Steur, P.P.M. 350
Stewart, I. 332, 948, 1380
Stewart, Ian 60, 949, 1523
Stewart, T. Dale 933
Stieber, Ralph 394
Stilwell, G.R. 633
Stocke, J.T. 651
Stodolsky, Leo 635
Stoehlker, Thomas 1369
Stokes, Georges Gabriel *262*
Stone, Michael 1378, 1532
Stoney, G.J. 652, 953
Stoney, George *681*
Stoney, George Johnston 914
Stong, C.L. 336
Stormer, H.L. 1367
Story, Don 391
Stowe, Timothy 1366
Strassmann, Fritz 1240
Strauch, F. 944
Strauch, S. 1375
Straumann, N. 649
Strohm, C. 1366
Stromberg, G. 648
Stromberg, Gustaf 574
Strominger, A. 1531
Strunk, William 354
Strunz, W.T. 1108
Styer, D. 939, 1108
Stöcker, J. 938
Su, B. 1367
Su, Y. 343, 644
Subitzky, Edward 1378
Suchocki, John 330
Sudarshan, E.C. 637
Sudarshan, E.C.G. 637, 1101
Sudarshan, George 1257, 1283
Sugamoto, A. 1379
Sugiyama, S. 337
Suhr, S.H. 341
Sullivan, J.M. 1381
Sullivan, John 1314, 1315, 1392
Sum, Robert 394
Sun, X.L. 943
Sundaram, B. 1365
Supplee, J.M. 636
Surdin, Vladimir 391, 941
Surry, D. 336
Susskind, L. 1527, 1530, 1532
Susskind, Leonard 1492
Sussman, G.J. 343
Suzuki, M. 1524
Svensmark, H. 648
Svozil, K. 1368
Swackhamer, G. 344
Swagten, Henk 945
Swatch Group 392
Swenson, C.A. 350
Swift, G. 351
Swinney, H.L. 352
Swope, Martha 352
Synge, J.L. 637
Szczepanski, Daniela 270, 394
Szczesny, Gerhard 950
Szilard, L. 351, 947, 1529
Szilard, Leo 290, 812, 813, 1470
Szuszkiewicz, E. 652

T

TÆrÆk, Gy. 1369
Tabor, D. 344
Tait, P.G. 325
Tajima, T. 1371
Takamoto, M. 953
Takita, A. 1369
Talleyrand 146
Tamm, Igor 1253
Tamman, Gustav 271
Tanaka, K. 1523
Tanaka, Y. 1367
Tangen, K. 647

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

T

TANIELIAN

Tanielian, M. 940
Tantalos 1357
Tarde, Gabriel *841*
Tarko, Vlad 391
Tarski, Alfred *60*, 251, 328, 949
Tartaglia, A. 645
Tartaglia, Niccolò *38*, 328
Tauber, G.E. 943
Taylor 1257
Taylor, B.N. 954, 1375
Taylor, E.F. 345
Taylor, G.J. 342
Taylor, J.H. 645, 646, 917
Taylor, Joseph 531, 645
Taylor, R.E. 1374
Taylor, W.R. 1381
Taylor, William 1327
Tegelaar, Paul 391
Tegmark, M. 646, 1107, 1109
Telegdi, V.L. 351
Teller, Edward 1241
Tennekes, Henk 392, 1378
Terence, in full Publius Terentius Afer 1119, *1487*
Terentius Afer, Publius *1119*, *1487*
Terletskii, Y.P. 939
Terpiłowski, K. 1366
TERRA 140
Terrell, J. 636
Tesla, Nikola *694*
Tetrode, Hugo 1053
Tetzlaff, Tim 393
Thaler, Jon 391
Thales of Miletus 669
Theodoricus Teutonicus de Vriberg 748
Thidé, Bo 710
Thierry, Paul 873
Thies, Ingo 391
Thinktank Trust 97, 393
Thirring, H. 644
Thirring, Hans 520
Thistlethwaite, M. 1380
Thober, D.S. 942
Thomas Aquinas 252, 828, 1535
Thomas, A.L.R. 1378
Thomas, Adrian 1304, 1392
Thomas, L. 1103
Thomas, Llewellyn 438
Thompson, C. 648
Thompson, Dave 392
Thompson, J.K. 637
Thompson, R.C. 637
Thomson 102
Thomson (Kelvin), William *281*, *672*
Thomson, Joseph John 682
Thomson, W. 349
Thomson-Kelvin 274
Thor 1361
Thorndike, E.M. 633
Thorne, K. 1528
Thorne, K.S. 645, 1106, 1521
Thorne, Kip 638
Thoroddsen, S.T. 349
Thoroddsen, Sigurdur 274, 394
Thurston, William 900
Thurston, William P. 1315
Thévenaz, L. 939
Tian, L. 1109
Tillich, Paul 1425
Tino, G. 1106
Tino, G.M. 1531
Tisserand, F. 644
Titius, Johann Daniel 174
Tittel, Wolfgang 1101
Tollett, J.J. 1102
Tolman, R.C. 637
Tolman, Richard 651
Tomonaga 849, 1257
Tonomura Akira 1020, 1114
Tonzig, Giovanni 330
Topper, D. 341
Torge, Wolfgang 335
Torre 552
Torre, C.G. 646
Torrence, R. 651
Torricelli, Evangelista *858*
Toschek, P.E. 348, 944
Tournay, Michel 752, 971
Townsend, P.K. 1522, 1528
Townsend, Paul 391
Tozaki, K.-I. 1366
Tozer, Jason 1119, 1390
Tracer 40
Travis, J. 935
Treder, H.-J. 1526
Trefethen, L.M. 339
Tregubovich, A.Ya. 351, 1529
Treille, D. 1377
Tretter, Felix 1365
Trevorrow, Andrew 391
Trout, Kilgore 597
Trower, W.P. 933
Truesdell, C. 349
Truesdell, Clifford 39
Tsagas, C.G. 943
Tsai, W.Y. 933
Tsang, W.W. 344
Tschichold, J. 354
Tschichold, Jan 1364
Tsuboi, Chuji 335
Tsubota, M. 1367
Tsui, D.C. 1367
Tsukanov, Alexander 30, 392
Tu, L.-C. 935
Tucholski, Kurt 211
Tuckermann, R. 943
Tuinstra, F. 632
Tuominen, M.T. 1102
Tuppen, Lawrence 391
Turatto, M. 1525
Turchette, Q.A. 1107
Turnbull, D. 1529
Turner, M.S. 340, 650
Twain, Mark 108, 840, 850, 869
Twamley, J. 1106
Twiss, R.Q. 1100
Twiss, Richard 1003
Tyler, John 976, 1114
Tyler, R.H. 935

U

Ucke, C. 375, 961
Udem, T. 1381
Udem, Th. 936
Ueberholz, B. 944
Uffink, J. 351, 1529
Uffink, Jos 1530
Uglum, J. 1530
Uguzzoni, Arnaldo 391
Uhlenbeck, G.E. 1103
Uhleneck, George 1035
Ulam, Stanislaw 302

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

U

ULFBECK

Ulfbeck, Ole 526
ultimate wheel 30, 392
Uman, M.A. 942
Umbanhowar, P.B. 352
Umbanhowar, Paul 304, 305, 395
Universität Augsburg 259
Unruh, W.G. 642, 1371, 1523, 1524
Unruh, William 499, 1207, 1208
Unwin, S.C. 636
Upright, Craig 391
Uranus 1361
Urban, F.R. 1529
Urban, M. 1373
Ursin, R. 1101
Ustinov, Peter 717

V

Vafa, C. 1531
Vaiyaboon, Oat 669, 970
Valanju, A.P. 939
Valanju, P.M. 939
Valencia, A. 634
Valentin, Karl 1135, 1152
Valenzuela, A. 938
Valsiner, Jaan 946
Valsinger, Jaan 946
van der Meer, Simon 1277
Vanadis 1361
Vancea, I.V. 1527
Vandewalle, N. 349
Vanier, J. 952
Vannoni, Paul 391
Vardi, Ilan 1105
Vareschi, G. 383
Varoquaux, E. 1370
Vassen, W. 1105
Vavilov 994
Vavilov, S.I. 1100
Veevaert, John 1390
Vega, H.J. de 1522
Veneziano, G. 1522, 1523
Vergilius 866
Vergilius, Publius 518
Vermeil 542
Vermeil, H. 646
Vermeulen, R. 651
Verne, Jules 380, 750
Verneuil, Auguste *1155*, 1173
Vernier, Pierre *66*
Veselago, V.G. 939
Veselago, Victor 755
Vessot, R.F.C 502
Vessot, R.F.C. 642
Vico, Giambattista 1093
Vigotsky, Lev 807, 946
Villain, J. 1370
Vincent, D.E. 341
Visser, Matt 1371
Viswanath, R.N. 945
Vitali, Giuseppe 58
Viviani, Vincenzo 119
Viñuda, J. 1367
Voigt, Woldemar *421*
Voit, A. 938
Voith 275
Volin, Leo 391
Vollmer, G. 948
Vollmer, M. 350, 938
Vollmer, Michael 279, 395
Volovik, G.E. 1367
Volta, Alessandro *696*
Voltaire 175, *200*, 863, 873, 919, 933, 951, 1334, 1527
Vorobieff, P. 352
Vos-Andreae, J. 1102
Voss, Gustav-Adolf 1265
Voss, Herbert 391
Voss, R.F. 1108
Vries, de 241
Vuorinen, R.T. 953
Völz, Horst 953

W

Wagon, Stan 60, 335
Wald, George 292
Wald, R.M. 652, 1220, 1371, 1373, 1524
Wald, Robert 1208
Waldhauser, F. 943
Waleffe, F. 352
Walgraef, Daniel 352
Walker, A.G. 580
Walker, Gabriele 648, 1363
Walker, J. 349, 938
Walker, Jearl 268, 331, 349
Walker, R.C. 636
Wallin, I. 633
Wallis, J. 325
Wallner, A. 648
Walser, R.M. 939
Walter, H. 944
Walter, Henrik 344
Walther, P. 1101
Walton 1273
Wambsganss, J. 649
Wang Juntao 874
Wang, L.J. 939
Wang, Y. 646
Wang, Z.J. 1378
Warkentin, John 392
Waser, A. 952
Washizu, M. 944
Watson, A.A. 654
Wearden, John 1364
Webb, R.A. 1108
Weber, G. 1531
Weber, Gerhard 1100
Weber, R.L. 352
Weber, T. 1371
Webster, Hutton 354
Wedin, H. 352
Weekes, T.C. 1373
Weeks, J. 1380
Wegener, Alfred 126, 340
Wehinger, S. 1104
Wehner, R. 341, 936
Weierstall, U. 348
Weierstrass, K. 325
Weijmar Schultz, Willibrord 1225
Weijmar Schultz, W.C.M. 1373
Weil, André 325
Weiland, Thomas 724, 970
Weill, Frederic 1392
Weinberg, Steven 641, 649, 1101, 1372, 1373, 1437, 1521, 1522, 1525
Weinrebe, Gerhard 744, 971
Weis, A. 1524
Weisberg, J.M. 645
Weiskopf, Daniel 431, 433, 663
Weiss, M. 336
Weiss, Martha 391
Weisskopf, V.F. 1366, 1374

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

W

WEISSKOPF

Weisskopf, Victor *872*, *1133*
Weissmüller, J. 945
Weitz, M. 936, 1381
Weitz, Martin 1370
Weizenbaum, Joseph 815
Weizmann, Chaim 520
Weller, Roger 729, 971
Wells, M. 344
Weltner, K. 348
Weninger, K. 945
Weninger, K.R. 337
Wernecke, M.E. 1363
Werner, S.A. 1370
Wertheim, Margaret 1527, 1532
Wess, Julius 1377
Wesson, John 1374
Wesson, Paul 586, 649
West, G.B. 345
Westbrook, C.I. 1105
Westerweel, J. 352
Westphal, V. 941
Westra, M.T. 660
Weyand, P.G. 341
Weyl, Hermann 52, 1064
Wheatstone, Charles 682
Wheeler 610
Wheeler, J.A. 642, 1106, 1109, 1521, 1528
Wheeler, John 355, 621, 652, 1219
Wheeler, John Archibald *604*
Whewell, William 700
White, E.B. 354
White, M. 340, 650
Whitehead, Alfred North 853
Whitney, A.R. 636
Whitney, C.A. 83
Widmer-Schnidrig, R. 346
Widom, A. 1103
Wiechert, Johann Emil 682
Wieman, Carl 1178
Wiemann, C.E. 1376
Wien, Wilhelm *769*
Wienerroither, Peter 356, 395
Wiens, R. 1373
Wierda, Gerben 391
Wierzbicka, Anna 334, 391, 819, 838, 948
Wiesner, Steve 1061
Wigner, E. 1106
Wigner, E.P. 935, 1522
Wigner, Eugene 832, 949, *1063*, 1514
Wigner, Eugene P. 1100
Wijk, Mike van 391
Wijngarden, R.J. 945, 1365
Wikell, Gˆran 949
Wilczek, F. 1375, 1379, 1533
Wilczek, Frank 1269, 1270
Wilde, Oscar 808, 855, 1131, 1427
Wilder, J.W. 372
Wiley VCH 1151, 1390
Wiley, Jack 349
Wilk, Harry 335
Wilk, S.R. 941
Wilkie, Bernard 337
Wilkinson, S.R. 1365
Will, C. 633, 640, 643
Will, C.M. 639, 645, 653
William of Occam 1501
Williams, D.R. 941
Williams, David 763
Williams, G.E. 339
Williams, H.H. 1376
Williams, R. 642
Wilson, B. 347
Wilson, Charles 1225
Wilson, J.R. 1372
Wilson, Robert 575
Wiltschko, R. 934
Wiltschko, W. 934
Wineland, D.J. 944, 1107, 1365
Winterberg, F. 1530
Wirtz, C. 648
Wirtz, Carl 574
Wisdom, J. 343, 1379
Wisdom, Jack 1313
Wise, N.W. 921
Witte, H. 940
Witteborn, F.C. 934
Witten, E. 1522, 1532
Witten, Ed 1510
Witten, Edward 1329, 1516
Wittgenstein, Ludwig 13, 23, 31, 33, 51, 83, 133, 186, 293, 317, 804, 817, 822, 832, 833, 836, 837, 846, 852, 854, 866, 950
Wittke, James P. 1103
Wittlinger, M. 341
Wittlinger, Matthias 141
Wodsworth, B. 1373
Woerdman, J.P. 1103
Woit, Peter 1533
Wolf, C. 1524
Wolf, E. 1530
Wolf, Emil 937
Wolf, G.H. 348
Wolf, H. 341
Wolf, R. 961
Wolfendale, A.W. 941
Wolfenstätter, Klaus-Dieter 1096
Wolfsried, Stephan 61, 393, 1155, 1157, 1164, 1166, 1390
Wollaston, William 1041
Wolpert, Lewis 332
Wolsky, A.M. 1104
Wong, M. 336
Wong, S. 939
Wood, B. 947
Wood, C.S. 1376
Woods, P.M. 648
Wootters 1061
Wootters, W.K. 1106
World High Diving Federation 1311, 1392
Wouthuysen, S.A. 1036, 1103
Wright, B. 942
Wright, E.M. 952
Wright, Joseph 392
Wright, K. 1365
Wright, S. 341
Wright, Steven 631
Wrinkle, N.C. 1381
Wu Chien-Shiung *1277*, 1278
Wu, C. 944
Wu, T.T. 935
Wulfila 322
Wussing, H. 1527, 1530
Wyder, P. 1366
Wynands, R. 944
Würschum, R. 945

X

Xavier, A.L. 942

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Xu Liangying 874
Xue, S.-S. 1372, 1529

Y
Yamafuji, K. 349
Yamaguchi University 311, 395
Yamamoto, H. 1369
Yamamoto, Y. 1101
Yamane, T. 938
Yang Chen Ning 1277
Yang, C.N. 935
Yang, J. 935
Yao, E. 1103
Yazdani, A. 941, 1104
Yearian, M.R. 635
Young, A.T. 938
Young, Andrew 391, 750, 936, 938, 971, 995, 1114
Young, Thomas 100, *726*
Yourgray, Wolfgang 345
Yu, Kristina 1124, 1390
Yukawa Hideki 328, *1257*

Z
Zabusky, N.J. 346
Zabusky, Norman 242
Zaccone, Rick 392
Zaitsev, A. 1376
Zakharian, A. 339
Zalm, Peer 391
Zanker, J. 333
Zbinden, H. 1101
Zedler, M. 940
Zedler, Michael 391
Zee, A. 1379
Zeeman, Pieter 418
Zeh, H.D. 1107, 1525
Zeh, Hans Dieter 1075, 1107
Zeiger, Stefan 728, 971
Zeilinger, A. 953, 1101, 1102, 1108
Zeitler, U. 1367
Zel'dovich, Ya.B. 1376
Zeller, Eduard 950
Zeno of Elea 22, 24, 67, 80, 1140, 1142, 1406, 1486, 1491, 1494, 1495, 1499
Zensus, J.A. 636
Zermelo, Ernst *823*
Zernike, Frits 766
Zetsche, Frank 1373
Zeus 565
Zhang 517
Zhang, J. 943
Zhang, W. 643
Zhang, Y. 1367
Zhao, C. 953, 1528
Zheng, Q. 348
Zhou, H. 1380
Zhu XiaoJin 752, 971
Ziegler, G.M. 60
Zimmer, P. 945
Zimmerman, E.J. 1364, 1514, 1522
Zimmermann, H.W. 351
Zimmermann, Herbert 291
Zuckerman, G. 952
Zurek 1061
Zurek, W.H. 947, 1105, 1106
Zurek, Wojciech 813
Zuse, Konrad 1091
Zwaxh, W. 1366
Zweck, Josef 338, 944
Zweig, G. 1374
Zweig, George *1257*
Zwerger, W. 1108
Zwicky, F. 649
Zwicky, Fritz 595
Zwiebach, B. 1532
Zybin, K.P. 942
Zürn, W. 346

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009



SUBJECT INDEX

Page numbers in *italic* typeface refer to pages where the keyword is defined or presented in detail. The subject index thus acts as a glossary.

Symbols

(325
) 325
*-algebra *890*
+ 325
− 325
· 325
× 325
: 325
< 325
= 325
> 325
EPR experiments 1062
∅ 325
≠ 325
$\sqrt{\ }$ 325
@ (at sign) 326
Δ 325
∞ 325
∇ 325
4-acceleration *450*
4-coordinates 422, *448*, *449*
4-force *716*
4-jerk *451*
4-momentum *451*
4-vector *450*
4-velocity *449*

A

α-rays *401*
a (year) *46*, *579*
a posteriori 822
a priori 822
a priori concepts 807
abacus *324*
Abelian, or commutative *213*
aberration *116*, 128, *403*, 431
aberrations *740*
abjad *323*
absolute value *877*
absorption 790
abstraction 827
abugida *323*
Academia del Cimento 74
acausal *424*, *1082*
acausality *187*
accelerating frames *460*
acceleration *80*, 635
acceleration composition theorem 463
acceleration, limit to 1477
acceleration, maximum 1021
acceleration, proper *450*, 459
acceleration, quantum limit 1022
acceleration, relativistic behaviour 459
acceleration, tidal *160*
acceleration, uniform *461*
accelerations, highest 88
accelerator mass spectroscopy 1245
accelerometer 357
accents, in Greek language *322*
accretion *616*
accretion discs *568*
accumulability *677*
accumulation 277
accuracy *315*, *920*
accuracy, maximal 1429
aces *1257*
Acetabularia 50
Acinonyx jubatus 41
Ackermann steering 363
acne 1129
acoustical thermometry 350
acoustoelectric effect 787
acoustomagnetic effect 788
acoustooptic effect 792
actin 1125
actinium 1353
actinoids 1352
action *196*, *216*, 1333
action, EBK 1046
action, limit to 1475
action, physical *194*
action, principle of least 151
action, quantum of *290*
actuators 182
adaptive optics 763
addition *213*, *875*
additivity 42, 48, 54, 97, 677, 679, 689
additivity of area and volume *59*
adenosine triphosphate 337, 1125
adjoint representation *892*
ADM mass *559*, *1438*
adventures, future 799
Aeneid 866
aerodynamics 1305
aeroplane, model 1303
aeroplanes 94
aerostat *267*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

A

AETHER

aether *757*, 844, 940
aether and general relativity 481, 506
aether models *940*
affine Lie algebra *894*
AFM, atomic force microscope 259
Africa collides with Europe 800
AgBr 790
AgCl *727*, 791
age *584*
age of universe 447, *1426*
ageing *987*
aggregates of matter *202*
AgI 790
agoraphobics *582*
Aharonov-Bohm *1034*
air *386*, 592, *787*
air cannot fill universe 588
air pressure 99
airbag sensors 683
Airbus 358
airflow instruments *236*
Al 788
albedo *744*
Albert Einstein, teenager *737*
alchemy 39
Aldebaran 83, 205, 594
Alectoris rufa 1367
aleph 322
alexandrite *1156*
AlGaAs laser 1182
algebra *888*, *889*, 889
algebra, alternative *884*
algebra, associated affine *894*
algebra, linear *889*
algebraic structure *827*
algebraic surfaces 931
algebraic system *827*
Alice in Wonderland *291*
alkali metals 1352
Allen belt, van 1245
Allen, Woody 811
allometric scaling *42*
Alluvium 579
Alnilam 594
Alnitak 594
Alpha Centauri 205
alpha decay 574
alpha ray dating 1245
alphabet *321*
alphabet, Greek *321*
alphabet, Hebrew *323*
alphabet, Latin *319*
alphabet, phonemic *323*
alphabet, story of 320
alphabets, syllabic 323
alphasyllabaries 323
Alps 150, 173
Altair 205, 594
aluminium 933, 1353
aluminium amalgam 1152
amalgam 1357
Amazon 126
Amazon River 243, 270
amber *669*
americium 1353
aminoacids 791
amoeba 1310
ampere *909*
amplitude *228*, *723*
Ampullae of Lorenzini *676*, *683*
Ampère's 'law' *690*
Anagrus 1307
analemma 170
anapole moment *1376*
AND gate, logical 813
andalusite 791
Andromeda nebula 564, 574
angel, are you one? 845
angels 27, 90, 828, 1069, 1335
angle 105
angle, plane *67*
angle, solid *68*
angler fish *1180*
angular acceleration 105
angular frequency *723*
angular momentum *103*, 105, 135, 688, 747, 1071, 1333
angular momentum as a tensor 454
angular momentum conservation 151
angular momentum of light 747
angular momentum, extrinsic *105*, *106*
angular momentum, indeterminacy relation 1024
angular momentum, intrinsic *105*
angular momentum, limit to 1475
angular velocity *102*, 105
anharmonicity 240
anholonomic constraints *199*
animism 808
annihilation 589, 787
annihilation operator *1060*
anode 700
anomalies 1515
Antares 83, 205
antenna, simplest 737
anthropic principle *868*, *1452*
anti-atoms *1350*
anti-bubbles 270
anti-bunching *1004*
anti-gravity devices 786
anti-Hermitean *215*
Anti-Raman scattering *1015*
anti-theft stickers 788
anti-unitary *215*
anticommutator bracket *1060*
antigravity *157*, *164*
antigravity device 164
antigravity device, patent for 514
antihydrogen 1349
antiknot *1324*
antimatter 97, *446*, *558*, 589
antimony 1353
Antiqua *322*
antiscreening *1269*
antisymmetry 215, 891
anyons *1073*, 1073
apes 1251, 1452
apex angle 364
aphelion *925*
Aphistogoniulus erythrocephalus 86
Apis mellifera 96
apogee 925
Apollo 378, 539, 655, 741
apparatus, classical *1094*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

A

APPARATUS

apparatus, irreversible 1094
apple as battery 696
apple trees 919
apple, standard 919
apples 90, 519, 841, 1441
Aquarius 170
aqueducts 263
Ar 787
Arabic numbers *323*
Arabidopsis 50
arc lamp 1163
Archaeozoicum 578
archean *578*
Archilochus colubris 1305
arcs *674*
Arcturus 205
argon 386, 1237, 1353
argon lamp 1163
argument *826*
Aries 170
Aristotelian view *180*
Aristotle 376
arithmetic sequence *356*
arm 881, *1066*
Armillaria mellea 1180
Armillaria ostoyae 55, 96
arms, human 601
arrow 1495
arrow of time 52
arsenic 1353
artefact 86, 864, 910
ash *320*
Ashtekar variables 629
aspects of nature *807*
asphaltenes *1170*
associative algebra *889*
associativity *213*
astatine 1353
asteroid 169
asteroid hitting the Earth 800
asteroid, Trojan 157
asteroids 171, 205
Astrid, an atom 348
astrology 152, 170, 1336
astronomers, smallest known 154
astronomical unit 174
astronomy 881
astronomy picture of the day 931
astrophysics 928
asymptotic freedom *1269*
asymptotically free *1301*
at-sign *326*
athletics 141
atmosphere of the Moon 299
atom 116 1349
atom formation 577
atom rotation 1039
atomic *917*
atomic clock 49
atomic force microscope 259, 372
atomic force microscopes 184
atomic mass unit *1292*
atomic number 1351
atomic radius *1362*
Atomium *274*
atoms 14, *258*, 976
atoms and swimming 1307
atoms are not indivisible *295*
atoms are rare 1234
atoms, hollow 1199
atoms, manipulating single 259
atoms, matter is not made of 1234
ATP 99, 337, 1125, 1349
ATP consumption of molecular motors 1122
ATP synthase 1122
atto 911
Atwood machine 376
Au 788
Auger effect 792
augmented fourth *236*
aureole *760*
aurora 1163
aurora australis *1234*
aurora borealis *1234*
aurora, artificial 1245
aurum 1355
austenitic steels *273*
autism *807*, 946
autistics 807, 946
average *200*, 852, *1079*, *1419*
average curvature *548*
Avogadro's number *252*, 268, 922
awe 865, 1346
axiom of choice *823*, 823
axioms *876*
axioms of set theory 823
axioms, ZFC of set theory 823
axis of the Earth, motion of 124
axis, Earth's 128
axle, impossibility in living beings *368*
azimuthal quantum number 1045
azoicum *578*

B

β-rays *401*
β decay 1275
B1938+666 595
Babylonia 326
Babylonians 174
background *32*, *33*, 52, *423*
background radiation *575*, 579, *585*, 589
bacteria 86, 1129, 1137
bacterium 103
bacterium lifetime 1127
badminton 1171
badminton serve, record 41
badminton smashes 361
bags as antigravity devices 786
bags, plastic 660
Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula 907
Balaenoptera musculus 96
ball lightning *778*
balloons 286
baloon rope puzzle 267
Banach measure *59*
Banach–Tarski paradox or theorem *60*, 251, 1199, 1406, 1407, 1449
banana catching 107
bananas, knotted 1329
BaO_2 787
barber paradox 834
barium 1353
Barlow's wheel 700

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

B

BARNETT

Barnett effect *687*
barometer light 787
barycentre 171
barycentric coordinate time 643
barycentric dynamical time *516*
baryon number *1240*
baryon number density 924
baryon table 1351
baryons *1259*
base units *909*
basic units *879*
Basiliscus basiliscus 139, 140
basilisk *139*
basis *888*, *891*
bath, physical *812*, *1076*
bath-tub vortex 338
bathroom scale 134
bathroom scales 272
bathtub vortex 118
$BaTiO_3$ 789
bats 1133
battery *696*
BCE *327*
BCH formula 907
BCS theory 1368
beam, tractor 758
beans 1339
bear puzzle 63
bear, colour of 63
Beaufort 41
beauty 25, *302*, 306, *1292*
beauty quark *1259*
beauty, origin of 302
becquerel 911
beer 270, 792, 1184
beer mat 64
Beetle 542
beetle, click 139
before the Common Era *327*
beginning of the universe 574
beginning of time 574, *1427*
behaviour 28
beings, living *1119*
Bekenstein's entropy bound *1480*
Bekenstein-Hawking temperature 1210
Belgium 742
belief systems 90
beliefs 29, *841*, 1345
beliefs and Ockham 1501
beliefs in physical concepts 837
bell 1068
Bell's equation *1092*
Bell's inequality 1092
Bellatrix 594
Belousov-Zhabotinski reaction *311*
belt 881
belt trick 881, *1066*
belts and spin 1508
Bennett–Brassard protocol 1062
BeppoSAX satellite 1211
berkelium 1353
Bernoulli equation *260*, 269
Bernoulli's equation *260*
beryllium 1353
Bessel functions *128*
Betelgeuse 83, 84, 205, 594, 801
beth 322
bets, how to win 121
Bi 788, 789
bible 845, *851*
bicycle *369*
bicycle riding 90
bicycle weight 286
big bang 585, 589, 590
big bang was not a singularity 493
big brother 826
billiards 93, 440
bimorphs 182
binary pulsars 516, 538
biographies of mathematicians 931
biological evolution *28*, 302
biology *182*, 1290
bioluminescence 791, 1165
biphoton *1005*
BIPM 851, 909, 910
bird appearance 579
bird speed 41
birds 14, 695, 730, 1251
birefringence *728*, 791
BiSb 789
BiSeTe 787
bismuth 46, 1349, 1353, 1381
$Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_x$ 1175
bitartrate 1153
Bi_2Te_3 787
bits *811*
bits to entropy conversion 923
black body *793*
black body radiation *793*, 793
black body radiation constant *793*, *1210*
black hole 481, 533, 593, *606*, *642*, *1400*
black hole collisions 617
black hole entropy 1504
black hole halo 615
black hole radiation 650
black hole, entropy of 612
black hole, extremal *610*
black hole, Kerr *610*
black hole, primordial *616*
black hole, rotating 610
black hole, Schwarzschild *610*
black hole, stellar 616
black holes 187, 472, *507*, 641, 1345
black holes do not exist 613
black paint 586
black vortex 611
black-body radiation *592*
black-hole temperature 1210
blackness 790
blasphemies 863, 1016
blasphemy 115
blinks 829
block and tackle 37
blood colour 1165
blood pressure 265
blood supply 85
blue 734
blue colour of the sea 1050
blue shift 413
blue whale nerve cell 1350
BN 1175
board divers 107
boat 98, 403
Bode's rule 174

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

B

BODIES

bodies, rigid 191, 1196
body *32*
body fluids 264
body, rigid 468
body, solid 468
Bohr radius 923, *1045*
bohrium 1353
Boltzmann constant 286, *287*, 290, 294, 438, 921, *1079*, 1470
Boltzmann's constant *768*
bomb 442
bombs 1212
Bombus terrestris 1304
bone, human 794
bones, seeing own 1244
book and physics paradox 316
books *319*, 1176
books, information and entropy in 290
boost 221, *422*, *477*, 477
boosts, concatenation of 438
boredom as sign of truth 843
boring physics 820
boron 1353
Bose–Einsein condensation 1333
Bose–Einstein condensate 1017, 1104, 1171, 1178
Bose–Einstein condensates 1481
bosonization 1509
bosons 1011, *1056*, *1060*
bottle 98, 112
bottle, full 192
bottom quark *1259*, 1260, 1292
bottomness *1292*
boundaries *89*
boundary conditions *715*
boundary layer 381
boundary of space-time *1435*
box tightness 1171
boxes 468
boxes, limits to 1491
brachistochrone *190*, *382*
bradyons *445*
Bragg reflection 792
braid *1326*
braid pattern 311
braid symmetry *1507*
brain 298, 782, 804, 829, 1033, 1134
brain and Moon 868
brain and physics paradox 316
brain size of whales 1134
brain stem 31
brain's energy consumption 815
brain's interval timer *1135*
brain, best book about 934
brain, clock in 1135
branching ratios *1265*
Brans–Dicke 'theory' 556
brass instruments *236*
bread 252, 359
breaking *987*
breathings *322*
breaths 829
bremsstrahlung 791
brick tower, infinitely high 485
bright-field microscopy *766*
brightness 916
brilliant 828
bromine 1164, 1354
brooms 165, 383
brown dwarfs 205, 570, *594*, 594
Brownian motion 288
Brownian motors *1125*
browser 928
brute force approach 483
bubble chamber 1226
bubbles 268
bucket 25
bucket experiment, Newton's 133, 601
bulge 1059
bullet speed 41
bullet speed measurement 62
bumblebee 1304
Bunsen burner 280
Bureau International des Poids et Mesures 909
Burgers vector *1321*
bus, best seat in 434
buses 500
bushbabies 139
butterfly 1303
butterfly effect *308*
button, future 292
byte *814*

C

C violation 1279
C*-algebra 890
c. *327*
C14 dating 945
Cabibbo angle *1281*
Cabibbo–Kobayashi–Maskawa mixing matrix 1283
cable, eliminating power 697
$CaCO_3$ 728
cadmium 1354
Caenozoicum 579
caesium 46, 1354
caesium and parity non-conservation 1279
CaF_2 791
calcite 728, *729*, 791
calcium 1354
calculating prodigies 324
calculus of variations *199*
calendar 326, 327
calendar, modern *327*
californium 1354
caliper 56, 66
Callisto 168
calorie *919*
Calpodes ethlius 76
Cambrian 578
camera 67
camera, holy 941
Canary islands 800
Cancer 170
candela *909*
candle 37, 299, 779, 916, 1179
candle colour 1163
canoeing 140
Canopus 205, 594
cans of beans 1339
cans of peas 137
cans of ravioli 137
capacitor 696, 796
Capella 205
Capricornus 170

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

C

CAPTURE

capture of light 609
capture, gravitational 608
capture, in universal gravity 171
car parking 66
car theft 1033
car weight 286
carbohydrates, radicals in 1327
carbon 1349, 1354
Carboniferous 578
cardinality *825*
cardinals *885*
cardinals, inaccessible *825*
carriage, south-pointing 191, 345
cars 315
cars on highways 1020
cars, polarizers in 758
Cartan algebra *893*
Cartan metric tensor *892*
Cartan superalgebra 893
Cartesian *54*
Cartesian product *824*
cartoon physics, 'laws' of 89
Casimir effect 792, *1190*, 1333, 1397
Casimir effect, dynamical *1194*
cat 98, 760
Cat's-eye, lunar 539
cat, falling 1310
Cataglyphis fortis 141
catastrophes 799
catechism, catholic 1535
categories 1440
category *821*, *827*
catenary *364*
caterpillars 76
Cathartes aura 1305
cathode 700
cathode rays *401*, *681*
cats 1132
causal 187
causal connection 424
causality 1091
causality and maximum speed 424
causality of motion 187
cause and effect 424, 870
cavitation *88*
cavity resonance *248*
Cayley algebra *884*
Cayley numbers 884
Cd 788
CdS 787, 792
CeB_6 788
CeF_3 789
celestrocentric system 359
cell 1350
cell motility 1122
cell, primary *696*
cell, secondary *696*
cell, voltaic *696*
cells 828
Celsius temperature scale 278
Celtic wiggle stone *136*
cement kiln 368
cementite 273
cenozoic *579*
censorship, cosmic 493
centi 911
centre *891*
centre of gravity 169
centre of mass *105*, 169, *446*
centre, quaternion *882*
centrifugal acceleration 135, 145
centrifugal effect 614
centrifugal force 150
Cepheids *1256*
cerebrospinal fluid *264*
Čerenkov effect 791
Cerenkov radiation 1172
Čerenkov radiation 410, 540
Ceres 171
cerium 1354
CERN 633, 635, 915, 1231, 1277, 1285, 1299
cerussite 61
Cetus *170*
chain 69
chair as time machine 427
chalkogens *1352*
challenge classification *11*
challenge level *11*
challenge, toughest of science 720
challenges 12, 13, 23–26, 30–32, 34, 36–42, 46–49, 52, 53, 55, 57–72, 74–81, 83–91, 93–102, 104–114, 117–122, 128, 131–139, 141, 142, 144–146, 148, 149, 151–157, 159, 160, 162–178, 180, 181, 183–192, 195, 197–203, 206–209, 211–215, 217–220, 223, 224, 226, 228, 229, 231–234, 238, 239, 243–251, 255, 258, 262, 264–272, 274, 278, 281, 283–293, 295–303, 307–311, 315–318, 333, 401, 403–407, 410–412, 414–418, 420–425, 427–431, 433–436, 439–448, 450–458, 460–471, 476, 481, 482, 486, 488, 490, 491, 494–496, 498–503, 505–515, 517–519, 521, 524, 525, 527, 528, 530, 531, 533–538, 540–547, 549–552, 554, 555, 557–563, 565, 566, 568, 572, 574, 575, 580–582, 584–588, 591, 593, 595, 597, 599–603, 605–621, 624, 627, 630, 631, 650, 669, 670, 674, 677–680, 682–684, 688–693, 695–705, 707–719, 721–723, 726, 727, 729–731, 735, 737–742, 744–749, 751, 753–756, 758, 760, 762–765, 768–771, 773–775, 777, 780–783, 785, 786, 790, 792–796, 804–806, 810–814, 819–821, 823–828, 831, 832, 834, 835, 845–848, 853, 855–859, 861, 862, 867, 868, 875, 877–883, 885–891, 894–897, 899, 901, 908, 911–914, 916, 918–921, 923, 924, 926, 935, 953, 954, 976, 977, 979, 980, 982, 984, 985, 987, 988, 992, 993, 997–1001, 1003, 1006, 1007, 1010, 1012–1014, 1016–1018, 1021, 1022, 1026, 1032, 1033, 1035, 1038–1040, 1044–1046, 1051–1053, 1055–1057, 1059, 1061, 1062, 1066–1073, 1076, 1077,

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

C

CHANDELIER

1079, 1082, 1084–1086, 1090, 1092–1095, 1119, 1120, 1122, 1126, 1127, 1129, 1130, 1133, 1136, 1137, 1139, 1142, 1143, 1148, 1150–1152, 1154, 1160, 1170–1174, 1184, 1187, 1188, 1191–1200, 1204, 1206, 1207, 1210–1216, 1218, 1219, 1226–1228, 1230, 1236, 1237, 1244, 1245, 1250, 1256, 1258, 1262, 1264, 1273, 1279, 1287, 1295, 1304–1306, 1310, 1312, 1313, 1315, 1318–1322, 1324, 1327, 1329–1331, 1334, 1335, 1343, 1345–1348, 1362, 1401, 1402, 1405, 1413, 1416–1419, 1424, 1426, 1428, 1429, 1431–1446, 1448–1450, 1456, 1459, 1461, 1465, 1466, 1472, 1476, 1477, 1480–1483, 1490, 1496, 1497, 1500, 1501, 1504, 1510–1514
chandelier 146
channel rays *401*
chaos *306*, 307, *308*, 308
chapter sign 326
characteristic *876*
charge *220*, 798
charge conjugation violation 1279
charge, amount of *675*
charge, central *894*
charge, radiation due to acceleration 780
charge, radiation due to gravity 780
charged current interaction *1283*
charm quark *1259*, 1260, 1292
chatterbot 815
check *211*
cheetah 41, 81
chemical elements, origin of heavy 1341
chemical mass defect *443*
chemistry 315, 1290
chemoluminescence 791
chess 37
chest operations 386
Chew-Frautschi plots *1266*, 1267
child psychology 804
childhood 41, 52
chimaera 1062
Chimborazo, Mount 150
chiral *697*
chiral symmetry *1262*
chirality 697
chirality in nature 1327
chirality of knots in nature 1327
Chlamydomonas 1309
Chlamys 1307, 1308
chlorine 1164, 1354
chlorophyll 866
chocolate 266, 586
chocolate and the speed of light 725
chocolate bar 250
chocolate does not last forever 250
choice, lack of, at big bang *863*
cholera 1124
Chomolungma, Mount 150, 269
Christoffel symbols of the second kind *558*
chromatic aberrations *748*
chromium 1354
chromosome 800, 1127, 1349
chromosome X and colour blindness 771
chrysoberyl 1156
Chrysopelea paradisii 1330
cilia *1308*
circalunar 154
circle packing 365
circularly polarized waves *730*
cirrus *776*
CKM matrix *1280*, *1281*
CL0024+1654 595
clasp *1327*
class 824
classical *892*
classical apparatus 1094
classical electron radius 922
classical mechanics *178*
classification *807*
classification of concepts 875
classifications in biology 1128
classifiers *808*
claustrophobics *582*
Clay Mathematics Institute 262, 907
cleveite 1041
click beetles 139
cloak, invisibility 756
clock *47*, *48*, 99, 146
clock in brain 1135
clock oscillator *1137*
clock paradox *426*
clock puzzles 64, 331
clock synchronization of 411, 414
clock, air pressure powered 99
clock, exchange of hands 65
clocks *47*, *317*, 620, *1136*
clocks and Planck time 1401
clocks, do not exist 1136
clockwise rotation 49
clone *1061*, 1127
clones, biological *1062*
closed system *283*, *284*
clothes, see through 1172, 1366
clothes, seeing through 733
cloud 607, 1494
cloud chamber *1225*
clouds *566*, *1023*, 1315, 1362
clouds as results of quantum theory *1039*
clouds in quantum theory 1023
clouds, floating plasma 779
Clunio 154
CMOS 782
CNO cycle 1250
CO_2 801
Co 788
coal 790
coastline length 58
cobalt 670, 1354
CODATA 954
CODATA 1375
coefficient of local self-induction *1317*
coffee machines 283
coherence 1020, *1075*, 1085

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

C

COHERENCE

coherence length *1004*
coherence time *1003*
coherent *1081*, *1184*, *1186*
coherer *725*
coil guns 698
cold fusion 844
cold working 1159
collapsars *606*
collapse *616*, *1087*, 1091
collision *444*
collisions 99, *182*
colour 790, *997*, *1259*, *1263*, *1292*
colour blindness 771
colour centres 1167
colour displacement, Wien's *769*
colour symmetries *209*
colour, evidence for three 1264
colour, world survey 939
coloured constellation 593
colours *1346*, 1422
colours in nature 938
comet 155, 745
comet shower 800
comet tails 747
comet, artificial 747
comet, Halley's 155
comets 937
comic books 272
Commission Internationale des Poids et Mesures 909
communication, faster than light *757*
communism 685
commutation of Hamiltonian and momentum operator 1040
commutation, lack of 991
commutative *876*, *891*
commutator *891*
commute, observables do 991
compact disc 829
compact discs 1120
compactness *902*
comparison with a standard *850*
compass 191
complementarity *1021*
complementarity principle 992, 1021
completeness 48, 54, 97, 677, *890*
completeness property of sets *876*
complex conjugate *877*
complex Lie group *901*
complex numbers 832, 877, 890
complex numbers as arrows 877
complexity *290*
complexity, 'infinite' 864
composed *1056*
compositeness *1037*
composition theorem for accelerations 463
comprehensibility of universe 861
Compton (wave)length *1039*
Compton effect 791
Compton satellite 1211
Compton scattering *1015*
Compton tube *121*
Compton wavelength 922, 1332
Compton wheel *121*
computational high-energy physics 928
computer programs 1440
computer science 928
computer science and quantum theory 991
computer scientists 804
computer, universe as 1097
computers 298
concatenation *212*
concave Earth theory 359
concept *817*, *821*, *822*
concepts 316
concepts, classification of 875
condensate *1111*
condensed matter physics 928
condom problem *1052*
conductance 1199
conductance quantum 922
conductivity 787
conductivity, electrical 1333
cones *1132*
cones in retina 829
cones in the retina 1100
Conférence Générale des Poids et Mesures 909, 919
configuration *34*
configuration space *75*, 75, 1067
confinement of quarks 1260, *1267*
confocal laser scanning microscopy *766*
conformal group *457*
conformal invariance *457*, *757*, 1295
conformal symmetry 716, 1262
conformal transformations 456
conic sections *155*, *537*
conjectures *840*
connected bodies *85*
connected manifold *897*
conscious *720*
consciousness *870*, 1094, 1141
conservation 97, 225, 677, *863*
conservation of momentum 98
conservation principles 115
conservative *181*
conservative systems 199
conserved quantities *24*
constancy of the speed of light *457*
constellations 83, 170, 564
constituent quark mass *1269*
constraints *199*
container 52, *423*
containers 56
continental motion 126
continuity 48, 53, 54, 97, *217*, 677, *896*, 1405
continuum 42, 679, 689
continuum approximation *84*
continuum hypothesis *826*
continuum mechanics *192*
continuum physics 276
contraction *548*, 563

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

C

CONVECTION

convection *284*
Convention du Mètre 909
Conway groups 900
cooking 315
Cooper pairs *1176*
cooperative structures *306*
coordinates *54*, *73*
coordinates, fermionic 1507
coordinates, generalized 199
coordinates, Grassmann 1507
Copernicus 338
copper 674, 774, 775, 787, 1355
copy, perfect 1061
copycat *1127*
copying machine 1061
copying machines 991, 1061, 1062
core *1146*
core of the Earth *780*
Coriolis acceleration *117*, *118*, 338, 373
Coriolis acceleration in atoms 1050
Coriolis effect 117, 338, 373
cork 98, 112, 1171
corkscrew 529
cornea 730, 791
corner figures 31
corner film, lower left 31, 32, 34
corner patterns 31
corner pictures 1031
corner, lower left film 31, 34
corpuscle *83*
corrected Planck units *913*
correctness *840*
corrugations, road 304
cortex 31
corundum *1154*
cosmic background radiation 650
cosmic censorship *493*, *617*, 652, 1465
cosmic evolution *28*
cosmic mirror 931
cosmic radiation 427, 774
cosmic rays 447, 774, 776, 777, 800, 1212, *1230*
cosmological constant 549, *553*, 588, 923, 1341, 1453
cosmological constant paradox 1419
cosmological constant problem 1513
cosmological principle *574*
cosmonauts 378, 419, 499, 512, 514, 741, 742
cosmonauts, lifetime of 1233
cosmos *33*, *806*
Cotton–Mouton effect 788
coulomb *675*, 911
Coulomb explosion 1202
Coulomb force 679
Coulomb gauge 1083
Coulomb's and Gauss's 'laws', equivalence of 680
countability 825
counter *1134*
coupling constant unification 1297
coupling, minimal 1048
coupling, principle of minimal 553
courage 410
covariance, principle of general 553
covariant *861*
covering *1407*
cows, ruminating *1287*
CP violation 1279
CPT 222, 1035
CPT invariance 1280
Cr 788
crackle *368*
crackpots 416, 635, *821*, 854, 932, 1447
creation *24*, 591, *1049*, 1416, 1440, 1536
creation is a type of motion *863*
creation is impossible 1436
creation of light 1184
creation of motion 98
creation operator *1059*
creation science 844
creationism 843
crest *233*
Cretaceous 578
cricket bowl 361
critical magnetic field 672
critical mass density *581*
crop circles *846*
cross product *106*, *885*
crust of the Earth *780*
cryptoanalysis *1096*
cryptography *1096*
cryptography, quantum 1062
cryptology 1096
crystal database 1159
crystal shapes 1159
crystallization dating 1245
crystals 61, *1153*
Cs *790*
$CsNO_3$ *790*
Cu 787
cube, magic *834*
cubes, magic 967
cucumber 758
cumulonimbus 245, *776*, 1315
cumulus *776*
cuprum 1355
curiosities 35
curiosity *25*, 189, *871*
curium 1355
curl *711*
curl, visualization of 711
current quark mass *1269*
current, electric *674*
curvature 65, 504, 505, 507, *542*
curvature, extrinsic 540
curvature, Gaussian *542*
curvature, intrinsic 540, 542
curvature, sectional *545*
curves of constant width *38*
curvimeter 58
cutting *1494*
cycle 239
cycloid *382*
cyclotron resonance 789
Cygnus X-1 616
Cyrillic alphabet *322*

D

∂ 325
dx 325
D4DR 951

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

D

DAEMONS

daemons 1335
daisy 828
daleth 322
daltonic *771*
damping *181*, *233*, *1078*
dancer 76
dark energy *443*, 571, 1341, 1453
dark matter *443*, 571, 630, 1341
dark matter problem *587*
dark stars 205
dark, speed of the 435
dark-field microscopy *766*
darkness 435
darmstadtium 1355
dating, radiocarbon 1245
Davey–Stewartson equation 248
day length, past 46
day, length of 160
day, mean solar 127
day, sidereal 127, 923
day, time unit *911*
de Broglie wavelength 910
dead alone are legal 769
dead water *229*
death 22, 99, 102, 219, 252, 317, 404, *987*, 1080, 1139, 1151
death sentence 252
deca 911
decay 297, 1138, *1239*, *1335*
decay of photons 603
deceleration parameter *582*
deci 911
decoherence *1076*, 1085
decoherence process 1086
decoherence time *1077*, *1079*
deep sea fish 791
deer 31
degenerate matter 1237
degree Celsius 911
degree, angle unit *911*
deity 855
Delft University of Technology 1447
delta function 235
demarcation *868*
Demodex brevis 1129
demon, Maxwell's 813
Dendrobates azureus 1168
denseness 48, 54, 1405
density functional *1075*
density matrix *1075*
density perturbations 577
density, proper *550*
deoxyribonucleic acid 1149
dependence on $1/r^2$ 628
derivative *79*
derivative at a point *79*
description *73*, *865*
descriptions, accuracy of 316
design *864*
design, intelligent 864
Desmodium gyrans 50
Desoxyribonukleinsäure 1149
detachable *1081*
details *844*
details and pleasure 26
details of nature *807*
detection of gravitational waves 531
detector *1088*
detectors of motion *976*
determinism *187*, *188*, 309, 1095, 1418
deutan 771
deuterium 1252
deuterium fluoride laser 770
devil 31, 1050, 1051
devils 1050, 1335
Devonian 160, 578
diagonal argument 966
diamagnetic materials *784*
diamagnetism *687*, 788
diameter *1435*
diamond 207, 787, 790, *1158*, 1296
diamond, breaking 272
diamonds 1173
dichroism 788, 791
Dicomorpha 1307
dielectricity 789
dielectrics *674*
Diet Coca Cola 270
diffeomorphism invariance *552*, 622
differences are approximate 1501
different 1008
differential *79*
differential equation *361*
differential interference contrast microscopy *766*
differential manifold *897*
diffraction *233*, 560, *741*, *1008*, *1010*
diffraction as colour cause *1169*
diffraction limit *741*, 767
diffraction of matter by light 1050
diffraction pattern *1087*
diffusion 297, 299, 1309
digamma 321
digital versatile discs, or DVD 1120
digits, history of 323
dihedral angles 60
dilations *219*, *456*
Diluvium 579
dimension *888*, *891*
dimension, fourth 424
dimensionality 42, 54, 679, 689
dimensionality, spatial 757
dimensionless 922
dimensions 53
dimensions, higher *1515*
dimensions, three spatial 1068
diminished fifth *236*
dinosaurs 579
diopter *960*
dipole strength 700
Dirac equation 1283
Dirac equation and chemistry 1147
direction 42, 679, 689
disappearance of motion 98
disasters, future 799
discovery of physical concepts 838
discrete *212*
discreteness, none in nature 1444
disentanglement *1076*
disentanglement process 1086
disinformation 992

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

D

DISLOCATION

dislocation 1171
dislocation loop 1320
dislocations *415*, *1320*
dispersion *233*, 1167
dispersion relation 529, *723*
dispersion, anomalous 939
dissection of volumes 60
dissipative *181*
dissipative systems *184*, *199*, *306*
distance *57*
distance, rod *460*
distinction, none in nature 1444
distinguish *31*
distinguishability 42, 48, 54, 97, 677, 679, 689
distribution, Gaussian normal *288*
distribution, normal *812*, 920
divergence *149*
divine surprises 870
division *876*
division algebra *882*, *890*
DNA 734
DNA 55, 811, 815, 829, 919, 1149
DNA (human) 205
DNA molecules *1327*
DNA, ripping apart 179
DNS 1149
doctrine *841*
Dolittle 200
dolphins 1133, 1307
domain of definition *826*
door sensors 414
dopamine 951, *1144*
Doppler effect *412*, 431
Doppler effect, reversed 756
Doppler red-shift *593*
double cover *881*
double numbers 885
doublets *215*
doubly special relativity 1525
Dove prisms *336*
down quark *1259*, 1260, 1292
Draconis, Gamma 403
drag *181*, *183*
drag coefficient *183*, 315
dragging of vector potential by currents 711
dreams 807
drift speed 774
dromion *248*
drop 183
Drosophila bifurca 1309
Drosophila melanogaster 50, 1303, 1309
drugs 13
dual field tensor *708*
dualities *1515*
duality between large and small 1498, 1499
duality in string theory 1527
duality of coupling constants 1295
duality transformation *708*
duality, electromagnetic *718*, *1300*
duality, space-time 624
dubnium 1355
Duckburg 1125
ducks, swimming 244
Duration *46*
dust *551*, 792
Dutch Balloon Register 395
Dutch telescope *740*
duvet 284
DVD 1120
dwarf planets *171*
dwarfs 205
dx 325
dyadic numbers *830*
dyadic product 325, 1076
dyadic rational numbers *830*
dyadosphere *1212*
DyI_3 1179
dynabee 137
dynamic friction *181*
dynamical Casimir effect *1193*
dynamics *178*
dynamos *690*
dyons 1301
dysprosium 1355

E

ε_0 678
E. coli 1350
e.g. 327
ear 53, 55, 234, 256, 346, *1132*
ear problems 246
Earnshaw's theorem *783*
Earth 116, 284
Earth core solidification 801
Earth dissection 60
Earth formation 578
Earth from space 931
Earth rays 848
Earth rotation and superfluidity 1198
Earth rotation slowing 801
Earth speed 41
Earth stops rotating 150
Earth's age 46, 925
Earth's average density 925
Earth's axis 128
Earth's gravitational length 925
Earth's mantle instability 800
Earth's radius 925
Earth's rotation 917
Earth's rotation change of 123
Earth's shadow 138
Earth's speed through the universe 132
Earth, age of 1236
Earth, flat 367
Earth, flattened 116
Earth, hollow 61, 623
Earth, length contraction 429
Earth, mass of *147*
Earth, ring around 566
Earth, shape of *149*
Earth-alkali metals 1352
earthquake *135*, 374
earthquake, starting 272
earthquake, triggered by humans 272
earthquakes 135, 154, 340, 1161
EBK quantization 1044
eccentricity *156*, *537*
eccentricity of Earth's axis 130
eccentrics 623, 624
echo 234, 1192
ecliptic *151*
eddies 1305
edge dislocations *1320*
effect and cause 870

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

E

EFFECT

effect, sleeping beauty 737
effective width 1321
effort 179
EHF, extremely high frequency 733
Ehrenfest's paradox 453
eigengrau 1143
eigenstates 1028
eigenvalue 889, 1028, 1089
eigenvalues 215, 1036, 1087
eigenvector 889, 1028
eight-squares theorem 884
Einstein algebra 622
Einstein tensor 549
Einstein, Albert 851
Einstein–Cartan theory 630
Einstein–de Haas effect 687
Einstein–Podolsky–Rosen paradox 1083
einsteinium 1355
Ekert protocol 1062
Ekman layer 338
elasticity 182, 508
elders 929
Elea 257, 1502
electrets 671
electric charge 674
electric charge is discrete 773
electric effects 182
electric field 671, 677
electric field, limit to 1482
electric polarizability 704
electric potential 712
electric signal speed 773
electrical conductance 1199
electrical resistance 703
electricity 680
electricity, start of 579
electrification 787, 1202
electro-optical activity 790
electro-osmosis 790
electroactive polymers 1129
electrochromicity 791
electrode 700
electrodynamics 878
electrokinetic effect 790
electroluminescence 791
electrolyte 700
electrolytes 773
electrolytic activity 790
electromagnetic coupling constant 1423
electromagnetic field 671, 690, 691, 713
electromagnetic field, linearity 723
electromagnetic smog 794
electromagnetic unit system 678, 914
electromagnetic wave, generation 737
electromagnetic waves 735
electromagnetic waves, spherical 722
electromagnetism 148
electromagnetism as proof of special relativity 735
electrometer 1230
electrometers 675
electromotive field 708
electron 401, 1276, 1291
electron neutrino 1276
electron radius 1071, 1293, 1450
electron size 469
electron speed 41, 774
electron, weak charge 1279
electronics, polymer 808
electrons 774
electronvolt 914
electroscope 1230
electroscope, capacitor 697
electrostatic machines 698
electrostatic unit system 678, 914
electrostriction 789
electrowetting 790
element of set 42, 48, 54, 97, 677, 679, 689, 823
element, adjoint 890
elementary particle 1063, 1335
elementary particle, shape of 1490, 1494, 1495
elementary particle, size of 1492
elementary particles 1410
elementary particles, electric polarizability 1350
elementary particles, size of 469
elements 1350, 1351
elements, none in nature 1440
elephants 245, 302, 814
Eliza 815
ellipse 146, 155, 537
elongation 1506
elves 777, 778
ELW 732
email 929
embryo 1122
emergence 309, 855, 855, 950
emergence of properties 855
emergent properties 309
emission, spontaneous 1191
emissivity 790, 793
emit waves 234
empirical 841
empty space 149, 231
EMS98 136
Encarsia 1307
Encyclopédie 686
end of applied physics 800
end of fundamental physics 800
end of science 860
energy 100, 100, 181, 206, 217, 441, 672
energy conservation 102, 150, 220, 761
energy consumption in First World countries 102
energy flow density 714
energy flows 98
energy flux 916
energy is bounded 452
energy of a wave 231
energy of the universe 598, 1206
energy velocity 754
energy width 1292
energy, free 443
energy, observer independence 217
energy, potential 452
energy, relativistic kinetic 442, 452
energy, relativistic potential

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

E

ENERGY

452
energy, scalar generalization of 217
energy, total 149
energy, undiscovered 443
energy–momentum 4-vector *451*
energy–momentum tensor 479, *550*
energy–momentum tensor of the electromagnetic field *715*
engines, maximum power of 475
English language 818
English language, size of 818
enlightenment 161
ensemble *1053*
ensembles *1441*
entanglement 991, *1081*, 1083
entanglement, degree of 1086
entities *807*
entropic forces *1197*
entropy *276*, *282*, 316, 599, 811
entropy flow 284
entropy of a black hole 1422
entropy of black hole 612
entropy, limit to 1479
entropy, quantum of 291
entropy, smallest in nature 290
entropy, state of highest 300, 1213
environment *32*, 769, *799*, *806*, *1077*
enzymes 1355
Eocene 579
Epargyreus clarus 76, 336
ephemeris time *47*
epistemology *949*
eponyms *328*
EPR 328, 1083
equal intonation *238*
equilibrium *283*, 283, *1076*
equipotential lines 710
equivalence principle 553, 628
erasable *814*
erasing memory 812
erbium 1355
ergosphere *611*, 611
Eris *171*
Erta Ale 1237
ESA 931
escape velocity 169, 604, 1045
Escherichia coli 86, 1309
essence of universe 1443
et al. 327
Eta Carinae 801
eth *320*, 353
ethel *320*
ether 1405
ether, also called luminiferous ether 635
ethics 189
Ettinghausen effect 789
Ettinghausen–Nernst effect 789
Eucalyptus regnans 254
Eucharist 252
Euclidean space *53*, 54
Euclidean vector space *40*, 42, 679, 689, 887
eumelanin 1165
Europa 168
europium 1164, 1355
EUV 734
evanescent waves 1033
evaporation 297, 1214
Evarcha arcuata 1172
evenings, lack of quietness of 245
event *46*, *836*
event horizon *465*
event symmetry *1417*, *1502*
events 422
Everest, Mount 150, 269
everlasting life 99
eversion *1314*
evolution 33, 814, 1137
evolution equation, first order *1031*
evolution equations *187*, *798*
evolution, biological 1127
evolution, marginal *581*
evolutionary biologists 804
ex nihilo *863*
Exa 911
excess radius *543*
excitations in gases *1163*
exclamation mark 326
exclusion principle 203
existence of mathematical concepts 856
existence of the universe 861
existence, physical *856*
existence, psychological 856
expansion *278*
expansion of the universe 132
expansions *219*
experience *807*, 808
Experience Island *23*, 29
experimental high-energy physics 928
experimental nuclear physics 928
experimental physicists *839*
experimentalists *839*
experiments *836*
explanation 869, 1094
exploratory drive *871*
explosion 590
explosion of volcano 800
explosion of Yellowstone 800
exponential notation 67
exposition, SI unit 1244
extended bodies, non-rigid *192*
extension *259*
extension in string theory *1514*
extension sensors *1133*
extension, tests of 1510
extensive quantities *276*
extensive quantity *98*
extrasolar planets *205*, 594
extraterrestrials 1130
extremal identity *1445*
extrinsic curvature *540*
eye 32, 764, *1132*
eye and the detection of photons 994
eye glasses 772
eye motion 53
eye sensitivity 763, 1132
eye, blinking after guillotine 92
eye, human 730, 937
eyelid 65

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

eyes of birds 764
eyes of fish 269

F
F. spectabilis 50
F. suspensa 50
F. viridissima 50
fact *836*, *840*
faeces 1143
Falco peregrinus 41
fall *144*, *518*
fall and flight are independent 74
fall is not vertical 116
fall is parabolic 75
fall of Moon 144
fall, permanent 606
false *840*
fame, way to reach 782
familiarity 31
fan-out effect *1423*
farad 911
Faraday cage *793*
Faraday effect 788
Faraday rotation 788
farting for communication 245
faster than light 515
faster than light motion observed in an accelerated frame 466
faster than light motion, in collisions 445
fate *1433*
Fe 788, 792
feathers 1171
feelings and lies 843
feet 265
feldspar 791
femto 911
femtosecond laser 1184
fence 421
fencing 1071
Fermi constant *1281*
Fermi coupling constant 922
Fermi problems 295
fermion, composite 1178
fermionic coordinates *886*, 1507
fermions *1056*, *1060*
fermium 1355
ferritic steels *273*
ferroelectricity 789
ferromagnetism *687*, 788, 1333
ferrum 1356
Fiat Cinquecento 266
Fibonacci series 948
field emission 789
field evaporation 790
field ionization 790
field lines 710
field of scalars *889*
field theory *710*
field, mathematical *876*
field, physical *670*
Fields medal 1314
fields, morphogenetic 847
fifth, perfect 236
figure-eight 1324
figures in corners 31
filament 280
film 977
fine structure *1047*
fine structure constant 719, 754, *912*, 921, *922*, *1046*, *1047*, 1178, 1423
fine structure constant, limit on 1272
fine tuning *1345*
fine-structure constant *1050*, 1051
fingers 726
fingers prove the wave properties of light 726
finite 294, *825*, *860*
finite number *853*
fire 14, 280, 787, *1242*
fire colour 1163
firefly 1180
firework colour 1163
first law of black hole mechanics *478*
first law of horizon mechanics *478*
first property of quantum measurements *1087*
Fischer groups 900
fish in water 1498, 1509
fish's eyes 269
fish, weakly-electric 683
flagella *86*
flagella, prokaryote 1309, 1379
flagellar motor 103
flagellum 1309
flame 37, 135, 295, 787
flashlamp colour 1163
flatness 61
flatness, asymptotic 559
flattening of the Earth 116
flavour symmetry *1262*
flavours *1259*
fleas 139
flies 32
flight simulation 881
flip film 31, 32
flip film, explanation of 73
floor, stability of 1152
flow 277
flow of time 51, 52, 623
flows must vary 1017
fluctuations *1076*
fluctuations, zero-point 1190
fluid mechanics *192*
fluids, body 264
fluorescence 791
fluorescence microscopy *766*
fluorine 1355
flute 226
flux 956
flux, electric 679
fly, common 148, 1120
flying saucers 245
flying systems 1303
foam 1130
focal point 367
focus 367
fogbow *751*
football, hairy 908
force 95, 105, *473*, 559
force limit 473
force, central *95*
force, definition of 179
force, maximum 471
force, maximum, assumptions 482
force, minimum in nature *496*
force, perfect 626

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

F

FORCE

force, physical *179*
force, use of 179
Ford and precision 315
forerunner velocity *754*
forest 31
forgery 812
forgetting *814*
form, mathematical *714*
formal sciences *836*
formula of life 1352
formulae, ISO 353
formulae, liking them 38
Forsythia europaea 50
Foucault pendulum 521, 1198
Foucault's pendulum, web cam 119
four-squares theorem *879*
Fourier components *795*
Fourier transformation 247
fourth dimension *422*
fourth dimension to special 424
fourth, perfect 236
foxfire 1180
fractals *58*, 80, *250*, 993
fractals do not appear in nature 1039
fractional quantum Hall effect 1178
frame dragging *524*, 535
frame of reference *460*
frame-dragging *521*
frames of reference *209*
francium 1349, 1355
frass *76*
fraud 1352
Fraunhofer lines 501, 656, *1041*
free energy *1322*
free fall, permanent 606
free fall, speed of 41
free will *188*
Freederichsz effect 790
frequency *229*
frequency mixing 792
friction *99*, 99, *181*, 181, *183*, 283, 292, *1078*
Friction between planets and the Sun 99
friction produced by tides 160
friction, importance of 283
Friendbot 815
frog 785
frog legs 683
froghopper 81
front velocity *754*
Froude number, critical *244*
fruit flies 1303
fruit fly 1120
fuel consumption 315
fuel, pouring 955
full width at half maximum 920
Fulling–Davies–Unruh effect *1193*, 1319
Fulling–Davies–Unruh radiation 1216, 1415
function *826*
function collapse, wave 1082
function, mathematical *826*
fundamental group *906*
funnel 268, 269
fur *1126*
fusion *1248*
fusion reactors 1252
Futhark *320*
Futhorc *320*
futhorc 322
future and present 867
future button 292
future light cone *424*
future, fixed 187
future, remembering 292

G

γ-rays *401*, 735
g-factor *1038*
G-parity 1292
Göttingen 981
GaAs 791, 792
GABA *1144*
gadolinium 789, 1355
Gaia 308
gait *109*
galaxies as clouds 1315
galaxy *565*, 602
galaxy centre 131
galaxy cluster 204
galaxy formation *577*
galaxy group 204
galaxy supercluster 204
Galilean physics 34, *39*, *178*
Galilean satellites *168*, 403
Galilean space *53*
Galilean telescope 740
Galilean time *48*
Galilean velocity *40*
gallium 1355
gallium arsenide 787
galvanometer 182
gamma ray bursts 407, 633, 800, *1211*, 1212, 1371, 1372, 1420
gamma-ray bursts 569, 596, 653
GaN laser 1182
Ganymede 168
garlic-smelling semiconductor 1361
garnet *1156*
gas *285*
gas discharge lamps 1183
gas lasers 1163
gas lighter 725
gas planets 205
gases 791, *1053*
gasoline 1416
gate, logical AND 813
gauge change *212*
gauge field *713*
gauge invariance *712*
gauge symmetries 219
gauge symmetry *712*, 901
gauge theory 52, 1310
gauge theory from falling cats 1310
gauge transformation *713*
gauge transformations *798*, 902
gauge, Coulomb 1083
gauge-dependent *1312*
gauge-invariant *1312*
Gauss rifle *697*
Gauss's 'law' *680*
Gauss's theorem *956*
Gaussian curvature 542
Gaussian distribution *288*, *920*
Gaussian integers *885*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

G

GAUSSIAN

Gaussian primes *885*
Gaussian unit system 678, 914
Gd 788
GdSiGe 789
gecko 1172
Gedanken experiment *483*
Geiger–Müller counters 1231
Geigerpod 1232
Gell-Mann matrices *1263*
Gemini 170
General Motors 671
general physics 928
general relativity *409*, *498*
general relativity and quantum cosmology 928
general relativity in one paragraph 546
general relativity in one statement 1461
general relativity in ten points 626
general relativity, accuracy of 627
general relativity, first half 507
general relativity, second half 512
general relativity, statements of 509
generalized coordinates *201*
generalized indeterminacy principle *1404*
generators *220*, *879*, *891*
genes 1121, 1122
genetic difference between man and chimpanzee 1127
genius *408*, *509*, *840*, *1005*
geocaching *517*
geocentric system 172
geodesic deviation *562*
geodesic effect *538*, 628
geodesic, lightlike *510*
geodesic, timelike *510*
geodesics 184
geodynamo *780*
geoid *149*
geology 1290
geometric sequence *356*
geometric symmetries *209*
geometrodynamic clock *621*
geostationary satellites 157
germanium 1355
Germany, illegality of life 769
Gerridae 140
ghosts 36, 90, 963, 1073, 1335
giant tsunami from Canary islands 800
Giant's Causeway 61, 311, 1154
giants 254
Gibbs' paradox *1053*
Giga 911
gimel 322
girl-watching 138
glass *271*, 787, 788, 790
Global infrasound Network *246*
global warming *284*, 846, 1173
globular clusters 569
glory 937
glove problem *1052*
gloves 1062
gloves, difference with quantum systems 1063
glow of eyes of a cat 760
glow-worm 791
glow-worms 1165
glueball *1272*, 1349
glueballs 1273
gluon *1260*, 1291
gluon jets *1265*
gnomonics *47*
goblin 1354, 1357
god 1361
god's existence 1535
goddess 1335, 1354, 1358, 1361
gods 39, 115, 133, 140, 158, 331, 333, 552, 599, 802, 813, 825, 842, 855, 857, 859, 863, 873, 1093, 1335, 1443, 1535
Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von 839, 857, 1443
goggles, night 916
gold *359*, 790, 1176, 1355
golden rule *1139*
golf balls 361
Gondwana 578
Gondwanaland 126
gorilla test for random numbers 187
Gosper's formula 297
Gothic alphabet *322*
Gothic letters *322*
GPS 47
GPS, global positioning system 516
grace 29, *108*, 313, 332
gradient *148*
grammatical *819*
grampus *856*, 865
grand unification *1295*, 1295, 1516
grandmother: a hard problem 1325
granular jet *275*
graphene *1175*, 1179
graphics, three-dimensional 881
graphite 784, 787, 788, 790
grass 421
grasshopper 1120
Grassmann coordinates 1507
Grassmann numbers *886*
grating *1010*
gravitation *142*, *182*
gravitation and measurements 317
gravitation as braking mechanism 475
gravitational acceleration, standard 81
gravitational and inertial mass identity *553*
gravitational Bohr radius 1206
gravitational constant *143*
gravitational constant is constant 493
gravitational coupling constant 921
gravitational Doppler effect *501*
gravitational energy *551*, 559
gravitational field *149*
gravitational lensing *595*, 616
gravitational mass *162*
gravitational radiation 641
gravitational red-shift *501*, *593*
gravitational waves 525
gravitational waves, detection

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

G

GRAVITATIONAL

of 531
gravitational waves, speed of 528, 533
gravitodynamics 527
gravitoelectric field 523
gravitoluminescence 792
gravitomagnetic field 524
gravitomagnetic vector potential 524
gravitomagnetism 628
graviton 1065, 1218
gravitons 991
gravity 491, 499
gravity Faraday cages 793
gravity inside matter shells 173
gravity measurement with a thermometer 1208
Gravity Probe B 522
gravity wave detectors and quantum gravity 1421
gravity wave emission delay 628
gravity waves 229, 525, 747
gravity waves, spin of 527
gravity, centre of 169
gravity, essence of 173
gravity, sideways action of 147
gray 911, 915
Great Wall 741
Great Wall in China 937
Greek alphabet 321
Greek number system 324
green 734, 764
green flash 750, 938
green ideas 845
green ray 938
green star 769
greenhouse effect 284, 1173
Greenland 46
Gregorian calendar 327
Gregorian calendar reform 66
grey hair 434
ground state 1045
group 876
group mind 841
group of components 906
group velocity 753
group velocity can be infinite 753
group, conformal 457
group, mathematical 213
group, monster 900
group, simple 900
growth 28, 193, 302
growth of deep sea manganese crust 41
growth of trees 1130
Gulf Stream 338
Gulliver's travels 980
guns and the Coriolis effect 118
GUT epoch 577
gymnasts 107
gypsum 1153
gyromagnetic ratio 615, 1037
gyromagnetic ratio of the electron 315, 1333
gyroscope 107, 120
Gödel's theorem 1440

H

H_2O 980
hadrons 577, 1259
hafnium 1356
hafnium carbide 280
Hagedorn temperature 280
hagfish 1327
hahnium 1355
Haidinger's brush 730
hair clip 181
hair growth 41
hair whirl 717
hair, diameter 55
hair, gray 434
hairs 829
half-life 1292
Hall effect 788, 1174, 1385
Hall effect, fractional quantum 1178
Hall effect, fractional quantum 1073
Hall effect, phonon 1175
Hall effect, photonic 1175
Hall probes 1174
halo 741, 760, 937, 938
halogens 1352
Hamilton's principle 194
hammer drills 111
Hanbury Brown-Twiss experiment 1011
Hanbury Brown–Twiss effect 1005
hand 445
hand in vacuum 641
hand, for quaternion visualization 881
handcuff puzzle 895
handedness 717
hands of clock 64
Hanle effect 788
hard discs, friction in 184
harmonic functions 783
harmonic generation 792
harmonic motion 226
hassium 1356
Hausdorff space 896
He–Ne 792
healers, Philippine 847
heart beats 829
heartbeat 146
heat 282, 1463
heat & pressure 182
heat capacity of diatomic gas 1333
heat capacity of metals 1333
heat radiation 787
Heaviside formula 709
Heaviside–Lorentz unit system 678, 914
heavy metals 1352
Hebrew alphabet 323
hecto 911
Heiligenschein 760
Heisenberg picture 1074, 1083
Heisenberg's indeterminacy relations 1021
helicity 999, 1064
helicity of stairs 50
helicopter 269, 778
helicopters 931
heliocentric system 172
helioseismologists 1255
helium 204, 280, 297, 401, 578, 589, 786, 790, 868, 1038, 1041, 1058, 1080, 1109, 1198, 1344, 1349, 1356
helium burning 1251

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

H

HELIUM

helium, discovery of 1041
helium, superfluid 267
helix *1318*
hell 1236
hemoglobin *1170*
henry 911
heresy 252, 1535
Hering lattices 760
Hermann lattice *760*
Hermitean *215*
Hermitean vector space 888
herring, farting 245
hertz 911
Hertzsprung–Russell diagram *576*
hexagon, magic 835
Hg 788
hiccup *313*
hidden variables *1091*
Higgs 1292
Hilbert space *888*, *1027*, 1032
Hilbert's problems 1442, 1485
Hilbert's sixth problem 1442, 1485
Hilversum 778
Himalaya age 46
hips 108
Hiroshima 1339
Hitachi 1104
hodograph 75, *144*, 168
HoI_3 1179
hole argument *622*
hole paradox *622*
holes 34
holes in manifolds 899
holistic medicine *1130*
hollow Earth hypothesis *623*
hollow Earth theory *61*, 1327
Hollywood 200
Hollywood films 194, 250, 336, 456, 837, 1433
holmium 1356
Holocene 579
hologram *765*
holograms with electron beams 1186
holograms, moving 765
holography *766*, 1439
holonomic *200*
holonomic systems *199*
holonomic–rheonomic *199*
holonomic–scleronomic *199*
homeomorphism *899*
Homo sapiens 50
Homo sapiens appears 579
Homo sapiens sapiens 579
homogeneity 48, 54
homogeneous *880*
homomorphism *214*, *215*
honey 711
honey bees 96, 730
Hooke 151
hoop conjecture 1465
Hopi *334*
hops 717
horizon *574*, *606*, 606, 658, 1206, 1435
horizon and acceleration 483
horizon force *477*
horizon, moving faster than light 435
horizons *471*
horizons as limit systems 626
horror vacui *858*
horse power 103
horsepower, maximum value of 475
hot air balloons 732, 778
hour *911*
Hubble constant *574*
Hubble parameter 923
Hubble space telescope 931
Hubble time 1430
Hudson Bay 46
human 1350
human body, light emission of 916
human energy consumption 1247
human eye 730
human growth 41
human language *818*, *820*
human observer 1094
human sciences *836*
human Y chromosome 1349
hummingbirds 1306
humour *309*
humour, physical 931
hurry 456
Huygens' principle *235*
hydrargyrum 1357
hydrodynamics 1304
hydrofoils *263*
hydrogen 790, 1349, 1356
hydrogen atoms 1104
hydrogen atoms, existence of 1039
hydrogen bombs in nature 1256
hydrogen fusion 578
hydroxylapatite 1159
hyperbola 155, 537
hyperbolas 607
hyperbolic *155*
hyperbolic cosine *462*
hyperbolic secant *464*
hyperbolic sine *462*
hyperbolic tangent *464*
hypernovae 569
hyperreals *885*
hypersurfaces *458*
hypotheses *840*

I

i.e. 327
ibid. 327
IBM 394
Icarus 538, 628
ice age 579, 800
ice ages *129*, 340, 867
ice colour 1164
ice, blue 1164
iceberg 96
icicles 272
icon *817*
icosane 289
idea, platonic 1429
ideal *55*, *891*
ideal gas *278*, *286*
ideal gas constant *278*, 388
ideas, green 845
idem *327*
identity, extremal *1445*
if 820
igneous rocks *1153*
ignition 1253
ill-tempered gaseous

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

vertebrates 842
Illacme plenipes 88
illness *264*
illuminance *916*
illumination 872
illusion, motion as 1486
illusions, optical 931
image *89*, *817*
image, real *738*
image, virtual *738*
images *33*, 744, 1336
images, and focussing devices 738
imaginary *880*
imaginary mass 445
imaginary number *445*
imagination 807
imagine *211*
imitation *841*
immediate *1083*
immovable property 91
impact *444*
impact parameter *534*
impact parameters 608
impenetrability 97, 792
impenetrability of matter 39, 986, 1071, 1336
in all directions 602
InAs:Mn *787*
incandescence *592*, 787, *793*, 793, 978, *1163*
incandescent lamps 1183
inclination of Earth's axis 131
incubation 872
independently *821*
indeterminacy relation 239, 1461
indeterminacy relation for angular momentum 1024
indeterminacy relation of thermodynamics 291
indeterminacy relation, relativistic 469, 1459
indeterminacy relations *984*, *1021*
index *817*
index finger 726
index of refraction *383*
index, negative refraction 755
Indian numbers *323*, 324
indigo 734
indistinguishable 758, *1053*, *1336*
indium 1356
individuality 34, *185*
inductions *220*
inertia *90*
inertial *419*
inertial frame *460*
inertial frame of reference *419*
inertial mass *162*
inf. 327
infinite *859*
infinite coastlines 58
infinite number of SI prefixes 919
infinite-dimensional *893*
infinitesimals *830*
infinities 854
infinity *24*, 42, 48, 54, 97, 679, 689, *825*
infinity in physics *80*
inflation *577*, *598*, 598, *629*
inflaton field *598*, 1341
information 290
information in the universe 1441
information science and quantum theory 991
information table 829
information, erasing of *298*
information, quantum of 291
infrared 733
infrared light *727*
infrared rays *401*
infrasound *246*, 1133
InGaAsP laser 1182
inhomogeneous Lorentz group *1063*
initial conditions *185*, 577, 591, *715*
injective 215, *825*
ink fish 1308
inner product *887*
inner product spaces *887*
inner world theory 359
inorganic charge transfer *1166*
InP 792
Inquisition 253
InSb *787*, 788
insects 154, 299, 730, 1304
inside 1226
instability of solar system 801
instant *39*, *45*
instant, human 46
instant, single *24*
instantons *1301*
instruments *849*
insulation 787
insulation power 284
insulators *674*
integers *830*, 875
integration *59*, *197*
intelligent design 843, 864
intention *866*
interaction *33*, *179*, *806*, *855*
interaction, is gravity an *559*
interaction, reciprocity of *855*
interactions 1446
interference *232*, *726*, 1075
interference and photons 1008
interference as colour cause *1168*
interference fringes *1006*
interferometer 94, 121, *418*, 1003
interferometers 918, 1020, 1204
intermediate black holes *616*
intermediate bosons *1038*
internal *212*, *1298*
internal photoelectric effect 790
International Earth Rotation Service 340, *342*, *917*
International Geodesic Union 926
International Latitude Service 124, 340
International Phonetic Alphabet 319
internet *928*, 929
interpenetration 1071
interpenetration of matter 1068
interpretation of quantum

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

mechanics 1075, 1094
interstellar gas cloud 800
intersubjectivity *841*
interval *449*
interval, musical 236
intrinsic *541*
intrinsic angular momentum 1025
intrinsic properties 1335
invariance 97, *212*, *677*
invariance, conformal *457*
invariant *861*
invariant property *209*
invariant, link 1329
invariant, topological 1329
invariants of curvature tensor 562
inverse element *213*
inversion *456*, 1315, *1446*
inversion symmetry 457
inverted commas 806
invisibility cloak 756
invisibility of objects *84*
invisible loudspeaker 296
involution *890*
Io 160, 168, 403
iodine 1164, 1356
ion 700
ionic radii 1362
ionization 787, 789
ionization energy *1045*
ionosphere 701, 795, *796*
ionosphere, shadow of 138
ions *683*, *773*, *774*
IPA 319
IRA or near infrared 733
IRB or medium infrared 733
IRC or far infrared 733
iridium 1356
iron 670, 787, 1356
irradiance *916*
irreducible *215*
irreducible mass *612*
irreducible radius *612*
irreversibility of motion 187
irreversible *283*, *1078*
Island, Experience *23*
ISO 851
isolated system *284*
isomorphism *215*
isotomeograph *121*
isotopes 1061, 1228, *1352*, 1381
isotropic *542*
Istiophorus platypterus 41, 264
Isua Belt 46
italic typeface *319*, *817*
IUPAC 954
IUPAC 851, 1382
IUPAP 954
IUPAP 851

J

Jacobi identity *891*
Jacobi identity, super 893
Janko groups 900
Jarlskog invariant *1281*
jerk 185, *368*
Jesus 140
JET, Joint European Torus 1252
jets *568*, *777*
jewel textbook 638
Joint European Torus 1252
Josephson constant 1333
Josephson effect 787, 910
Josephson frequency ratio 922
joule 911
Journal of Irreproducible Results 1378
Julian calendar *326*
jump 139
jump, long 335
Jupiter 172, 205
Jupiter's mass 925
Jupiter's moons 174
Jurassic 578
just intonation *238*

K

k-calculus 357, *411*
Kac–Moody algebra *894*, 894
kaleidoscope 597
kaon 1229, 1348
kaons and quantum gravity 1421
Karachay lake 1131
Karachay, Lake 1243
katal 851
kefir 204
kefir grains *1127*
kelvin *909*
Kelvin generator *672*, 955
Kepler's relation 530
Kerr effect 790
ketchup motion 41, 774
Killing form *892*
kilo 911
kilogram *909*
kilogram, prototype 627
kilotonne 101, 1339
kinematics *73*, *178*
kinesin 1125
kinesiology 839
kinetic energy *100*, 100
Kirlian effect 671
KJ 1152
Klein bottles 897
Klitzing, von – constant 922, 1333
knife limits 1491
knocking on table and fermionic character of matter 1069
Knot Atlas 1324
knot fish *1327*
knot invariants *1325*
knot problem, simplest 1327
knot shapes 1325
knot theory 1202
knot, mathematical *1324*
KnotPlot 1324
knotted protein 1327
knowledge *849*
knowledge, humorous definition of 381
knuckle angles 68
koppa 321
Korteweg–de Vries equation *241*
KPO_4 791
krypton 1356
Kuiper belt 171, 204

L

ladder 112
ladder puzzles 70
ladder, sliding 112

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

L

LADY'S

lady's dress 1314
LAGEOS 644
LAGEOS satellites 522
Lagrange's equations of motion *200*
Lagrangian 512
Lagrangian (function) *197*
Lagrangian is not unique 200
Lagrangian libration points *157*
Lagrangian of the electromagnetic field 691
Lagrangian operator *1029*
LaH 792
Lamb shift 1191, 1196, 1333
laminarity *260*
lamp 1183
lamp, ideal 1180
lamps *1179*
lamps, sodium 1179
lamps, xenon 1179
Lampyris noctiluca 976
Landolt–Börnstein series 850
language 804
language, human *817*
language, spoken *817*
language, written 817
languages on Earth 323
languages spoken by one person 829
lanthanoids 1352
lanthanum 1356
Laplace acceleration *689*
large 226
Large Electron Positron ring 415
large number hypothesis 1217, 1437
larger *441*
Larmor formula *737*
laser 765, *1184*
laser activity 792
laser and glass beads 744
laser and Moon 741
laser beam 748
laser beam, tubular 771
laser cavities 1000
laser distance measurement of Moon 632
laser levitation 744
laser loudspeaker 296
laser sword 1071, 1194
laser weapon 1181
laser, CO_2 1181
laser, argon 1180
laser, beer 1181
laser, cadmium 1181
laser, copper 1181
laser, deuterium fluoride 770
laser, gold 1181
laser, helium-neon 1180
laser, krypton 1180
laser, lead salt 1182
laser, nitrogen 1180, 1181
laser, quantum cascade 1182
laser, semiconductor 1182
laser, vodka 1181
laser, water 1180
laser, xenon 1180
lasers 1004
lateral force microscopes 184
lateralization 717, *718*
latex 1171
Latin 327
Latin alphabet *319*
lattice QCD *1267*
lattice gauge theory *1267*
lattice space-time 1409
Laurasia 578
lava 1237
lava colour 1163
lava, radioactivity of 1237
law 852
law of cosmic laziness *455*
law of nature, first 806
lawrencium 1356
laws and sausages 837
laws are laziness 837
laws of nature *806*, 863
Lawson criterium 1253
lawyers 91, 991
laziness of physics 836
laziness, cosmic, principle of 191, 198
lead 267, 1356
lead, from Roman times 1244
leaf, falling 269
leap day 326
leapfrogging of vortex rings 270
learning *31*, *808*
learning mechanics 180
learning, best method for 11
Lebesgue measure *60*
lecture scripts 930
left-handed material *755*
left-handers *717*
leg 146
leg performance 139
legends, urban 847
Lego 258, 976, 1449
legs 35
Leidenfrost effect *268*
length *53*, *57*, *78*, *318*, *1398*
length contraction 430, 636
length scale 299
length scales *1336*
lens *738*
Lenz's rule *708*
Leo 170
LEP 415
lepton number *1240*
Leucanthemum vulgare 193
levitation *157*, 744, *782*, 789
levitation, human 785
levitation, neutron 1228
Levitron 944
lexical universals 819
LHC 1298
liar's paradox 845
Libra 170
library *757*
librations *153*
lichen growth 41
Lie algebra *891*, *902*
Lie algebra, finite-dimensional *892*
Lie algebra, solvable *892*
Lie algebras 903
Lie group *901*
Lie group, compactness of *902*
Lie group, connectedness of 902
Lie group, linear *901*
Lie multiplication *891*
Lie superalgebra *893*
lie, biggest in the world 1286

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

L

LIES

lies *840*, *842*, 846
lies, general *843*
lies, specific *843*
life *1119*, 1121
life appearance 578
life time *1235*
life's basic processes 1120
life's chemical formula 1352
life, sense of 865
life, shortest 46
lifetime 1292
lifetime, atomic 1333
lift into space 271
lifters 698
light *182*, 412, 733, *999*
light acceleration 412
light beams, twisting 743
light bulbs 758
light can hit light 1193
light deflection 628
light deflection near masses 162
light dispersion and quantum gravity 1421
light does not move *560*
light emitting diodes 1180
light is electromagnetic 730
light microscope 960
light mill 182, *745*
light onion 1432
light polarization 728
light pressure 745
light pulses, circling each other 515
light quantum *991*
light source 1004
light speed measurement 62
light speed observer is impossible 737
light speed, finite 586
light swords 1194
light tower 41
light tunnelling 1033
light year 923
light, angular momentum of 747
light, constant speed in electromagnetism 735
light, detection of oscillations 728
light, faster than 515
light, longitudinal polarization 412
light, macroscopic 1085
light, made of bosons 1071
light, massive 412
light, slow group velocity 333
light, the unstoppable 412
light, weighing of *443*
lightbulb 1163
lightbulb temperature 280
lighthouse 71
lightlike *424*
lightlike geodesics *558*
lightning 14, 405, 671, 677, 776, 916
lightning emits X-rays 778
lightning rod 674
lightning rods, laser 1184
lightning speed 41
lightning, colour of 655
lightning, not straight 1233
lightning, zigzag shape of 776
Lilliput 1336
limbic system 332
limit concept 614
limit on resolution *741*
limit size of physical system 493
limit statements and physics 16
limit values for measurements 1405
limit, definition of 896
limits to cutting 1491
limits to motion 1458
limits to observables, additional 1476
$LiNbO_3$ 791, 792
line 1325
linear motors *1122*
linear spaces *886*
linear vector spaces *886*
linearity of electromagnetic field 723
linearity of quantum mechanics 1074
lines, high voltage 695
linguists 804
link *1326*
links, long *1326*
Linux 404
lipoid pneumonia *1150*
liquid 550
liquid crystal effect 790
liquid crystals 790
liquids 791
Listing's 'law' *139*
lithium 868, 1356, 1362
litre *911*
living beings *1119*
living thing, heaviest 96, 1350
living thing, largest 55
lizard 139
lobbyists 839
local *1409*
local time *46*
locality *860*, 1091
localization 1492
localization (weak, Anderson) 787
locusts 139
logarithms 152
logicians 805
long jump 75, 76, 101, 335
Lorentz acceleration *689*
Lorentz boosts 457
Lorentz gauge *692*
Lorentz group 902
Lorentz relation *691*
Lorentz symmetry breaking and quantum gravity 1421
Lorentz transformations of space and time *421*
Loschmidt's number *252*, 268
loudspeaker 407
loudspeaker with laser 296
loudspeaker, invisible 296
love 148, 1447
Love number 127
love, making 1223, 1447
low-temperature physics 287
lower frequency limit 732
lowest temperature 279
lumen 911
luminary movement 999
luminescence 791

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

L

LUMINOUS

luminous bodies 999
luminous density *917*
luminous intensity *915*
luminous pressure 792
lunar calendar *46*
lunar retrorelfector 539
Lunokhod 378, 539, 655, 741
lutetium 1356
lux 911, 916
LW, long waves 732
Lyapounov exponent *308*
Lyman-α 656
Lyman-alpha line *1043*
lymph *264*

M

μ_0 690
M theory 1441
M31 564
M51 567
M82, galaxy 81
mach *94*
Mach's principle 94, *553*, *601*
machine 86, *1120*
macroscopic system *1081*
macroscopically distinct *1075*
macula lutea 730
Magellanic clouds 564
magentization of rocks 126
magic 863, 931, 1338
magic cubes and squares 834
magic hexagon 835
magic moment 805
magic moments 872
magma colour 1163
magmatites 1154
Magna Graecia 257
magnesium 1356
magnet 700
magnetar 570, 672, *702*
magnetic charge 1300
magnetic circular dichroism 788
magnetic effects *182*
magnetic field *671*, *688*, 688
magnetic field, limit to 1482
magnetic flux *708*
magnetic flux density 688
magnetic flux quantum 922
magnetic induction 688
magnetic monopole *718*
magnetic monopoles 1301, 1341
magnetic pole in a mirror 717
magnetic resonance 789
magnetic resonance force microscope 1035
magnetic resonance imaging 1141, 1160, 1222
magnetic thermometry 350
magnetic vector potential 710
magnetism 95
magnetite 1166
magneto–Seebeck effect 789
magneto-optical activity 788
magnetoacoustic effect 789
Magnetobacterium bavaricum 685
magnetocaloric effect 789
magnetoelastic effect 788
magnetoencephalography 720
magneton *1038*
magnetoresistance 787
magnetorheologic effect 789
magnetosomes 685
magnetostriction 788
magnets *671*, 785
magnifying glass *738*
magnitudes *217*
main result of modern science 292
Majorana effect 788
mammals 579, 764
mammals, appearance of 578
man years of work in string theory 1517
man, wise old 200, 455
manganese 1357
Manhattan as copper mine 674
manifold 422, *897*, *1407*
manifold, analytic 901
manifold, connected *897*
manifolds *895*
manta 1308
mantle of the Earth *780*
many types *825*
many worlds interpretation 1094
many-body problem *314*
mapping *826*
marble, oil covered 98
marriage 804
Mars 538, 915, 1171
mars trip 1233
martensitic steels *273*
maser 502, *747*
masers *1184*
Maslov index *1044*
mass *92*, 95, 181, *318*, *440*, 798
mass change, limit to 1478
mass change, maximum 475
mass conservation implies momentum conservation 94
mass defect, measurement 443
mass density, limit to 1479
mass is conserved 92
mass measurement error 1488
mass, centre of 169, *446*
mass, equality of inertial and gravitational 518
mass, Galilean *95*
mass, gravitational 162, 505
mass, identity of gravitational and inertial 163
mass, imaginary 445
mass, inertial *90*, 162, 505
mass, limit to 1479
mass, negative 95, 97, 783, 1416
mass, total, in general relativity *559*
mass–energy equivalence 442
matchboxes and universe 1434
material systems 469
material, left-handed *755*
materials science 1290
materials, dense optically *1010*
math forum 931
mathematical physics 928
mathematicians 805, *821*, *832*, 931
mathematics 40, 821, *833*, 928
mathematics is applied physics *821*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

M

MATHIEU

Mathieu groups 900
maths problem of the week 931
matrix, adjoint *215*
matrix, antisymmetric *215*
matrix, complex conjugate *215*
matrix, orthogonal *215*
matrix, real *215*
matrix, symmetric *215*
matrix, transposed *215*
matter *83*, *90*
matter and antimatter, indistinguishability *1412*
matter and vacuum, mix-up *1415*
matter domination *577*
matter is not made of atoms 1234
matter shell, gravity inside 173
matter transformation 863
matter, composite 1348
matter, impenetrability of 39
matter, metastable 606
mattress 505, 525, 527, 529, 530
mattress analogy of vacuum 1466
Mauna Kea 1171
maximal ageing *456*
maximal ideal *891*
maximons 1412
Maxwell equations 1283
Maxwell's demon 813
Mayak 1243
meaning 25
measurability 42, 48, 54, 97, 677, 679, 689
measure 318
measured *1089*
measurement *42*, *812*, *850*
measurement apparatus 1094
measurement limits 1421
measurement requires matter and radiation 1490
measurements 1086
measurements and gravitation 317
measurements disturb *1094*
mechanics *178*, *191*
mechanics, classical 178
mechanics, quantum 178
Medicean satellites *168*
medicine 1290
medicines 35
Mega 911
megaparsec *574*
megatonne 101, 1339
Megrez 594
Meissner effect 789
meitnerium 1357
melanin *1170*
membrane theory *1514*
memories 852
memorize *31*
memory 36, 283, 424, *807*, 1033, 1086
memory erasing 812
memory, write once *814*
Mendel's 'laws' of heredity 1119
mendelevium 1357
menstrual cycle 154, 342
Mentos 270
Mercalli scale 136
Mercury 158
mercury 787, 790, 1151, 1357
mercury lamp 1163
mercury lamps 1179
meridian *147*
meson table 1351
mesons *1259*
Mesopotamia 319
mesoscopic 983
mesozoic *578*
Messier object listing 564
metacentric height *1189*
metal alloys 788
metal halogenide lamps 1179
metal multilayers 787, 788
metallic bands *1166*
metallic shine 790
metallurgy 315
metals 792, 1352
metals, transition 1352
metamaterials *756*
metamorphic rocks *1153*
metamorphites 1154
metaphor *865*
meteorites 246
metre *909*
metre bars 620
metre rule 1433
metre sticks *317*
metric *449*, *455*
metric connection *558*
metric space *887*, *1407*, 1407
metricity 42, 48, 54, 97, 677, 679, 689
Mg 788
micro 911
micronystagmus *763*
microscope *740*, 983
microscope, atomic force 259, 372
microscopes, light 960
microscopic 983
microscopic motion *628*
microscopic system *1081*
microscopy *766*
microscopy, fluorescence 767
microscopy, stimulated emission depletion *767*
microwave background temperature 924
microwave oven 779
microwaves 733
Mie scattering 792, *1015*
migration 1251
mile 912
milk 404, 566, 751, 842, 949
Milky Way 564
Milky Way's age 925
Milky Way's mass 925
Milky Way's size 925
milli 911
million dollars 854
mind 1094
mind change *28*
mind-reading 782
minerals 931
mini comets *171*
miniaturization feats of living beings 1120
minimum 1016
minimum electrical charge 773
minimum force in nature *496*
Minkowski space-time 422

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

M

Mintaka

Mintaka 594
minute *911*, *926*
Miocene 579
Mir 176
miracles 802, 842, 870
mirage *742*, 936
mirror 697, 717, 737, 1008, *1208*
mirror and source, motion of 1192
mirror molecules 1127
mirror, concave 718
mirrors 1033, 1192
mixed state *1076*
mixture of light *748*
Mn 788
MnO 1171
Mo 787
mobile phone 671
modified Newtonian dynamics *654*
moduli space *1300*
mole *909*, 1061
molecular cloud 801
molecular motors 1122, 1125
molecular pumps *1122*
molecular vibrations and rotations *1164*
molecule 515
molecule size 1333
molecules 258
molecules as bosons 1057
molecules, mirror 1127
molybdenum 1357
momenergy *451*
moment 47
moment of inertia *102*, 105, 217, 223
moment of inertia, extrinsic *105*
moment of inertia, intrinsic *105*
moment, magic 872
momentum *93*, *98*, 100, 181, *206*, 451
momentum as a liquid 179
momentum change *179*
momentum conservation follows from mass conservation 94
momentum density *714*
momentum flows 98
momentum of a wave *231*
momentum, angular *105*
momentum, flow of 179
momentum, limit to 1478
momentum, relativistic *440*
monade *1442*
MOND *654*
money, humorous definition of 381
monism 1530
monochromatic *748*
monocycle 90
monopole, magnetic 720, 1296
monopoles 708
Monster group 900
monster group 900
month 326
Moon 14, 144, 628, 1233
Moon and brain 868
Moon and laser 741
Moon calculation 144
Moon density and tides 160
Moon formation 578
Moon illusion *69*
Moon path around Sun 168
Moon phase 172
Moon size illusion 69
Moon size, angular 69
Moon size, apparent 144
Moon's atmosphere 299
Moon's mass 925
Moon's mean distance 925
Moon's radius 925
Moon, dangers of 160
Moon, fall of 144
Moon, laser distance measurement 632
moons 204
Moore's law *993*
morals 189
mornings, quietness of 245
MoS_2 1175
moth *263*
motion *33*, *317*, *499*, *799*
motion and measurement units 910
motion as an illusion 1486
motion as illusion 24, 1142
motion backwards in time *985*
motion detectors 37
motion does not exist 23, 423
motion in living beings 1122
motion invariance *35*
motion inversion *716*
motion inversion violation 1280
motion is based on friction 181
motion is change of position with time *73*
motion is due to particles 30
motion is relative *32*
motion is the change of state of objects *34*
Motion Mountain 23
motion of continents 41
motion of images 798
motion, drift-balanced *333*
motion, faster than light 292
motion, harmonic 226
motion, hyperbolic *462*
motion, limits to 1458
motion, manifestations 23
motion, non-Fourier *333*
motion, passive *29*, 181
motion, simplest 30
motion, superluminal 435
motion, volitional *29*
motion, voluntary 181
motor 407
motor bike 91
motor, electrostatic 182
motor, linear 182
motor, unipolar 700
motorbike 468
motors 182, *1122*
mountain 445
moustache 56
movable property 91
movement *29*
mozzarella 982
MRI 1222
mu-metal *794*
multiple universes *1345*
multiplet *213*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

M

MULTIPLICATION

multiplication *212*, *875*
multiplicity *1502*
multiverse 848, 1444
muon 1229, 1276, 1291
muon neutrino 1276, 1292
Muons 1161
muons *635*, 636
Musca domestica 50, 1304
muscle motion 1122
muscles 829, 1122
music record 435
MW, middle waves 732
mycoplasmas *1137*
myoglobin *1170*
myosin 1125
myosotis *209*
mysteries 842
mystery of motion 22
Myxine glutinosa 1327
Möbius strip 897
Mössbauer effect 501
Mößbauer effect 792

N

n-Ge 787
n-Si 787
Na 1179
nabla 325
NaCl 788
NaI 1179
naked singularities 617, 1417
Nannosquilla decemspinosa 86
nano 911
Nanoarchaeum equitans 205
nanoscopic 983
NASA 915, 1188
NASA 748, 931
natural *55*
natural numbers *828*
natural sciences *836*
natural units *1467*, 1467
nature *33*, *806*, 1093
nature and computer science 991
nature, sense of 865
Navier–Stokes equations *262*
Nb-Oxide-Nb 787
$NbSe_2$ 1175
Ne 787
near-field scanning optical microscopy *766*
necessities, science of symbolic 833
necklace of pearls 431
needle on water 270
negative *541*, *674*
negative group velocity 754
negative vector *78*
neighbourhood *895*, *896*, 896
neocortex 332
neodymium 1357
Neogene 579
neon 1357
neon lamp 1163
Neptune 171, 172
neptunium 1357
Nernst effect 789
nerve signal speed 41
nerve signals 947
nerves *774*
network *810*
neural networks 808
neurological science 1142
neurologists 804
neurons 810, *813*, 829
neurosciences 1290
Neurospora crassa 50
neutral bodies *675*
neutral current interaction *1283*
neutral element *213*
neutrinium 1287
Neutrino 1161
neutrino 260, 417, 456, 577, 635, 656, 1078, 1243, *1275*, 1287
neutrino flux on Earth 1285
neutrino oscillations *1285*
neutrino, Earth *1285*
neutrino, electron 1292
neutrino, fossil *1285*
neutrino, man-made *1285*
neutrinos 1210
neutrinos, atmospheric *1285*
neutrinos, solar *1285*
neutron 1038, 1259, 1349
neutron levitation 1228
neutron mass 1269
neutron star 204, 672
neutron stars *1153*, 1237
neutron trap 1228
neutron, magnetic moment 1264
neutrons *1228*
neutrons and table tennis 1204
new age 1095
New Galactic Catalogue 566
newspaper 351
newton 911
Newtonian physics *39*, *178*
NGC 205 566
NGC 2240 280
Ni 788
Niagara 250
Niagara Falls 309
nickel 670, 1357
nigh goggles 916
niobium 787, 1357
Nit 917
nitrogen 266, 1357
NMR 1222
no *619*
no-cloning theorem *1061*, 1106
NOAA 970
Nobel Prizes, scientists with two 1177
nobelium 1357
noble gases *1352*
node *717*
Noether charge *220*
Noether's theorem *219*
noise *287*, *812*
noise thermometry 350
noise, (physical) *240*
non-Cantorian *948*
non-classical 1004
non-classical light *1001*, *1005*
non-commutative space-time 1302
non-local *1082*
non-singular matrix 901
non-stationary *782*
non-unitarity 1094
nonholonomic constraints *199*
nonius *65*
nonlinear sciences 928

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

N

NONSENSE

nonsense *845*
nonstandard analysis *885*
Nordtvedt effect 494, 653
norm *78*, *877*, *879*
normal distribution *288*
normality *954*
normality of π 926
North Pole 49, 125, 150, 504, 590, 1024
north poles 686, 800
nose *1133*
notation, scientific 319
notion *817*
nova *575*, 801
novae 568
novelty seeking 872
nuclear explosions 245
nuclear fission *1240*
nuclear magnetic resonance 1222, *1224*
nuclear magneton 923
nuclear material accident or weapon use 800
nuclear motion, bound *1239*
nuclear reaction 1273
nuclear reactor, natural 1244
nuclear warhead 1339
nuclei *182*, 577
nucleon 260
nucleosynthesis *577*
nucleus 1025, *1227*
nuclides *1228*, 1349
null *424*
null geodesics *558*
null vector *78*
null vectors 449, *450*
number of particle *860*
number of stars 1437
number theory 885
numbers *217*, *832*
numbers, hypercomplex 884–886
numbers, transfinite 826
nutation *128*
nutshell, general relativity in a 626
nymphs 1335

O

object *32*, 45, *89*, *819*, *1081*, *1398*
object, full list of properties 1291
object, levitation 783
objects *33*, *317*
objects are made of particles 1334
objects, real *445*
objects, virtual *445*
oblique microscopy *766*
obliquity *128*, 379
observable limits, system-dependent 1475
observables *34*, *216*, *851*, 1028
observables, discrete *217*
observation *812*, 852, 1088
observations *807*, *1086*
observer, comoving *459*
Occam's razor 838, *1501*
ocean floors 1154
ocean levels 800, 801
oceanography *247*
octave *236*
octaves *883*
octet *215*
octonions *883*, 890
odometer 58, 449
ohm 911
Ohm's 'law' 703
Ohm's relation *775*
oil 98, 268, 790
oil film experiment 251
oil tankers 699
Oklo 1244
Olbers 586
Olbers' paradox *586*, 1474
Oligocene 579
Olympic year counting 327
Olympus mons 1171
omega 1349
one million dollar prize 907
one-body problem 1199
onset 963
onto *825*
ontological reach *857*
Oort cloud 204, 800
op. cit. 327
Opel 671
open link 1073
open questions in physics 1341
operation, (binary) *827*
operator 149
operator, adjoint 1060
Ophiuchus *170*
opposite 820, *842*
optical activity 790, *960*
optical black holes *1211*
optical Kerr effect 792
optical nonlinear effects 792
optical radiation thermometry 350
optically induced anisotropy 791
optoacoustic affect 792
optogalvanic effect 792
orange 734
orbifold *900*
orbits 557
orchid 1121
order 48, 54, 97, *302*, 677
order parameter *306*
order structures *827*
order, partial *424*
order, total *876*
ordered pair *824*
ordinal numbers *830*
ordinals *885*
Ordovician 578
ore-formers 1352
organelles 1122
organic compounds *1165*
orgasms 313
orientation change needs no background 107
orientation sensors *1133*
origin, human 22
original Planck constant 921
origins of the heavy chemical elements 1341
Orion 84, 444, 593
orthogonality 78
oscillation 226
oscillation, harmonic or linear 226
oscillator *1134*
oscillons *304*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

osmium 1357
osmosis *182*, 297
otoacoustic emissions *234*
outer product 325
oven *769*
overdescription *713*
Oxford 626
oxygen 266, 1358
oxygen depletion 800
oxygen, appearance in atmosphere 648
ozone shield reduction 800

P
π 453
π and gravity 146
π, normality of *926*
P violation 1277
p-Ge 790
packing of spheres 1197
paerlite 273
Paffinus griseus 1128
pain sensors *1133*
paint, black 586
painting puzzle 177
pair creation 792, 1332
Paleocene 579
Paleogene 579
paleozoic *578*
palladium 1358
Pangaea 578
pantheism *1535*
paper aeroplanes 931
paper boat contest 267
parabola 69, *75*, 146, 155, 537, 607
parabolic *155*
parachutes 181
paradox about physics books 316
paradox of incomplete description *855*
paradox of overcomplete description *856*
paradox, EPR 1083
paradox, liar's 845
paraelectricity 789
paraffin 1150
parallax *116*, *128*
parallelepiped 106
paramagnetism *687*, 788
Paramecium 1308
parameter *851*
parameter space *1300*
parametric amplification 792
parenthesis 326
parhelia *751*
parity 1292
parity invariance *718*
parity violation 1277, 1279
parity violation in electrons 1279
parking challenge 66
parsec 574, 923
particle *83*, 1058, *1398*
Particle Data Group 1375
particle data group 930
particle exchange 1506
particle number *860*, 860
particle, real *1037*
particle, ultrarelativistic 452
particle, virtual *1012*, *1037*
particles 1056
particles, massive *412*
particles, virtual *1189*, *1469*
partons *1257*
parts *33*, *83*, *293*
parts in nature 1501
parts, sum of 855
pascal 911
Paschen–Back effect 788
passim *327*
passive motion 186
past light cone *424*
path *73*
paths *990*
paths of motion *626*
patterns *836*
patterns of nature *806*
Paul trap 260
Paul traps 786
Pauli exclusion principle 948, 1060, 1065, 1068, 1070, 1071
Pauli pressure 1069
Pauli spin matrices *882*, 1262
Pauli's exclusion principle *1068*, 1152
Pauw, method of Van der 703
Pb 792
$Pb(NO_3)_2$ 1152
PbI_2 1384
PbLaZrTi 790
PbSe 787
PbTe 787
pea dissection 60
pearl necklace paradox *431*
pearls 272
peas 137
pee research 311
peers *929*
Peirce's puzzle 64
Peltier effect 787
pencil, invention of 39
pencils 1175
pendulum 146
penetrability of matter 986
penguins 109
Penning effect 787
Penning traps *443*, 786
Penrose inequality 493, 1465
Penrose process 1213
Penrose–Hawking singularity theorems 617, 652
pentaquarks *1272*, 1376
people 1251
perceptions *807*
perfect copy 1061
performers *929*
periastron *537*
periastron shift 537
perigee 925
perihelion *158*, *537*, *925*
perihelion shift *131*, 157, 628
period *228*
periodic decimal expansion 831, 834, 885
periodic table *1351*
periodic table of the elements *1146*, 1351
permanence *31*, 985, 1095
permanence of nature 24
permanent free fall 606
permanganate 1166
permeability 757
permeability, vacuum *690*
Permian 578
permittivity 757

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

P

PERMITTIVITY

permittivity of free space *678*
permutation symmetry *212*, *1055*
perovskite *1157*
perpetual motion machine *99*
perpetuum mobile *96*
perpetuum mobile, first and second kind 99
person 945
perturbation calculations 620
perverted *869*
Peta 911
Phaedrus 1520
phanerophyte, monopodal *1129*
phase *228*, *229*, *723*
phase conjugated mirror activity 792
phase factor *713*
phase of wave function 1034
phase space *33*, *186*, *798*
phase space diagram 75
phase velocity *752*
phase, thermodynamic *1053*
phase-contrast microscopy *766*
PhD, enjoying it 313
pheasants 1305
phenomena, supernatural 854
phenomena, unnatural 854
phenomenological high-energy physics 928
phenomenon *836*
pheomelanin 1165
Philaenus spumarius 81
Philips 1191
philosophers 999
philosophers of science 805
phonon Hall effect *1175*
phosphorescence 791
phosphorus 1358
phot 916
photino *1299*
photoacoustic effect *296*, *298*, 792, 1384
photochromism 1167
photoconductivity 792
photoeffect 790
photoelectricity 790
photoelectromagnetic effect 788
photography *766*, 790
photography, limits of 1492
photoluminescence 791
photon *991*, *1283*, 1291
photon as elementary particle 1000
photon cloning 1106
photon decay 603
photon drag effect 790
photon hall effect *1366*
photon number density 924
photon sphere *609*
photon, mass of 719
photon, position of 1003
photon-photon scattering 1333
photonic Hall effect 789, *1175*
photons *995*, 999, 1335
photons and interference 1008
photons and naked eye 994
photons as arrows 1007
photons, entangled 1005
photons, eye detection of single 997
photons, spin of *999*
photons, virtual *1012*
photorefractive materials 743, 792
photostriction 790
physical aphorism 1514
physical concepts, discovery of 838
physical explanation *866*
physical observations *211*
physical system *34*, 1441, *1459*
physicists 930
physics *22*, *836*, *839*
physics as limit statements 16
physics papers 757
physics problems 930
physics, boring 820
physics, etymology of 839
physics, everyday 34
physics, open questions in 1341
physics, outdated definition 29
physiology 804
pico 911
piezoelectricity *182*, 789
pigeons 109, 1133
pigs 1251, 1452
pile *696*
pinch effect 787
ping command to measure light speed 682
ping-pong ball 135
pion 1229, 1348
Pioneer anomaly *563*
Pioneer satellites 81
Pisces 170
Planck acceleration 1418
Planck area, corrected 496
Planck density 1413
Planck force 474
Planck length *621*, *1401*, *1455*
Planck limit 735
Planck limits, corrected *1467*
Planck mass *1411*
Planck stroll 917
Planck time 1217, *1401*, 1428
Planck units, corrected 913
Planck values 1467
Planck's (reduced) constant *978*
Planck's (unreduced) constant 977
Planck's constant *768*, *997*
Planck's natural length unit *621*
Planck's natural units *912*
plane gravity wave 529
planet 99
planet formation 578
planet–Sun friction 99
planetoids 204, 205
plankton 1050, 1308
plant sensors for electric and magnetic fields 721
plants 35
plants appear 578
plasma 567, 1172
plasma clouds, floating 779
plasmas 773, 787, 792
plasmoids *779*
plate tectonics *126*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

P

PLATES

plates *780*
platinum 1358
platonic ideas 1429
platonism *821*
platypus 683
play 29, *836*
pleasure system *1143*
Pleiades star cluster 579
Pleistocene 579
pleural cavity 257, 386
Pleurotya ruralis 86
Pliocene 579
plumb-line 61
plumbum 1356
Pluto 171
plutonium 1358
pneumothorax *386*
Pockels effect 790
Poincaré algebra *893*
point contacts *702*
point exchange 1506
point mass *83*
point particle *83*
point particles, size of 614
point, mathematical *53*
point-like for the naked eye *84*
pointer *1089*
points *39*, 84, *896*
points, shape of 1487
points, size of 1496–1498
poise 1306
poisons *35*, 1150
Poisson equation *149*
Poisson's spot 743
polar motion *124*
Polaris 205
polarizability 789
polarization *233*, *728*, 790, *1011*, 1167
polarization brush *730*
polarization detection with the unaided human eye 730
polarization of light 999
polarization, electrical *677*
polarizers in car lights and windscreens 758
polders 742
pole, magnetic, in a mirror *717*
poles *684*
police 1033
pollen 1306
polonium 1150, 1358
polymer 790, 791
polymer electronics 808
polymer, DNA as 1149
polymers, electroactive 1129
Pontecorvo–Maki–Nakagawa–Sakata mixing matrix 1283
pool, game of 440
pop *368*
porcine principle *869*, 1452
Pororoca 243
Porpoise Cove 46
posets 1440
position *1095*
positional system *324*
positions *77*
positive *541*, *674*
positive or negative 677
positivity 97
positron *1049*
positron charge 921
positron tomography 1141
possibility of knots 54
post-Newtonian formalism 516
postcard 62
potassium 240, 299, 683, 1237, 1358
potato as battery 696
potential energy *149*
potential energy in relativity *452*
potential, gravitational *148*
potential, spherical 1044
power *453*, 916
power emission, limit to 1477
power lines 695
power paradox *490*
power set 823, *825*
power supply noise 795
power, humorous definition of 381
power, maximum 471
power, maximum in nature 616
power, maximum, assumptions 482
power, physical *102*, *179*
Poynting field 722
Poynting vector 530, *714*, *716*, 716, 721
PPN, parametrized post-Newtonian formalism *516*
praeseodymium 1359
praesodymium 1164
pralines 266
praying effects 206
precession 128, 538
precession of a pendulum *119*
precession, equinoctial *123*
precision *25*, 36, 40, 73, *315*, 416, *844*, *920*, *921*
precision does not increase with energy 1500
precision, maximal 1429
precision, maximum 1423
predicates *819*
predictions, difficulties for 1138
prefixes *911*, 952
prefixes, SI 911
prejudice *841*
preon models 1524
preprints *928*, 930
present *424*, *1140*
present, Zeno and the absence of the 1140
presocratics 950
pressure 180, 256, *286*
pressure of light 745
pressure, negative 1187
primal scream 1212
primary blue 734
primary green 734
primary red 733
primates 764
primates, appearance of 579
prime knots *1324*, 1324
primes, Sophie Germain *966*
principal quantum number *1146*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

P

PRINCIPE

Principe, island of 642
principle of equivalence *499*
principle of gauge invariance *212*
principle of general covariance *553*
principle of general relativity *553*
principle of least action 116, 151, *198*, 1028
principle of minimal coupling *553*
principle of relativity *212*, *357*, *420*
principle of the straightest path 184
principle, anthropic *1345*
principle, correspondence *553*
principle, equivalence *553*
principle, extremal *194*
principle, physical *836*
principle, simian 1345
principle, variational *194*
printed words 829
prism 336
prison 991
prize, one million dollar 262
probability 1087
probability amplitude 1093
probability distribution 1023
problems, physical 930
Proca Lagrangian *720*
process, chemical 443
process, sudden *189*
processes *283*
Procyon 205, 594
prodigies 324
product set *824*
product, dyadic 325
product, outer 325
projective planes *897*
promethium 1359
pronunciation, Erasmian *322*
proof *840*
propeller 368
propellers in nature 85
proper distance *449*
proper length 428
proper time *47*, *422*, *449*
proper velocity 41, *425*
properties of nature *806*
properties of the elementary particles 1291
properties, emergent 309, 855
protactinium 1359
protan *771*
proterozoic *578*
proton 1038, *1228*, 1259, 1348
proton age 46
proton decay *1296*
proton lifetime 1296, 1333
proton mass 1269, 1333
proton radius 1038
proton shape, variation of 1270
proton stability or decay 1341
proton, magnetic moment 1264
proton–electron mass ratio 923
protonvolt 914
prototype kilogram 627
pseudovector *135*, *688*
PSR 1257+12 205
PSR 1913+16 46, 525, 531
PSR J0737-3039 525
psychokinesis 29
psychological existence *856*
psychology 1290
public *844*
pulley 182
pullovers 895
pulsar 566
pulsar period 46
pulsars 531, 628
pulse 234
pulsed impulse kill laser *770*
pumps *1122*
pure *880*
pure state *1075*
pure truth 840
purpose *866*
pyramid 106
pyroelectricity 790
Pythagoras' theorem 67

Q

Q-factor *226*
q-numbers 885
Q0957+561 595
QED 1048
QED diagrams 1509
QED in one statement 1470
qoppa 321
quadrupole *530*
quadrupole radiation 530
quality factor *1189*
quanti, piccolissimi 252
quantitative biology 928
quantities *217*, *851*
quantities, conserved *24*
quantity of matter 92, 97
quantity, extensive *98*
quantization *997*
quantization, EBK 1044
quantons *999*, *1011*, *1019*, *1334*
quantum action principle *1029*
quantum asthenodynamics *1286*
quantum chromodynamics *1260*
quantum computers 1061
quantum computing 1086, 1109
quantum dots 702
quantum electrodynamics *1048*
quantum field theory 1301
quantum fluctuations 1440
quantum geometry *1401*, 1410, 1446, 1472, *1490*, 1513
quantum gravity 1485
quantum groups *1302*
quantum Hall effect 1178
quantum lattices 1440
quantum mechanical system *1081*
quantum mechanics *178*
quantum mechanics applied to single events 1095
quantum numbers *1064*, 1292
quantum of action 455, *768*, *978*
quantum of change *978*
quantum of entropy *291*
quantum of information *291*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Q
QUANTUM

quantum particles *1336*
quantum physics 928
quantum principle *977*
quantum theory 33, 254
quantum theory and computer science 991
quantum theory in one statement 1460
quantum Zeno effect 1495
quark confinement 1260, 1265
quark mass *1269*
quark masses *1269*
quark stars 1153
quarks 577, 1179, *1257*, 1259
quartets *215*
quartz 228, 789–791, *1154*
quartz, transparency of 1162
quasar 204, *436*
quasars *576*, 616, *1213*
quasistatic fields 732
Quaternary 579
quaternion, conjugate 879
quaternions 832, *878*, 890
qubits *1086*
quietness of mornings 245
quotation marks 806
quotations, mathematical 932

R

R-complex 332
Rad 1244
radar 414
radian *67*, *910*
radiation *90*, *284*, *401*, 469, *724*, *798*, 1348
radiation composite *1350*
radiation exposure 1233
radiation thermometry 349
radiation, black body 793
radiation, observer dependence of 780
radiation, observers made of 1096
radiation, thermal 793
radiative decay 1332
radicals *1057*
radio control, simplest possible 725
radio field *671*
radio interference *1185*
radio speed 41
radio transmitter, simplest possible 725
radio waves *724*, 732
radioactivity 915, 1053, *1224*
radioactivity, artificial *1241*
radioactivity, of human body 1235
radiocarbon dating 1245
radiocarbon method *1236*
radiometer *745*
radiometer effect 792
radiometric dating *1236*, 1236, 1244
radium 1359
radius, covalent 1362
radius, ionic 1362
radon 1359
rail guns 698
rain drops 76, 183
rain on demand 1330
rain speed 41
rainbow 217, 658, 726, 740
rainbow due to gravity 1216
rainbow polarization 751
rainbow width 751
rainbow, explanation 748
rainbow, irregular *751*
rainbow, twinned *751*
rainbows, supernumerary 726
raindrops 1329
Raleigh scattering 792
RAM 1033
Raman effect 792
Raman scattering *1015*
random *187*
random errors *920*
random pattern 31
random-access memory 1033
randomness 187
randomness, experimental 1087
range *826*
rank 218
Ranque–Hilsch vortex tube 299
rapidity *417*
ratchet *1125*
ratchet, classical *1126*
ratchet, quantum 1126
rational coordinates 926
rational numbers *830*, *876*
rattleback *136*
ravioli 137
ray days 401
ray form *172*
Rayleigh scattering *1015*
rays *401*
reactions *988*
reactions, nuclear *1239*
reactor, natural nuclear 1244
real numbers 48, *53*, *830*, *831*, *876*
real particle *1037*
reality 807
reals *830*
reason *866*
recognition 31, 1059
recognize *31*
recoil *681*
recombination *577*, 787
record *812*, 1086
rectilinear *462*
red 733, *764*
red-shift 413, 603
red-shift mechanisms 603
red-shift number *414*
red-shift tests 628
red-shift values 1211
reduced Planck constant 921
reducible *215*
reductionism 867
reed instruments *236*
reel 25
reflection 560, 743, *1008*
reflection of waves 232
reflection, total 1050
reflectivity *744*, 790
refraction 207, *233*, 560, *738*, 755, 760, 788, 791, 1010, 1167
refraction and photons 1013
refraction index, negative 755
refraction of matter waves 1039
refraction, vacuum index of 534

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

R

REFRACTIVE

refractive index *207*
Regge trajectory *1266*
Regulus 205, 594
Reissner–Nordström black holes *610*
relation 821
relation, binary *824*
relations *33*, *807*, *824*
relativistic acceleration *450*
relativistic contraction *421*
relativistic correction *421*
relativistic jerk *451*
relativistic kinematics *419*
relativistic mass *452*
relativistic velocity *449*
relativity *191*
relativity, doubly special 1525
relativity, Galileo's principle of *132*
relativity, special, and dislocations 1320
relaxation *1078*
religion *843*
reluctance to turn 102
rem 1244
remote control, simplest possible 725
renormalizable *1301*
representation *214*, 877, 882, 884
representation of the observables 218
representations *213*
repression *720*
reproducibility *211*
reproduction *1121*
research 184
research fraud 1352
reservoir *1076*, *1077*
reset mechanism *1135*
resin 669
resinous 674
resistance of single atoms 703
resistivity, Joule effect 787
resolution *961*
resources *929*
rest *24*, *498*, *499*, 979
rest does not exist *1335*
rest energy *443*
rest mass *452*
rest, Galilean *78*
retina 763
retroreflecting paint 760
Reuleaux curves *357*
reversal of Earth's magnetic field 800
reversibility of motion 187
reversible *283*, *612*
Reynolds number *312*, *1306*, 1379
rhenium 1197, 1359
Rhine 270
rhodium 1359
rhythmites, tidal *339*
Ricci scalar 546, *548*, 549
Ricci tensor 480, *548*
Richardson effect 787
Richter magnitude *135*
riddle 23
Riemann curvature tensor 561
Riemann tensor *561*
Riemann-Christoffel curvature tensor *561*
Riemannian manifold *561*
Rigel 205, 594
Righi–Leduc effect 789
right-hand rule *106*
right-handers 717
rigid bodies 1196
rigid bodies do not exist in nature 468
rigid coordinate system *461*
rigidity 429
ring *875*
ring interferometers 918
ring laser 339
rings, astronomical, and tides 159
Roadrunner 272
Robertson–Walker solutions 580
robot 345
robot, walking 207
robotics 881
robots walking on water 140
Roche limit *381*
rock cycle *1153*
rock magnetization 126
rock types 1154
rocket 612
rocket launch sites 134
rocket motor 182
rocks *1153*
rod distance 460
rods *1132*
rods in retina *764*, 829, 1100
roentgenium 1359
rolling *107*
rolling puzzle 38
rolling wheels 107
Roman number system *324*
rope attempt 483
ropelength *1325*
rose 863
rosetta 607
rosetta paths 609
Rostock, University of 267
Roswell incident 245
rotation *711*, 880, *1071*
rotation and arms 133
rotation change of Earth 123
rotation of atoms 1039
rotation of the Earth 917
rotation rate 102
rotation sense in the athletic stadium 49
rotation speed 102
rotation, absolute or relative 134
rotational axis 1024
rotational energy *105*
rotational motors *1122*
roulette and Galilean mechanics 111
rubber 1323
rubidium 1359
Rubik's Cube 246, 829
ruby 790, 792, *1154*
ruby glass 1168
rugby 101
rules *836*
rules of nature *806*
runaway breakdown 776
Runic script 320
running backwards 295
running on water 340
running reduces weight 167

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

R

RUNNING

running speed record, human *75*
ruthenium 1359
rutherfordium 1359
rutile *729*
Rydberg atoms *1045*
Rydberg constant 315, 922, *1043*, 1333
Röntgen, unit 1244

S

S duality 1300
S-duality *1498*
Sackur–Tetrode formula 1053
Sagarmatha, Mount 150, 269
Sagittarius 131, 170
Sagnac effect *121*, 374
Sahara 828
Sahara, 50 Hz signal in middle of 794
sailfish 41
sailing 98, 403
sails 262
Saiph 594
salamander 683
Salmonella 86, 1309
salt 790, 924
salt-formers 1352
Salticidae 1172
samarium 1164, 1360
sampi 321
san 321
sand 303, 828, 1386
sapphire *1154*, 1166
Saraeva *330*
Sasaki–Shibuya effect 787
satellite *84*
satellite phone and light speed 725
satellite, artificial *84*
satellites 136, 171, 1211
satellites, observable 931
saturable absorption 792
saturation 872
Saturn 159, 171, 472
scalar *210*, *217*, *886*
scalar multiplication *886*
scalar part of a quaternion *879*
scalar product 54, *78*, *887*
scale 134, 272
scale factor *456*, 586
scale invariance 254
scale symmetry 209, *552*
scaling *1175*
scaling law *48*
scallop theorem *1308*
scallops *1307*
scandium 1360
scanning for imaging *766*
Scarabeus 730
scattering 743, 750, 791, 1167, *1239*
scattering experiment 1226
Schadt–Helfrichs effect 790
Schottky effect 789
Schrödinger equation, complex numbers in 1319
Schrödinger equation, for extended entities 1318
Schrödinger picture 1074
Schrödinger's cat *1074*, 1082
Schrödinger's equation 1146
Schrödinger's equation of motion *1030*
Schumann resonances 942
Schwarzschild black holes *607*
Schwarzschild metric *506*, *606*
Schwarzschild radius *507*, *605*
Schwarzschild radius as length unit *914*
ScI_3 1179
science *849*
science fiction 443, 1071
science fiction, not in quantum gravity 1219
science of symbolic necessities 822, 832, 833
science, end of 860
scientific method 839
scientism *849*
scientist *849*
scissor trick *1066*, *1106*
scissors 435
Scorpius 170
Scotch tape 697
scotopic sensitvity *958*
screw 181
screw dislocations *1320*
scripts, complex 323
Se 792
sea wave energy 247
sea waves, highest 243
seaborgium 1360
search engines 633
searchlight effect *431*
season 151
second *909*, *911*, *926*
second harmonic generation 791
second principle of thermodynamics 1208, 1452
second property of quantum measurements: *1087*
secret service 1172
sedenions *885*
sedimentary rocks *1153*
sedimentites 1154
Sedna *171*
see through clothes 1366
Seebeck effect 787
seeing *743*, 769
selenite 61
selenium 1360
self-acceleration 1216
self-adjoint *215*
self-organization *193*
self-referential *845*
self-similarity *58*
semi-ring 828, *875*, *876*
semiconductivity 787
semiconductor bands *1166*
semiconductor, garlic-smelling 1361
semiconductors 789
semimajor axis *538*
semisimple *892*
sensations *807*
sense of life 865
sense of nature 865
senses 976
sensors, animal 1133
separability 677, 1081
separability of the universe 861
sequence *45*, 48, 54, 97, 677

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

S

SEQUOIADENDRON GIGANTEUM

Sequoiadendron giganteum 96
serious *869*
sesquilinear *888*
set 821, *823*
sets in nature 1502
sets, connected 80
sets, not useful to describe the universe 1484
sets, useful to describe the universe? 860
seven sages 669
sex 22, 30, 148, 1052, 1447
sexes, number of 1126
sexism in physics 258, 1513
sextant 341
sha 321
shadow *401*
shadow of Great Wall in China 741, 937
shadow of ionosphere 138
shadow of the Earth 138
shadow of the Earth during a lunar eclipse 144
shadow of the moon by cosmic rays 1232
shadow with halo or aureole 760
shadow with hole 742
shadows 89, 337, 435
shadows and attraction of bodies 173
shadows and radiation 401
shadows not parallel 659
shadows of cables 700
shadows of sundials 50
shadows, colour of 939
shadows, speed of 406, 415, 435
shape 54, *83*, *259*, 429, *980*
shape deformation and motion *85*
shape of points 1487
shape of the Earth *169*
sharks 683, 1133
sharp s *320*
shear stress, theoretical 482
sheep, Greek 322
sheets, thinnest, in nature 1175
Shell study 337
shell, gravity inside matter 173
shells *1146*
SHF, super high frequency 733
ship 96, 265, 403
ships and relativity 132
ships, critical speed 244
shit 76, 336
shock waves *248*
shoe laces 1330
shoe size 919
shoelaces 53, 283
shore birds 340
short *985*
short pendulum 373
shortest measured time 46
shot noise *256*
shot, small 267
shoulders 108
showers, cosmic ray *1233*
shroud, Turin 1245
Shubnikov–de Haas effect 788
shutter 67
shutter time 67
shutter times 1493
shuttlecocks 1171
Si 790
SI prefixes 919
SI system 678
SI units *909*, 920
SI units, supplementary *910*
siemens 911
Sievert 1244
sievert 911, *915*
sign *817*
signal *757*
signal distribution *1134*
signal, physical *751*
silent holes *1211*
silicon 787, 788, *1158*, 1360
Silurian 578
silver 674, 1360
simian principle *869*, 1452
similar *34*
Simon, Julia 336
simple *892*
simply connected *897*
sine curve *226*
single atom 703, 1085, 1137, 1184, 1198, 1417
single events in quantum mechanics 1095
singlets *215*
singular *215*
singular point *969*
singularities 493, 555, 649, 1465
singularities, naked *617*
singularity, dressed 617
singularity, naked 801
sink vortex 338
siren *243*
Sirius 83, 205, 594, 642
situation *34*
size *52*
size limit 492
size of electron 469
skatole *1142*
skew field *876*
skew-symmetric *215*
skin 85, 733, 748
skin effect 787
skipper 76
sky 14, 592, 792
sky, moving 124
skyrmions *1301*
sleeping beauty effect 737
slide rule 152, *366*
slime eel 1327
slingshot effect *168*
Sloan Digital Sky Survey 647, 931
sloth 837
slow motion 447
smallest experimentally probed distance 67
Smekal–Raman effect 792
smiley *326*
smoke 287
snake constellation 170
snakes 1133
snap *368*
snooker 440
snow flakes 1198
snowboard 429
snowboarder, relativistic 429
snowflake speed 41
snowflakes 351, 828
SO(3) 1063

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

S

SOAP

soap bubbles 268
Sobral, island of 642
sodium 240, 280, 299, 333, 683, 1039, 1360
sodium lamps 1179
sodium street lamps 1163
sodium vanadate 729
soft gamma repeater 672
solar cells 790
solar constant, variation 1255
solar data 931
solar sail effect 792
solar storms 795
solar system 204
solar system formation 123
solar system simulator 931
solar system, future of 174
solid bodies 468
solid body, acceleration and length limit *468*
solid state lamps 1183
solid state physics, in society 793
solidity *786*, 792
solitary waves *241*
soliton *242*
solitons *241*, *1301*
sonar 248
sonic boom *248*
sonoluminescence *88*, 792
soul 110, 1335
sound 741
sound channel 245
sound speed 41
sound waves 414
source term 149
sources *149*, *1185*
South Pole 150
south poles 686, 800
south-pointing carriage 191, 562
soviets 685
space *317*
space is necessary 54
space lift 271
space of life 619
space points 84
space travel 134
space, absolute 120, 418, 420
space, absoluteness of 54
space, mathematical 1440
space, metric 1407
space, physical *52*
space, relative or absolute 56
space, white *326*
space-time *33*, *422*, *512*
space-time as lattice 1409
space-time diagram *75*
space-time duality 1300, *1498*
space-time elasticity 1466
space-time foam *1219*
space-time interval *422*
space-time lattices 1440
space-time, fluid 1319
space-time, relative or absolute *56*
space-time, solid 1320
space-time, swimming through curved 1313
spacelike *424*, 449
spacelike convention *449*
spanners, optical *746*
spark 671
spark chambers 1231
sparkler colour 1163
sparks 678, 1163
spatial inversion *219*
special conformal transformations *456*
special orthogonal group 881
special relativity *409*
special relativity and dislocations 1320
special relativity before the age of four 211
special relativity in one statement 1459
specific mechanical energy 367
spectrometers 748
spectrum *889*
spectrum of hot objects 1333
spectrum, photoacoustic 298
speculations *840*
speculative *841*
speed *79*
speed of dark 435
speed of darkness *435*
speed of gravitational waves 528, 533
speed of light 773
speed of light inside the Sun 41, 1249
speed of light, finite 586
speed of light, one-way 467, 468
speed of light, theories with variable 469
speed of light, two-way 468
speed of shadows *435*
speed of sound 94, 123
speed of sound, values 468
speed of the tip of a lightning bolt 700
speed, electron drift 701
speed, highest 41
speed, infinite 318
speed, limit to 1476
speed, lowest 36
speed, perfect *401*, 626
sperm 982, 1309
sperm motion 41
sphere packing 1197
sphere, hairy 959
Spica 205
spiders 730, 740
spin 687, *1025*, *1063*, *1336*
spin 1 particles 747
spin 1/2 and quaternions 881
spin 2 particles 747
spin and classical wave properties 529
spin and extension 1508
spin and rotation 1071
spin foams 1509
spin groups *209*
spin myth *1070*
spin of a wave *527*
spin of gravity waves 527
spin valve effect 788
spin, electron 687
spin, importance of 1508
spin–orbit coupling 539
spin–spin coupling 539
spin–statistics theorem *1069*
spinor *1068*
spinors *217*, *881*, 881

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

S

SPIRITS

spirits 1335
spirituality 189, *843*
split personality 188
spoon 136
spores 1306
spreading of wave function 1032
spring 226
spring constant 226
spring tides *160*
sprinting 141
sprites *777*, 778
square, magic *834*
squark 391
squeezed light *1001*, *1005*
squid 1180
squinting 741
$SrAlO_4$ 791
St. Louis arch 365
stadia 49
stainless steel 273
staircase formula *141*
stairs 50
stalactite 272, 472
stalagmites 41, 404
standard apple 919
standard clock *168*
standard deviation *315*, *920*
standard kilogram *92*
standard pitch *227*
standard quantum limit for clocks *1137*
standing wave 234
stannum 1361
star age 46
star algebra *890*
star approach 800
star classes 205, 593, 594
star colours 1163
star speed measurement 414
star, green 769
stardust *580*
stargazers 931
Stark effect 790
stars 83, 205, 578, 828
stars, neutron 1153
stars, number of 1437
start of physics 579
state *185*, 798, *1074*, 1097
state allows one to distinguish 34
state function *1093*
state of an mass point, complete *185*
state of motion *34*
state of universe 599
state space diagram *75*
state sum *1112*
state, initial *185*
state, physical *34*
statements 805
statements, boring 843
statements, empirical 841
statements, undecidable *844*
states *33*, *317*
static friction *181*, 184
static limit *611*
stationary 198, *782*
stationary fluid motion *260*
statistical mechanics *193*
steel *273*
steel, hot 1163
steel, stainless 273
Stefan–Boltzmann black body radiation constant *793*, 1210, 1333
Stefan–Boltzmann constant 923
Steiner's parallel axis theorem *105*
stellar black hole *616*
steradian *68*, *910*
Stern–Gerlach experiment 1026
stibium 1353
sticking friction *181*
stigma 321
stigmata 847
stilts 846
stimulated emission *1184*
Stirling's formula 297
stock exchange 682
stokes (unit) 1306
stone formation 1153
stones 30, 45, 74, 77, 83, 98, 117, 136, 142–144, 146, 165, 167, 175, 234, 246, 283, 445, 510, 606, 669, 826, 862, 867, 872, 988, 1010, 1019, 1068, 1334
Stoney units 914
stopping time, minimum 484
straight line, drawing a 191
straight lines in nature 61
straightness 52, *61*, 61, 65, 401
strain 507
strange quark *1259*, 1260, 1292
stratus *776*
streets 376
Streptococcus mitis 1128
stretch factor *421*
striatum 1135
strike with a field *709*
string theory 1441, 1485, *1514*
strong coupling constant 922, *1262*
strong CP problem 1273
strong field effects *627*
strong nuclear interaction 1228
strong-coupling *959*
strontium 1360
structure constants *892*, 1262
structure, highest human-built 55
stun gun 694
subalgebra *891*
subgroup *213*
subjects *819*
submarine, relativistic 430
submarines 245
subscripts *322*
sugar 737, 790, 791, 960
sulfates 1153
sulphur 1360
sulphuric acid 790
sum of parts 855
Sun 14, 96, 99, 172, 205, 578, 594, 945, 964
Sun density and tides 160
Sun dogs 937
Sun size, angular 69
Sun will indeed rise tomorrow 150
Sun's age 925
Sun's heat emission 945, 964
Sun's luminosity 925, 945, 964

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

S

SUN'S

Sun's mass 925
Sun's motion around galaxy 566
Sun, stopping 272
Sun–planet friction 99
sunbeams 358
sundial 49
sundials 47, 50
sundogs 751
sunflower 828
sunny day 916
sunset 751
superalgebras 893
superboom 248
superbracket *893*
supercavitation *264*
supercommutator *893*
superconducting supercollider 1286
superconductivity 787, *1176*, 1273, 1333, 1334
superconductors 789
superfluidity 267, *1177*, 1198, 1333
supergiants 205
supergravity *1299*
superlubrication *181*
superluminal *757*
superluminal motion 435
superluminal speed 597
supermarket 49
supermassive black holes *616*
supernatural phenomena 854, 1336
supernovae *88*, 568, *575*, 801
supernumerary rainbows *726*
superposition *232*, *723*
superposition, coherent *1075*
superposition, incoherent *1076*
superradiation 792
superstition *841*
superstring theory *1514*
supersymmetry 1295, *1297*, *1299*, 1413, *1514*
suprises, divine 870
surface *53*, 1325
surface gravity of black hole *605*
surface tension *183*
surface tension waves *229*
surface, compact 897
surface, physical *489*, *1468*
surfaces of genus *n* *897*
surfing 243
surjective 215
surprises 189, 220
surprises in nature 799
surreal *830*
surreal numbers 948
surreals *885*
suspenders 660
SW, short waves 732
swimming *1307*
swimming and atoms 1307
swimming speed underwater 264
swimming through curved space-time 1313
swimming, macroscopic 1307
swimming, microscopic *1307*
swimming, olympic *244*
Swiss cheese 250
switch, electrical 696
switch, inverter 957
switchable magnetism 787
switchable mirror 792
switching off the lights 236
swords in science fiction 1194
syllabary *323*
symbol, mathematical *851*
symbolic necessities, science of 833
symbols 324, *817*
symbols, mathematical 324
symmetries *853*
symmetry *212*
symmetry of the whole Lagrangian 218
symmetry operations *212*
symmetry, event *1417*
symmetry, external *212*, *1298*
symmetry, low *209*
synapses *813*
synchronization of clocks 411, 414
syntactic *819*
syrup 960

Système International d'Unités (SI) *909*
system *1074*, *1081*
system, cloning of macroscopic 1062
system, geocentric 172
system, heliocentric 172
system, isolated 284
system, macroscopic *983*
systematic errors *920*
systems, conservative *149*
systems, dissipative *184*
systems, simple *309*

T

T duality 1300
T violation 1280
T-duality *1498*
table as antigravity device 786
table tennis with neutrons 1204
tachyon *436*, 436, *445*
tachyon mass 445
tachyons 445, 469, *985*
Talitrus saltator 50
Taningia danae 1180
tankers, sinking 699
tantalum 46, 1349, 1360, 1381
tape, adhesive 1175
tape, sticky 1175
Tarantula nebula 564
taste 1133
tau 1276, 1292
tau neutrino 1276, 1292
Taurus 170
tax collection 909
TB 1033
$TbCl_3$ 791
teachers 816
teapot 268, *1346*
technetium 1361
technology 324
tectonic activity 154
tectonics 340
teeth 794, *1159*, 1172
teeth growth 302, 794
telecommunication 769
telekinesis 206, 1336
telephathy 1188

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

T

TELEPHONE

telephone speed 41
teleportation 98, 439, 1062, 1086, 1187, 1336
telescope 244, *739*
telescopes in nature 740
telescopy *767*
television 31, 416, 670
tellurium 1361
telomeres *1131*
temperature *276*, *278*, 278
temperature scale 349
temperature, absolute *278*
temperature, human 1130
temperature, lower limit to 1481
temperature, lowest in universe 280
temperature, negative 280, 300
temperature, relativistic 438
tensor 217, *218*, 690
tensor of curvature 543
tensor order 218
tensor product 325, 1076
tensor trace 545
tensor, antisymmetric *688*
tensor, energy–momentum 715
tensors 548
Tera 911
terabyte 1033
terahertz waves 733, 794, 1161, 1172, 1366
terbium 1361
terms *817*
terrestrial dynamical time *516*
Tertiary 579
tesla 689, 911
Tesla coil 694
Tesla coils 698
test 869
testicle 336
testimony 336
tetra-neutrons 1350
tetrahedral skeletons 1148
tetrahedron 66, 106
tetraquark 1376
tetraquarks 1272
thallium 745, 1361
Thames 403
theoretical high-energy physics 928
theoretical nuclear physics 928
theoretical physicists *839*
theoreticians *840*
theory *843*
theory of everything 804
theory of evolution *843*
theory of motion *804*
theory of relativity *409*
theory, physical *843*
thermal de Broglie wavelength *1080*
thermal emission 787
thermal energy *281*
thermal equilibrium 769
thermal radiation 769, 787, *793*, 793
thermoacoustic engines 300
thermodynamic degree of freedom *294*
thermodynamic equilibrium 606
thermodynamic limit *1410*
thermodynamics *281*
thermodynamics in one statement 1470
thermodynamics, first 'law' of 102
thermodynamics, first principle *281*
thermodynamics, indeterminacy relation of 291
thermodynamics, second 'law' of 102
thermodynamics, second principle *283*
thermodynamics, second principle of 297, 424
thermodynamics, third 'law' of *1016*
thermodynamics, third principle *279*
thermodynamics, zeroth principle *278*
thermoelectric effects 787
thermoluminescence 791
thermomagnetic effects 789
thermometer 1208
thermometry 350
thermostatics *281*
theses *840*
thin lens formula *738*
third 'law' of thermodynamics *1016*
third, major 236
third, minor 236
Thirring effect *521*
Thirring–Lense effect *521*, 539, 608
Thomas precession *438*, 539
Thomson effect 787
thorium 1237, 1361
thorn *320*, 320, 353
thought reading 720
three-body problem 1199
thriller 200
thrips 1306
throw 30
throwing speed, record 41, 65
throwing, importance of 31
thulium 1361
thumb 69
thunderclouds are batteries *777*
thunderstorms 1242
Ti:sapphire laser 1369
tidal acceleration *160*
tidal effects 503, 545, *562*, 607
tides 118, 154, 158, 339, 642
tides and friction 160
tides, once or twice per day 176
tie knots 1330
time *34*, *45*, *317*, *318*, *424*, *1398*
time average *1140*
time delay 628
time dilation factor *411*
time does not exist *1429*
time independence of G 628
time intervals *48*
time inversion 716
time inversion violation 1280
time is deduced by comparing motions *46*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

T

TIME

time is necessary 48
time is what we read from a clock *47*
time machine 427
time machines 1220
Time magazine 504
time measurement, ideal *47*
time of collapse 1091
time scales *1336*
time translation *219*
time travel 132, 985
time travel to the future 427
time, absolute 48, 418, 420
time, absoluteness of 48
time, arrow of 52
time, beginning of *1427*
time, definition of 220
time, flow of 52
time, limits to 1478
time, proper, end of 1406
time, relative or absolute 56
time-bandwidth product 239
timelike *424*, 449
timelike convention *449*
tin 1361
titanium 1361
Titius's rule 174
TmI_5 1179
TNT 1339
TNT energy content 923
Tocharian 336
TOE 804
tog 284
toilet brushes 1306
toilet research 311
tokamak 280, *1253*
TOM 804
Tom Thumb *993*
tomography *767*
tongue *1133*, 1133
tonne, or ton *911*
tooth decay 794, 1161
toothbrush 407, 617
toothpaste 811
toothpick 779
top quark *1259*, 1260, 1292
topness *1292*
topoisomerases 1328
topological invariant *1329*
topological space *896*, *1407*
topological structures *827*
topology 54, *757*, *896*
tornado 1316
torque 105, *525*, 688
torsion 630
torsion balances 643
torus, *n*- *897*
total momentum *93*
total symmetry *1500*
touch *89*
touch sensors *1132*
touching *1494*
tourmaline 790, *1156*
toys, physical 931
trace 691, *1076*
tractor beam 758
train 96
train windows 989
trains 500
trajectory *73*
transfinite number *885*
transfinite numbers *826*
transformation of matter 863
transformation relations *798*
transformation, conformal *431*
transformations *28*, *212*
transformations, linear *889*
transformer, Poynting field *722*
transforms *99*
transition metal compounds *1164*
transition metal impurities *1164*
transition radiation 791
translation *456*
translation invariance 48, 54
transmitter, simplest possible *725*
transparency 790
transpiration-cohesion-tension model *1130*
transport *28*
transporter of energy *757*
transsubstantiation 843
transubstantiation *252*
travel into the past 424
tree 445, 466, 500, 828, 919
tree growth 41, 1130
tree height, limits to 254
tree leaves and Earth rotation 122
tree, family 33
tree, noise of falling 1094
trees *254*
trees and electricity 669
trees and pumping of water 348
trees appear 578
trefoil knot 1324
Triassic 578
triboelectricity *787*
triboluminescence 791
triboscopes 184
tripod 182
trirefringence *729*, 729
tritan 771
tritium 1252
tritone *236*
trivial knot *1324*
Trojan asteroids *157*
tropical year 923
trousers 895
trout 1133
true *842*
true velocity of light *755*
truth *253*, *840*, *1292*
truth quark *1259*
tsunami 231
tubular laser beam 771
tuft 349
tumbleweed 85
tungsten 758, 1179, 1197, 1361
tunnel 436
tunnel through the Earth 175
tunnelling 1033, *1335*
tunnelling effect *986*, *1032*
tunnelling of light 1033
tunnelling rate 1332
turbulence 262, 309
Turin shroud 1245
Turing machines 1440
tv 791
TV tube 1033
tweezers, optical *746*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

twin paradox *426*
twins as father(s) 1127
two-body problem 1199
two-dimensional crystals *1175*
two-dimensional universe *72*
two-squares theorem *877*
Tyndall scattering *1015*
Tyrannosaurus rex 139

U

U-duality *1498*
udeko 911
Udekta 911
UFOs 245, 844
UHF, ultra high frequency 733
ultrarelativistic particle *452*
ultrasound 782, 1133
ultrasound imaging 1160
ultrasound motor 182
ultraviolet 734
ultraviolet light *727*
ultraviolet rays *401*
umbrella *76*
umbrellas 403
unboundedness 42, 48, 54, *217*, 679, 689
unboundedness, openness *97*
uncertainty relation of thermodynamics 291
uncertainty relations *984*, *1021*
uncertainty, total *920*
unconscious *720*
uncountability 825
understand *620*
understanding quantum theory 992
underwater swimming 264
underwater, speed records 264
undisturbed motion *401*
Unicode 323
unicycle 274
unification *867*, *1295*
unification is possible 1500
uniqueness 48, 54
unit 284, *851*, *880*, *909*
unit systems *678*
unitarity 1091, 1094
unitary *215*
unitary vector space 888
units *53*
units, astronomical 923
units, natural 1467
units, non-SI 912
units, Stoney 914
units, true natural *913*
unity *1502*
universal 'law' of gravitation *143*
universal 'law' of gravity *144*
universal gravity as consequence of maximum force 556
universal gravity, deviation from 588
universal semantic primitives *819*
universal time coordinate *47*, *516*, *917*
universality of gravity 158
universals *818*
universe 14, *33*, 186, *602*, 602, *806*, 1199, *1444*
universe is comprehensible 861
universe not a physical system 1441
universe not a set 1440
universe recollapse 801
universe' luminosity limit 1474
universe's initial conditions do not exist 1098
universe, age of 447, 1426, *1427*
universe, believed *571*
universe, description by universal gravitation 168
universe, energy of 598
universe, essence 1443
universe, existence of 861
universe, filled with water or air 588
universe, full *572*
universe, is it a set? 860, 1484
universe, only one 854
universe, oscillating 1426
universe, size of 1433
universe, state of 599
universe, two-dimensional *72*
universe, visible *571*
universe, volume of 1435
universe, wave function of 1097
universes, other 841
UNIX 404, 682
unnatural phenomena 854
unpredictability, practical *187*
unstoppable motion, i.e., light 412
ununbium 1361
ununhexium 1361
ununoctium 1361
ununpentium 1361
ununquadium 1361
ununseptium 1361
ununtrium 1361
up quark *1259*, 1260, 1292
uranium 1224, 1237, 1361
urban legends 742, 847
URL 929
Usenet *929*
UTC 47, 516
UVA 734
UVB 734
UVC 734

V

vacuoles *1170*
vacuum 457, *622*, 758, 1037, 1055, 1207
vacuum curvature 549
vacuum elasticity 1466
vacuum energy density 1341, 1453
vacuum permeability 921
vacuum permittivity 921
vacuum polarization *1049*, 1195
vacuum state *1059*
vacuum wave resistance 922
vacuum, hand in 641
vacuum, human exposure to 134
vacuum, swimming through 1313
vacuum, unstable 801

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

V

VACUUM–PARTICLE

vacuum–particle indistinguishability 1488
value *826*
vampire *737*
Van-der-Waals interaction 1258
vanadium 1361
vanilla ice cream 1143
vanishing *541*, *1076*
variability *31*
variable *34*, *851*
variance *920*
variation 33
variational principle *198*
variational principles *190*
Varuna 204
Čerenkov radiation 410, 540
vector *77*, *217*, *880*, *886*
vector coupling *1284*
vector part of a quaternion *879*
vector potential, dragging by charges *711*
vector potential, magnetic *710*
vector product *106*, *885*
vector space *77*, *886*
vector space, Euclidean *78*, *887*
vector space, Hermitean *888*
vector space, unitary *888*
Vega 205
Vega at the North pole 124
Vela satellites 1371
velars 321
velocimeters 357
velocity *79*, *229*, *318*
velocity as derivative 80
velocity composition formula *417*
velocity is not Galilean 42
velocity measurements 457
velocity of an electron 754
velocity of light, one-way 467, *468*
velocity of light, two-way *468*
velocity, escape 169
velocity, faster than light 453
velocity, perfect 626
velocity, proper *425*, 658
velocity, relative 453
velocity, relative - undefined 546
vendeko 911
Vendekta 911
Venturi gauge 262
Venus 538
verb *819*
verification 872
vernier *65*
VHF, very high frequency 732
Viagra 1357
video recorder 292
Vietnam 176
viewpoint-independence *210*
viewpoints 209
violet 734
Virasoro algebra *893*, *894*, *1515*
Virgo 170
virtual and real particles at Planck scales 1412
virtual image 738
virtual particle *1012*, *1037*
virtual particles 661, 1055, *1189*
virtual photons 1012
virus 1119
virus crystallization 1383
vis viva *99*
viscosity *1306*
viscosity, kinematic 312, *1306*
viscosity,dynamic *1306*
viscous *183*
vitamin B_{12} 1354
vitamin C 1057
vitreous 674
vocabulary *817*, *833*
vocal cords 236
vodka 1184
void 258, *858*
Voigt effect 788
volcano, giant 800
volcanoes 340
Volkswagen 542
volt 911
volume 59
volume of the universe 1435
voluntary motion *181*, 186
von Neumann equation *1076*
vortex *1316*
vortex evolution 1317
vortex filaments *1316*
vortex in bath tub or sink 338
vortex lines 710
vortex rings 270
vortex tube 299
vortex tubes *1316*
vortex, black 611
vortex, circular 313
vortices 263
Voyager satellites 404
Vulcan *158*
Vulcanoids *205*

W

W *787*, 790
W boson 1277, 1291
Waals, van der, forces at feet of Geckos and spiders 1172
wafer, consecrated 259
wafer, silicon 259
walking 108, 283, 808, 947
walking on two legs 808
walking robots 207
walking speed 146
walking speed, maximum animal 377
walking, Olympic 434
warming, global 846, 1173
warp drive situations 1220
water 14, 348, 788, 791, 1349
water cannot fill universe 588
water colour 1164
water density 1333
water drops and droplets 1329
water strider 140
water taps 309
water waves 229, 231, 1190
water waves, group velocity of 244
water, speed records under 264
water-walking robots 140
waterspout *1316*
watt 911
wave *723*
wave angular momentum 747
wave equation *723*, *1030*
wave function 1030, *1093*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

W

WAVE

wave function, phase of *1031*, *1034*
wave function, spreading of 1032
wave function, symmetry of 1056
wave impedance/resistance *757*
wave interference *1185*
wave reflection 232
wave vector *723*
wave, evanescent 962
wave, harmonic *228*
wave, linear *228*
wave–particle duality *999*
wavelength *229*, 233, *726*
wavelet transformation *247*
waves *1335*
waves in relativity 454
waves, circularly polarized *730*
waves, deep 231
waves, electromagnetic *723*, *735*
waves, evanescent 1033
waves, long *231*
waves, longitudinal *229*
waves, shallow 231
waves, short *231*
waves, terahertz 733, 794, 1161, 1172, 1366
waves, transverse *229*
waves, water *229*
waw 321
weak charge *1280*, *1284*, *1292*
weak energy condition *515*
weak equivalence principle 643
weak isospin *1280*, *1284*, *1292*
weak mixing angle 922, *1281*, 1296
weapons with light 770
weather *313*
weather, unpredictability of 187
web cam, Foucault's pendulum 119
web, largest spider 55
weber 911
week *326*
week days, order of 174
Weib 336
Weigert effect 791
weighing light 443
weight *163*, *180*, *518*
weight of the Moon 173
weko 911
Wekta 911
well-tempered intonation *238*
whale brain 814
whale brain size 1134
whales 170, 245, 246, 814, 1133, 1134
wheel axle, effect of 368
Wheeler–DeWitt equation 1097, 1409
wheels and propellers 1307
wheels in living beings 85
wheels in nature 86
whip cracking 274
whip, speed of 41
whirl 131
whirl, hair 717
white *768*
white colour does not last *283*
white dwarf 672
white dwarfs 570, 594
whole, the *806*
wholeness, Bohm's unbroken 1440, 1531
Wien's colour displacement *769*
Wien's displacement constant 923, 1333
wife 336
Wikipedia 906
wind 403
wind resistance 183
window frame 435
windows in trains 989
wine 252, 1016, 1079, 1153
wine arcs 310
wine bottle 98, 112
wine, dating of 1245
wings 262
Wirbelrohr *299*
wise old man 200, 455
WMAP 378
WMAP 495
wobblestone *136*
wolframates 791
women 154, 336, 416, 610
women and physics 1513
women, dangers of looking after 139
words *817*
words heard 829
words spoken 829
work *100*, 100, *199*
work, physical *180*
world 22, *33*, *806*
world colour survey *939*
World Geodetic System 342, 926
world question center 932
world, chaos or system 806
world-line *424*
world-wide web *929*
worm holes 1219
wound healing 1122
wristwatch time 422, 506
writhe *1329*
writing *319*, *852*
written texts 579
wrong *316*, *409*, *840*
wyn *320*

X

X bosons *1296*
X-ray binaries 1256
X-ray lasers 782
X-rays *401*, 734, 998
X-rays, hard 734
X-rays, soft 734
Xe 1179
xenno 911
xenon 1179, 1362
Xenta 911

Y

year, number of days 160
yellow 734
yo-yo 146
yocto 911
yogh *320*
yot 321
Yotta 911

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

young mother puzzle *834*
youth effect 428
youth, gaining 511
ytterbium 1362
yttrium 1362
Yucatan impact 579
Yukawa coupling *1283*

Z

Z boson 1277, 1291
Z boson mass 1333
Z-graded Lie algebras *894*
Zeeman effect 788
Zener effect 790
zenith 136
zenith angle 144
Zeno effect, quantum 1141
zepto 911
zero 324, 828
zero-body problem 1199
zero-point fluctuations *1017*, 1190
Zetta 911
ZFC *824*
ZFC axioms 823
zinc 1362
zippo 308
zirconium 1362
ZnS 791
ZnSb 787
zodiac *151*

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

Content Overview

Preface 10
Advice for learners 11
Using this book 11
A request 12
An appetizer 13

First Part : Fall, Flow and Heat

1 Why should we care about motion? 22
2 From motion measurement to continuity 39
3 How to describe motion – kinematics 73
4 From objects and images to conservation 89
5 From the rotation of the earth to the relativity of motion 116
6 Motion due to gravitation 142
7 Classical mechanics and the predictability of motion 178
8 Measuring change with action 194
9 Motion and symmetry 209
10 Simple motions of extended bodies – oscillations and waves 226
11 Do extended bodies exist? – Limits of continuity 250
12 From heat to time-invariance 278
13 Self-organization and chaos – the simplicity of complexity 302
14 From the limitations of physics to the limits of motion 314
A Notation and conventions 319
Bibliography 330
Challenge hints and solutions 355
Credits 391

Second Part : Relativity

15 Maximum speed, observers at rest, and motion of light 401
16 General relativity: gravitation, maximum speed and maximum force 471
17 The new ideas on space, time and gravity 498
18 Motion in general relativity – bent light and wobbling vacuum 520
19 Why can we see the stars? – Motion in the universe 564
20 Black holes – falling forever 604
21 Does space differ from time? 619
22 General relativity in ten points – a summary for the layman 626
Bibliography 632
Challenge hints and solutions 655
Credits 663

Third Part : Light, Charges and Brains

23 Liquid electricity, invisible fields and maximum speed 669
24 The description of electromagnetic field evolution 706

Motion Mountain – The Adventure of Physics available free of charge at www.motionmountain.eu Copyright © Christoph Schiller November 1997–January 2009

25 What is light? 723
26 Images and the eye – optics 760
27 Charges are discrete – the limits of classical electrodynamics 773
28 Electromagnetic effects 776
29 Classical physics in a nutshell 798
30 The story of the brain 804
31 Thought and language 817
32 Concepts, lies and patterns of nature 836
B Numbers and spaces 875
C Units, measurements and constants 909
D Sources of information on motion 927
Bibliography 933
Challenge hints and solutions 955
Credits 970

Fourth Part : Quantum Theory: The Smallest Change

33 Minimum action – quantum theory for poets 976
34 Light – the strange consequences of the quantum of action 994
35 Motion of matter – beyond classical physics 1016
36 Colours and other interactions between light and matter 1041
37 Permutation of particles – are particles like gloves? 1052
38 Rotations and statistics – visualizing spin 1063
39 Superpositions and probabilities – quantum theory without ideology 1074
Bibliography 1099
Challenge hints and solutions 1110
Credits 1114

Fifth Part : Pleasure, Technology and Stars

40 Motion for enjoying life 1119
41 Changing the world with quantum theory 1146
42 Quantum electrodynamics – the origin of virtual reality 1189
43 Quantum mechanics with gravitation – the first approach 1204
44 The structure of the nucleus – the densest clouds 1222
45 The sun, the stars and the birth of matter 1248
46 The strong interaction 1257
47 The weak nuclear interaction and the handedness of nature 1275
48 The standard model of elementary particle physics – as seen on television 1290
49 Dreams of unification 1295
50 Bacteria, flies and knots 1303
51 Quantum physics in a nutshell 1332
E Composite particle properties 1348
Bibliography 1363
Challenge hints and solutions 1383
Credits 1390

Sixth Part : Motion Without Motion

52 General relativity versus quantum theory 1396
53 Nature at large scales – Is the universe something or nothing? 1425
54 The physics of love – a summary of the first five-and-a-half parts 1447
55 Maximum force and minimum distance – physics in limit statements 1458
56 The shape of points – extension in nature 1487
57 Unification (not yet available) 1518
58 The top of the mountain (not yet available) 1519
Postface 1520
Bibliography 1521
Challenge hints and solutions 1534
Credits 1537
Name index 1538
Subject index 1566